**Policy Statement**

Use of gamma detection following radiopharmaceutical administration for localization of sentinel lymph nodes in patients with breast cancer may be considered **medically necessary**.

Scintimammography, breast-specific gamma imaging (BSGI), and molecular breast imaging (MBI) are considered **investigational** in all applications, including but not limited to their use as an adjunct to mammography or in staging the axillary lymph nodes.

**Policy Guidelines**

The most commonly used radiopharmaceutical in breast-specific gamma imaging or molecular breast imaging is technetium 99m (Tc 99m) sestamibi. There is a specific HCPCS code for this radiopharmaceutical:

- **A9500**: Technetium Tc-99m sestamibi, diagnostic, per study dose, up to 40 millicuries

The 2013 Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System (BI-RADS) breast assessment and breast tissue categories are summarized in Table PG1.

**Table PG1. 2013 BI-RADS Breast Assessment and Breast Tissue Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Schema</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Benign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Probably benign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Suspicious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Highly suggestive of malignancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Known biopsy-proven malignancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Breast tissue categories**

- a. Breasts are almost entirely fatty
- b. Scattered areas of fibroglandular density
- c. Heterogeneously dense
- d. Extremely dense

BI-RADS: Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System.

The most commonly used radiopharmaceuticals for sentinel lymph node detection using either lymphoscintigraphy or hand-held gamma detection include Tc 99m-labeled colloids (e.g., sulfur colloid).

The HCPCS code for this particular radiopharmaceutical is:

- **A9541**: Technetium Tc-99m sulfur colloid, diagnostic, per study dose, up to 20 millicuries

Among the other possible radiopharmaceuticals is Lymphoseek®, which is reported with the following HCPCS code:

- **A9520**: Technetium tc-99m, tilmanocept, diagnostic, up to 0.5 millicuries
The following HCPCS code is specific to scintimammography:

- **S8080**: Scintimammography (radioimmunoscintigraphy of the breast), unilateral, including supply of radiopharmaceutical

### Description

Scintimammography, breast-specific gamma imaging (BSGI), and molecular breast imaging (MBI) use radiotracers with nuclear medicine imaging as a diagnostic tool for abnormalities of the breast. These tests are distinguished by the use of differing gamma camera technology, which may improve diagnostic performance for detecting small lesions. BSGI uses a single-head breast-specific gamma camera and a compression device; whereas, MBI uses dual-head breast-specific gamma cameras that also produce breast compression. Preoperative lymphoscintigraphy and/or intraoperative hand-held gamma detection of sentinel lymph nodes is a method of identifying sentinel lymph nodes for biopsy after radiotracer injection. Surgical removal of one or more sentinel lymph nodes is an alternative to full axillary lymph node dissection for staging evaluation and management of breast cancer.

### Related Policies

- N/A

### 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

Several scintillation (gamma) cameras have been cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process for “measuring and imaging the distribution of radionuclides in the human body by means of photon detection.” Examples of gamma cameras used in BSGI are the Dilon 6800® (Dilon Technologies) and single-head configurations of Discovery NM750b (GE Healthcare). Dual-head cameras used in MBI include LumaGEM™ (Gamma Medical) (FDA product code IYX) and Discovery NM750b (GE Healthcare).

Tc-99m sestamibi (marketed by Draxis Specialty Pharmaceuticals, Cardinal Health 14, Mallinkrodt, and Pharmalucence) has been approved by the FDA with the following labeling: “Breast Imaging: Technetium TC 99M Sestamibi is indicated for planar imaging as a second-line diagnostic drug after mammography to assist in the evaluation of breast lesions in patients with an abnormal mammogram or a palpable breast mass. Technetium TC 99M Sestamibi is not indicated for breast cancer screening, to confirm the presence or absence of malignancy, and it is not an alternative to biopsy.”

In 2013, Tc 99m tilmanocept (Lymphoseek; Navidea Biopharmaceuticals) was approved by the FDA for use in breast cancer and melanoma as a radioactive diagnostic imaging agent to help localize lymph nodes.
Technetium-99m-sulfur colloid was approved by the FDA through the new drug application (NDA; GE Healthcare, NDA 017456; Mallinckrodt, NDA 017724) process although these products appear to be marketed no longer. In addition, in 2011, Technetium Tc 99m Sulfur Colloid Kit (Pharmalucence) was approved by the FDA through the NDA process (NDA 017858) for use as an injection to localize lymph nodes in breast cancer patients.

In 2018, the FDA granted approval to Northstar Medical Radioisotopes for its RadioGenix™ System, which produces molybdenum 99, the material used to generate Tc 99m. Previously, molybdenum 99 was only produced from enriched uranium in facilities outside of the United States.

### Rationale

#### Background

**Mammography**

Mammography is the main screening modality for breast cancer, despite its limitations in terms of less than ideal sensitivity and specificity. Limitations of mammography are a particular issue for women at high-risk of breast cancer, for whom cancer risk exceeds the inconvenience of more frequent screening, starting at a younger age, with more frequent false-positive results.

Furthermore, the sensitivity of mammography is lower in women with radiographically dense breasts, which is more common among younger women. The clinical utility of adjunctive screening tests is primarily in the evaluation of women with inconclusive results on mammography. A biopsy is generally performed on a breast lesion if imaging cannot rule out malignancy with certainty. Therefore, adjunctive tests will be most useful in women with inconclusive mammograms if they have a high negative predictive value and can preclude the need for biopsy. Additional imaging for asymptomatic women who have dense breasts and negative mammograms has been suggested but the best approach is subject to debate (see the TEC Special Report [2013]-).

#### Scintimammography

Scintimammography is a diagnostic modality using radiopharmaceuticals to detect breast tumors. After intravenous injection of a radiopharmaceutical, the breast is evaluated using planar imaging. Scintimammography is performed with the patient lying prone, and the camera positioned laterally, which increases the distance between the breast and the camera. Special camera positioning to include the axilla may be included when the area of interest is an evaluation for axillary metastases. Scintimammography using conventional imaging modalities has relatively poor sensitivity in detecting smaller lesions (e.g., <15 mm), because of the relatively poor resolution of conventional gamma cameras in imaging the breast.

#### Breast-Specific Gamma Imaging

BSGI and molecular breast imaging (MBI) were developed to address the poor resolution of conventional gamma cameras. Breast-specific gamma cameras acquire images while the patient is seated in a position similar to that in mammography and the breast is lightly compressed. Detector heads are immediately next to the breast, increasing resolution, and images can be compared with mammographic images. BSGI and MBI differ primarily in the number and type of detectors used (e.g., multicrystal arrays of cesium iodide or sodium iodide, or nonscintillating, semiconductor materials, such as cadmium zinc telluride). In some configurations, a detector is placed on each side of the breast and used to compress it lightly. The maximum distance between the detector and the breast is therefore from the surface to the midpoint of the breast. The radiotracer typically used is technetium 99m (Tc 99m) sestamibi, and MBI takes approximately 40 minutes.

#### Lymphoscintigraphy and Hand-Held Gamma Detection

Preoperative lymphoscintigraphy and/or intraoperative hand-held gamma detection of sentinel lymph nodes is a method of identifying sentinel lymph nodes for a biopsy after radiotracer injection. Surgical removal of one or more sentinel lymph nodes is an alternative to full axillary
lymph node dissection for staging evaluation and management of breast cancer. Several trials have compared outcomes following sentinel lymph node biopsy with axillary lymph node dissection for managing patients who have breast cancer. The National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project trial B-32 examined whether sentinel lymph node dissection provides similar survival and regional control as full axillary lymph node dissection in the surgical staging and management of patients with clinically invasive breast cancer. This multicenter randomized controlled trial included 5611 women and observed statistically similar results for overall survival, disease-free survival, and regional control based on 8-year Kaplan-Meier estimates. An additional three-year follow-up of morbidity after surgical node dissection revealed lower morbidity in the sentinel lymph node dissection group, including lower rates of arm swelling, numbness, tingling, and fewer early shoulder abduction deficits. A recent systematic review and meta-analysis by Ram et al (2014) reported no significant difference in overall survival (hazard ratio, 0.94; 95% confidence interval, 0.79 to 1.19), no significant difference in disease-free survival (hazard ratio, 0.83; 95% confidence interval, 0.60 to 1.14), and similar rates of locoregional recurrence. However, axillary node dissection was associated with significantly greater surgical morbidity (e.g., wound infection, arm swelling, motor neuropathy, numbness) than sentinel node biopsy.

Radiopharmaceuticals
Scintimammography, BSGI, and MBI
The primary radiopharmaceuticals used with BSGI or MBI is Tc 99m sestamibi. The product label states that Tc 99m sestamibi is "indicated for planar imaging as a second-line diagnostic drug after mammography to assist in the evaluation of breast lesions in patients with an abnormal mammogram or a palpable breast mass. Technetium Tc-99m sestamibi is not indicated for breast cancer screening, to confirm the presence or absence of malignancy, and it is not an alternative to biopsy." Tc 99m tetrofosmin (Myoview™), a gamma-emitter used in some BSGI studies, is approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) only for cardiac imaging.

Lymphoscintigraphy and/or Hand-Held Gamma Detection
The primary radiopharmaceuticals used for lymphoscintigraphy include Tc 99m pertechnetate-labeled colloids and Tc 99m tilmanocept (Lymphoseek). Whereas, Tc 99m sulfur colloid may frequently be used for intraoperative injection and detection of sentinel lymph nodes using hand-held gamma detection probe.

Radiation Exposure
Scintimammography, BSGI, and MBI
The radiation dose associated with BSGI is substantial for diagnostic breast imaging modalities. According to Appropriateness Criteria from the American College of Radiology, the radiation dose from BSGI is 10 to 30 mSv, which is 15 to 30 times higher than the dose from a digital to the American College of Radiology, at these levels, BSGI is not indicated for breast cancer screening.

According to a study by Hruska and O'Connor (2015; who reported receiving royalties from licensed technologies by an agreement with Mayo Clinic and Gamma Medica), the effective dose from a lower "off-label" administered dose of 240 to 300 MBq (6.5-8 mCi) of Tc 99m sestamibi that is made feasible with newer dual-head MBI systems, is 2.0 to 2.5 mSv. For comparison, the effective dose (i.e., mean glandular dose) of digital mammography is estimated to be about 0.5 mSv. Hendrick (2010) calculated mean glandular doses and lifetime attributable risks of cancer due to film mammography, digital mammography, BSGI, and positron emission mammography.
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(PEM). The author, a consultant to GE Healthcare and a member of the medical advisory boards of Koning (manufacturer of dedicated breast computed tomography) and Bracco (magnetic resonance contrast agents), used group risk estimates from the Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation VII report to assess the risk of radiation-induced cancer and mortality from breast imaging studies. For a patient with average-sized breasts (compressed thickness during mammography of 5.3 cm per breast), estimated lifetime attributable risks of cancer at age 40 were:

- 5 per 100000 for digital mammography (breast cancer only),
- 7 per 100000 for screen-film mammography (breast cancer only),
- 55 to 82 per 100000 for BSGI (depending on the dose of Tc 99m sestamibi), and
- 75 for 100000 for PEM.

Corresponding lifetime attributable risks of cancer mortality at age 40 were:

- 1.3 per 100000 for digital mammography (breast cancer only),
- 1.7 per 100000 for screen-film mammography (breast cancer only),
- 26 to 39 per 100000 for BSGI, and
- 31 for 100000 for PEM.

A major difference in the impact of radiation between mammography and BSGI or PEM is that, for mammography, the substantial radiation dose is limited to the breast. With BSGI and PEM, all organs are irradiated, increasing the risks associated with radiation exposure.

Notes: The term molecular breast imaging is used in different ways, sometimes for any type of breast imaging involving molecular imaging, including PEM, and sometimes it is used synonymously with the term breast-specific gamma camera, as used in this review.

Use of single-photon emission computed tomography and positron emission tomography of the breast are not addressed in this review.

Literature Review
This review has been informed by a TEC Assessment (2013). Lymphoscintigraphy and radioactive localization for sentinel lymph node biopsy were not discussed in that TEC Assessment. The scope of this evidence review was expanded to include lymphoscintigraphy and radioactive localization for sentinel lymph node biopsy (SLNB).

A few studies have reported on the change in patient management after imaging but there were insufficient data to determine whether these changes led to improvements in health outcomes. A subsequent TEC Special Report (2013) reviewed evidence for asymptomatic women undergoing breast cancer screening, including those with dense breasts or at high risk of breast cancer. Retrospective studies included women with a mix of indications. For all indications, evidence was insufficient.

Tests for Diagnosis
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.
Scintimammography, Breast-Specific Gamma Imaging, and Molecular Breast Imaging for Diagnosis

Dense Breasts or High-Risk for Breast Cancer

Clinical Context and Test Purpose
One purpose of scintimammography, BSGI, and MBI is to confirm a diagnosis of breast cancer for women with dense breasts or are at high-risk for breast cancer.

The question addressed in this evidence review: Does the use of scintimammography, BSGI, or MBI as an adjunct to mammography improve the net health outcome compared with mammography alone, ultrasonography, or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) in women with dense breasts or high-risk for breast cancer?

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

Patients
The relevant populations of interest are women with dense breasts or high-risk for breast cancer, as part of routine screening.

Interventions
The imaging techniques being considered in this review are scintimammography, BSGI, and MBI.

These procedures use radiotracers, which are injected intravenously, followed by nuclear medicine imaging, to detect abnormalities of the breast. Scintimammography uses planar imaging with the woman lying prone and the camera positioned laterally. If the area of interest includes the axilla, the camera can be positioned to include the axilla. During BSGI and MBI, the patient is seated in a position similar to mammography and the breast is lightly compressed. The differences between these techniques are the number and type of detectors used in the camera.

Scintimammography, BSGI, and MBI are administered in tertiary care centers or other facilities equipped with the gamma imaging technology.

Comparators
The following tests and practices are currently being used to make decisions about women with dense breasts or high-risk for breast cancer: mammography alone, ultrasonography, or MRI. The comparators are administered in facilities with specialized equipment.

Outcomes
True-positives can inform decisions to initiate treatment among newly diagnosed women with breast cancer. For women already diagnosed with breast cancer, true-positives can inform surgical and other management decisions.

False-positives may lead to unnecessary biopsies in women in need of a definitive diagnosis. For women already diagnosed with breast cancer, false-positives may lead to unnecessary treatment.

True-negatives may reduce the number of biopsies in women in need of a definitive breast cancer diagnosis. For women already diagnosed with breast cancer, true-negatives can inform surgical and other management decisions.

False-negatives may prevent women from pursuing the necessary evaluations to determine a breast cancer diagnosis. For women already diagnosed with breast cancer, false-negatives may result in incorrect treatment decisions.
The time frame of interest for calculating performance characteristics is time to biopsy result. Patients who forgo biopsy based on test results could miss or delay the diagnosis of cancer. Years of follow-up would be necessary to determine the effects on overall survival (OS).

**Study Selection Criteria**
For the evaluation of the clinical validity of gamma imaging, studies that met the following eligibility criteria were considered:
- Reported on the accuracy of the marketed version of the technology (including any algorithms used to calculate scores)
- Included a suitable reference standard (describe the reference standard)
- Patient/sample clinical characteristics were described
- Patient/sample selection criteria were described.

**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).

Several studies have assessed BSGI and MBI in women at high-risk for breast cancer.

**Prospective Studies**
Rhodes et al (2015) reported on a prospective study that evaluated MBI using a lower dose of technetium Tc 99m (Tc 99m) sestamibi (dispensed activity, 300 MBq [≥2.4 mSv] vs 740 MBq in conventional doses). Like an earlier study (discussed next), participants were asymptomatic and had heterogeneously or extremely dense breasts. More than half (57%) had an additional risk factor for breast cancer, representing varying degrees of risk (e.g., 10% had a personal history of breast cancer) and 22% (without a personal history of breast cancer) had elevated Gail model risk score. Of 1651 eligible women, 1583 (96%) underwent both mammography and MBI. Images were interpreted by radiologists blinded to results of the other test using a standardized lexicon, and reference standards included follow-up of both positive and negative test results for 11 months minimum. Twenty-one (1.3%) of 1583 women were diagnosed with cancer. For detection of all cancers (invasive cancers plus ductal carcinoma in situ), sensitivity was 24% (95% confidence interval [CI], 11% to 45%) for mammography and 91% (95% CI, 71% to 97%) for mammography plus MBI (p < 0.001); specificity was 89% (95% CI, 88% to 91%) and 83% (95% CI, 81% to 85% p < 0.001); positive predictive value (PPV) was 3% (95% CI, 1% to 7%) and 7% (95% CI, 4% to 10% p = 0.021); and negative predictive value (NPV) was 99% (95% CI, 98% to 99%) and 100% (95% CI, 99% to 100% p < 0.001), all respectively. The addition of MBI increased the recall rate to 18% from 11% with mammography alone (p < 0.001), and the biopsy rate to 4% from 1% (p < 0.001).

Rhodes et al (2011) prospectively compared MBI (with dual-head cadmium zinc telluride detectors), mammography, and a combination of both modalities in 936 asymptomatic women with heterogeneously or extremely dense breasts on a prior mammogram, as well as additional risk factors (BRCA variants, a personal history of breast cancer). Risk levels in these different populations varied substantially. Eleven (1.2%) of 936 women were diagnosed with cancer. For detection of all cancers (invasive cancers plus ductal carcinoma in situ), sensitivity was 82% (95% CI, 52% to 95%) for MBI, 27% (95% CI, 10% to 57%) for mammography, and 91% (95% CI, 62% to 98%) for both combined. Specificity was 93% (95% CI, 91% to 94%) for MBI, 91% (95% CI, 89% to 93%) for mammography, and 85% (95% CI, 83% to 87%) for both (sensitivity and specificity for MBI vs mammography, both p = 0.07). The number of breast cancers diagnosed per number of biopsies performed was 28% for MBI and 18% for mammography.
Several studies have evaluated the diagnostic accuracy of BSGI in patients with dense breasts or high-risk for breast cancer who had normal mammographic findings. Brem et al (2005) prospectively evaluated 94 women with BSGI who were considered at high-risk for breast cancer despite normal mammographic findings. High-risk was defined as a 5-year breast cancer risk of 1.66%, as determined by the Gail model. Of 94 women in the study, 35 (37%) had a history of some type of breast cancer or atypical hyperplasia. Sixteen (17%) women had abnormal BSGI findings. Follow-up ultrasounds in 11 of them identified a hypoechoic lesion that was biopsied. The five remaining patients had normal ultrasound results and were followed with repeat BSGI at six months, all of which were normal. Among the 11 women who underwent ultrasound-guided biopsy, 2 (12%) invasive cancers were identified. The sensitivity of BSGI was 100% (95% CI, 22% to 100%) and the specificity was 85%. The study was limited by the small number of cancers detected.

**Retrospective Studies**

Two retrospective studies were published in 2016. Shermis et al (2016) reported on women with dense breasts and negative mammograms. The study sample was taken from a population of asymptomatic women who presented for routine breast cancer screening with mammography; a subset of these women was referred for supplemental screening. Women with Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System (BI-RADS) category 1 or 2 findings on mammography (i.e., negative or benign) who had a BI-RADS density category C or D (i.e., heterogeneously or extremely dense) and whose lifetime risk was less than 20% according to the Gail model were recommended for supplemental MBI screening. (Women with similar characteristics but a 20% or greater lifetime risk of breast cancer were recommended for MRI screening.) The MBI protocol was similar to that used in the Rhodes et al (2015) clinic studies (i.e., use of 300 MBq of Tc 99m sestamibi). Of 1696 women who received supplemental MBI, 143 (8.4%) had a positive finding, and 13 (9%) of these 143 women had malignant tumors confirmed histopathologically. Two of the tumors were ductal carcinoma in situ, and 11 were invasive. Thus, the incremental cancer detection rate with MBI was 0.77% (13/1696) and an invasive cancer rate of 0.65% (11/1696). The recall rate was 8.4% (143/1696). As the authors noted, follow-up was not conducted on all 1696 women so the sensitivity and specificity of MBI in this study population could not be determined.

Brem et al (2016) retrospectively reviewed BSGI findings in 849 women at increased risk of breast cancer (e.g., BRCA1, BRCA2, family history of breast cancer) whose mammogram findings were classified as negative, benign, or probably benign (BI-RADS categories 1, 2, or 3). BSGI examinations were performed with a single-head high-resolution breast-specific gamma camera, initially at a mean of 781 MBq Tc 99m sestamibi (n=653) but the protocol was then modified to a mean of 296 MBq (n=196). A total of 212 (25%) of 849 women had a positive BSGI examination (recall rate). Fourteen (6.6%) of the 212 women who tested positive were found to have breast cancer. Eight of the 14 cancers were ductal carcinoma in situ. The incremental cancer detection rate with BSGI was 1.6% (14/849), and the invasive cancer rate was 0.7% (6/849).

Although the use of BSGI (or MBI) has been proposed for women at high-risk of breast cancer, there is controversy and speculation over whether some women (e.g., those with BRCA variants) have a heightened radiosensitivity. If women with BRCA variants are more radiosensitive than the general population, studies may underestimate the risks of breast imaging with ionizing radiation (i.e., mammography, BSGI, MBI, positron emission mammography, single-photon emission computed tomography/computed tomography, breast-specific computed tomography, tomosynthesis) in these women. In contrast, ultrasonography and MRI do not use radiation. More research is needed to resolve this issue. Also, the risk associated with radiation exposure will be greater for women at high-risk of breast cancer, whether or not they are more radiosensitive because they start screening at a younger age when the risks associated with radiation exposure are greater.
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.

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).

No direct evidence on the clinical utility of scintimammography, BSGI, and MBI for this indication was identified.

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.

Because the clinical validity of scintimammography, BSGI, and MBI has not been established, a chain of evidence supporting their clinical utility in this population cannot be constructed.

Section Summary: Dense Breasts or High-Risk for Breast Cancer
Three prospective studies have compared the incremental difference in diagnostic accuracy when BSGI or MBI is added to mammography in women at increased risk, and both MBI studies were by the same research group. Sensitivity was higher with combined BSGI (or MBI) and mammography but specificity was lower. Studies of women at increased risk of breast cancer and negative mammograms found that a small number of additional cancers were detected but the recall rate was relatively high. Studies tended to include women at different risk levels (e.g., women with dense breasts and those with BRCA1). Moreover, any potential benefits need to be weighed against potential risks of additional radiation exposure and risks from breast biopsy for false-negative findings. Even in studies that used a reduced dose of Tc 99m sestamibi, the effective dose (2.4 mSv) exceeded that of digital mammography (≤0.5 mSv) by a factor of 4.8. In addition, a large, high-quality, head-to-head comparison of BSGI (or MBI) and MRI would be needed, especially for women at high-risk of breast cancer, because MRI, alternated with mammography, is currently the recommended screening technique.

Indeterminate or Suspicious Breast Lesions
Clinical Context and Test Purpose
One purpose of scintimammography, BSGI, and MBI is to confirm a diagnosis of breast cancer for women with indeterminate breast lesions.

The question addressed in this evidence review: Does the use of scintimammography, BSGI, or MBI improve the net health outcome compared with mammography spot compression views, ultrasonography, or MRI in women with indeterminate or suspicious breast lesions?

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

Patients
The population of interest are women with indeterminate or suspicious breast lesions, to confirm a diagnosis.

Interventions
The imaging techniques being considered in this review are scintimammography, BSGI, and MBI. (See explanation under the first indication.)
Scintimammography, BSGI, and MBI are administered in tertiary care centers or other facilities equipped with the gamma imaging technology.

Comparators

The following tests and practices are currently being used to make decisions about women with indeterminate or suspicious breast lesions: mammography spot compression views, ultrasonography, or MRI. The comparators are administered in facilities with specialized equipment.

Outcomes

Test accuracy: true-positives, false-positives, true-negatives, false-negatives. (See explanation under the first indication.)

The timeframe of interest for calculating performance characteristics is time to biopsy result. Patients who forgo biopsy based on test results could miss or delay the diagnosis of cancer. Years of follow-up would be necessary to determine the effects on OS.

Study Selection Criteria

The principles followed to select methodologically credible studies for this section are outlined in the first indication above.

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).

Cho et al (2016) retrospectively reviewed breast lesions in 162 women diagnosed with BI-RADS category 4 lesions (suspicious) on mammography or ultrasonography. Patients had subsequently undergone BSGI with Tc 99m sestamibi at 925 to 1110 MBq. Using biopsy-confirmed pathologic evaluation as the criterion standard, 66 (40.7%) of 162 lesions were found to be malignant. The sensitivity and specificity of BSGI were 90.9% (95% CI, 81.3% to 96.6%) and 78.1% (95% CI, 68.5% to 85.9%), respectively. The PPV was 74.1% (95% CI, 63.1% to 83.2%) and the NPV was 92.6% (95% CI, 84.6% to 97.2%). For lesions of 1 cm or smaller, the sensitivity of BSGI was 88.0% (95% CI, 68.6% to 97.5%) and the specificity was 66.8% (95% CI, 71.9% to 95.6%). For lesions larger than 1 cm, the sensitivity was higher (92.7%; 95% CI, 80.1% to 98.5%) and the specificity was lower (61.5%; 95% CI, 44.6% to 76.6%).

Meissnitzer et al (2015) in Austria evaluated BSGI in the diagnostic workup of 67 patients with 92 suspicious breast lesions identified on mammography and/or ultrasonography. Biopsy results were obtained as the reference standard in all patients, and 67 (73%) of 92 lesions were malignant. BSGI images were interpreted visually and semi-quantitatively. Overall BSGI sensitivity and specificity were 90% and 56%, respectively, compared with ultrasound sensitivity and specificity of 99% and 20%, respectively. For lesions smaller than 1 cm, the sensitivity of BSGI was 60%.

Tan et al (2014) assessed the diagnostic accuracy of dual-phase BSGI (at 10-15 minutes and at 90-120 minutes) in 76 women at a single institution in China who had suspicious breast masses. On pathologic review, 54 (59%) of 92 tumors were malignant, and 38 (41%) were benign. Using receiver operating characteristic-determined cut points for visual and semiquantitative interpretation, sensitivity and specificity were maximized when a combination
of visual and early-phase semiquantitative interpretation was used (85% and 92%, respectively) compared with either analysis or delayed-phase semiquantitative analysis alone.

Spanu et al (2012) assessed the clinical impact of BSGI (using Tc 99m tetrofosmin) in a prospective study of 467 women who had suspicious lesions on physical examination, MRI, ultrasound, or mammogram. Histopathology reports were obtained in all cases. BSGI results were true-positives in 408 of 420 breast cancer patients (sensitivity, 97%), including the detection of multifocal, multicentric disease and bilateral disease, and were false-negatives in 12 breast cancer patients. BSGI results were true-negatives in 40 of 47 patients with benign lesions (specificity, 85%). The authors calculated that BSGI provided additional value compared with mammography in 141 (30%) of 467 patients, 108 with breast cancer and 33 with benign lesions.

Hruska et al (2008) evaluated 150 patients with BI-RADS classification 4 or 5 lesions less than 2 cm identified on mammography or ultrasound who were scheduled for a biopsy. The patients underwent MBI using a dual-head, breast-specific gamma camera. Results from three blinded readers were averaged. In 88 patients, 128 cancer tumors were found. The per-lesion sensitivity with the dual-head camera was 90% (115/128) for all lesions and 82% (50/61) for lesions of 1 centimeter or less. Overall, MBI specificity (across patients) was 69%. The proportion of patients with cancer in this study was higher than might have been expected in a screening population with suspicious lesions on mammography. This was the case because preference was given to those who had a high suspicion of cancer or were likely to have a multifocal or multicentric disease.

Spanu et al (2008) evaluated 145 consecutive patients scheduled for biopsy with MBI (using Tc 99m tetrofosmin) of suspected breast lesions. With an 86% prevalence of the disease, the sensitivity of MBI was 98% per patient (100% for tumors >10 mm, 91% for tumors ≤10 mm). Per-lesion specificity was 86%. Four cancers were missed, three of which were detected by mammography. The authors suggested using MBI for surgical planning or avoiding biopsy but the NPV (83%) was not high enough to forgo biopsy.

Brem et al (2007) compared BSGI with MRI in 23 women who had 33 indeterminate lesions. Eight patients had 9 pathologically confirmed cancers. BSGI demonstrated a significantly greater specificity (71% [95% CI, 49% to 87%] than MRI (25% [95% CI, 11% to 47%], p<0.05) and comparable sensitivity (BSGI, 89% [95% CI, 51% to 99%] vs MRI, 100% [95% CI, 63% to 100%]), PPV (BSGI, 53% [95% CI, 27% to 78%] vs MRI, 33% [95% CI, 17% to 54%]), and NPV (BSGI, 94% [95% CI, 71% to 100%] vs MRI, 100% [95% CI, 52% to 100%]). The authors noted that the 100% sensitivity and 25% specificity of MRI would likely was due to the small number of cancers in the study.

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.

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.

No direct evidence on the clinical utility of scintimammography, BSGI, and MBI for this indication was identified.

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.
Because the clinical validity of scintimammography, BSGI, and MBI has not been established, a chain of evidence supporting their clinical utility in this population cannot be constructed.

**Section Summary: Indeterminate or Suspicious Breast Lesions**
A number of studies have evaluated the diagnostic accuracy of BSGI (or MBI) of suspicious lesions. Compared with biopsy, the NPV in studies that reported this outcome varied from 83% to 94%. The utility of BSGI in evaluating indeterminate or suspicious lesions must be compared with other modalities that would be used (e.g., spot views ultrasound, MRI) for diagnostic mammography. Given the relative ease and diagnostic accuracy of the criterion standard (biopsy), coupled with the adverse consequences of missing a breast cancer, the NPV of BSGI would have to be extremely high to alter treatment decisions. Because NPV is partially determined by disease prevalence, NPV will be lower in a population of patients with mammographic abnormalities highly suggestive of breast cancer than in a population of patients with mammographic abnormalities not suggestive of breast cancer. Therefore, any clinical utility of BSGI as an adjunct to mammography would vary by type of mammographic abnormalities included in the studies.

**Scintimammography and BSGI to Inform Treatment**
Evidence reviews assess the clinical evidence to determine whether the use of technology improves the net health outcome. Broadly defined, health outcomes are the length of life, quality of life, and ability to function—including benefits and harms. Every clinical condition has specific outcomes that are important to patients and managing the course of that condition. Validated outcome measures are necessary to ascertain whether a condition improves or worsens, and whether the magnitude of that change is clinically significant. The net health outcome is a balance of benefits and harms.

To assess whether the evidence is sufficient to draw conclusions about the net health outcome of technology, two domains are examined: the relevance, and quality and credibility. To be relevant, studies must represent one or more intended clinical use of the technology in the intended population and compare an effective and appropriate alternative at a comparable intensity. For some conditions, the alternative will be supportive care or surveillance. The quality and credibility of the evidence depend on study design and conduct, minimizing bias and confounding that can generate incorrect findings. The RCT is preferred to assess efficacy; however, in some circumstances, nonrandomized studies may be adequate. RCTs are rarely large enough or long enough to capture less common adverse events and long-term effects. Other types of studies can be used for these purposes and to assess generalizability to broader clinical populations and settings of clinical practice.

**Detection of Residual Tumor After Neoadjuvant Therapy**

**Clinical Context and Test Purpose**
One purpose of scintimammography and BSGI is to inform a treatment plan for women diagnosed with breast cancer. This review evaluates the use of these procedures among women with breast cancer to detect residual tumor after neoadjuvant therapy.

The question addressed in this evidence review: Does the use of scintimammography or BSGI improve net health outcome compared with MRI, fluorine 18 fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography, or ultrasonography in women with breast cancer undergoing evaluation for residual tumor after neoadjuvant therapy?

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

**Patients**
The relevant population of interest are women with breast cancer undergoing an evaluation to detect any residual tumor tissue following neoadjuvant therapy.
Interventions

The imaging techniques being considered in this review are scintimammography and BSGI.

These procedures use radiotracers, which are injected intravenously, followed by nuclear imaging, to detect abnormalities of the breast. Scintimammography uses planar imaging with the woman lying prone and the camera positioned laterally. If the area of interest includes the axilla, the camera can be positioned to include the axilla. During BSGI, the patient is seated in a position similar to mammography and the breast is lightly compressed. The differences between these techniques are the number and type of detectors used in the camera.

Scintimammography and BSGI are administered in facilities equipped with the gamma imaging technology.

Comparators

The following tests and practices are currently being used by indication to make decisions about women with breast cancer undergoing screening to detect any residual tumor tissue following neoadjuvant therapy: MRI, fluorine 18 fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography, or ultrasonography. These comparators are administered facilities with specialized equipment.

Outcomes

Test accuracy: true-positives, false-positives, true-negatives, false-negatives. (See explanation under the first indication.)

For women already diagnosed with breast cancer who are using the tests to guide treatment decisions, years of follow-up are necessary to capture recurrence rates and survival rates.

Study Selection Criteria

The principles followed to select methodologically credible studies for this section are outlined in the first indication above.

Systematic Reviews

A systematic review and meta-analysis by Guo et al (2016) identified 14 studies investigating the performance of BSGI with Tc 99m for evaluating the response to neoadjuvant therapy in patients with breast cancer.\(^3\) In all studies, histopathologic results were obtained after surgery and used as the criterion standard. Study sizes ranged from 14 to 122 patients (total n=503 patients). Most studies had fewer than 30 patients. Thirteen studies were prospective and one retrospective. Only three studies conducted BSGI both before and after treatment. The sensitivity of BSGI for identifying residual disease ranged from 33% to 100%, with a pooled sensitivity of 86% (95% CI, 78% to 92%). The specificity ranged from 17% to 95%, and the pooled specificity was 69% (95% CI, 64% to 74%).

Retrospective Studies

The largest study included in the Guo et al (2016) systematic review is the retrospective and single-center by Lee et al (2014).\(^3\) It evaluated BSGI detection of residual tumor after neoadjuvant chemotherapy (primarily anthracycline and taxane-based) in 122 women who had pathologically confirmed invasive breast cancer. All patients underwent BSGI and dynamic contrast-enhanced breast MRI after completing neoadjuvant therapy. Surgeons consulted BSGI and MRI for surgical planning (i.e., either breast-conserving therapy [64%] or mastectomy [36%]). Of 122 patients, 104 (85%) had the residual disease by pathologic review. BSGI sensitivity was 74%, specificity was 72%, NPV was 33%, and PPV was 94%. The sensitivity of BSGI varied by cellularity and size of residual tumor (greater sensitivity with greater cellularity and greater tumor size).

No studies were identified that compared imaging methods (e.g., BSGI vs MRI or fluorine 18 fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography) for detection of residual tumor after neoadjuvant therapy. In addition, no studies were identified on the clinical utility of...
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BSGI, i.e., changes in patient management strategies (e.g., the extent of surgery) or in health outcomes (e.g., disease-specific survival).

Section Summary: Detection of Residual Tumor After Neoadjuvant Therapy
A systematic review of studies evaluating BSGI for detecting residual tumor after neoadjuvant therapy found a pooled sensitivity of 86% and a pooled specificity of 69% compared with histopathologic analysis. No studies were identified that compared the diagnostic accuracy of BSGI with other imaging approaches, or that investigated the impact of BSGI on patient management decisions or health outcomes.

Surgical Planning for Breast-Conserving Therapy
Clinical Context and Test Purpose
One purpose of scintimammography and BSGI is to inform a treatment plan for women diagnosed with breast cancer. This review evaluates the use of these procedures among women with breast cancer undergoing planning for breast-conserving surgery.

The question addressed in this evidence review: Does the use of scintimammography or BSGI improve the net health outcome compared with MRI in women with breast cancer undergoing planning for breast-conserving surgery?

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

Patients
The population of interest are women with breast cancer undergoing planning for breast-conserving surgery.

Interventions
The imaging techniques being considered in this review are scintimammography and BSGI. (See explanation under the previous indication.)

Scintimammography and BSGI are administered in tertiary care centers or other facilities equipped with gamma imaging technology.

Comparators
The following tests and practices are currently being used by indication to make decisions about women with breast cancer undergoing planning for breast-conserving surgery: MRI. MRIs are administered in facilities with specialized equipment.

Outcomes
Test accuracy: true-positives, false-positives, true-negatives, false-negatives. (See explanation under the first indication.)

For women already diagnosed with breast cancer who are using the tests to guide treatment decisions, years of follow-up are necessary to capture recurrence rates and survival rates.

Study Selection Criteria
The principles followed to select methodologically credible studies for this section are outlined in the first indication above.

Edwards et al (2013) retrospectively assessed changes in the surgical management of 218 women who had breast cancer and were eligible for breast-conserving therapy.33 All patients had undergone preoperative BSGI or MRI. Twelve percent of patients who had BSGI and 29% of those who had MRI changed to mastectomy. On pathologic review, no patient who underwent a mastectomy was eligible for breast-conserving therapy. Of patients who received breast-conserving therapy, 15% of those who had BSGI and 19% of those who had MRI required a single re-excision because of positive surgical margins, and 14% and 6% respectively,
required a mastectomy. Based on this retrospective study, the clinical utility of BSGI for guiding surgical decision making in breast cancer patients would appear limited.

**Section Summary: Surgical Planning for Breast-Conserving Therapy**

One retrospective study is insufficient to determine the clinical utility of BSGI for guiding surgical decision making in breast cancer patients. In this study, results suggested that MRI identified more patients than BSGI who were not appropriate candidates for breast-conserving therapy. Prospective comparative studies are needed.

**Detection of Axillary Metastases**

**Clinical Context and Test Purpose**

One purpose of scintimammography and BSGI is to inform a treatment plan for women diagnosed with breast cancer. This review evaluates the use of these procedures among women with breast cancer undergoing screening to detect axillary metastases.

The question addressed in this evidence review: Does the use of scintimammography or BSGI improve the net health outcome compared with surgical nodal dissection in women with breast cancer undergoing screening to detect axillary metastases?

The following PICO's were used to select literature to inform this review.

**Patients**

The population of interest are women with breast cancer undergoing screening to detect axillary metastases.

**Interventions**

The imaging techniques being considered in this review are scintimammography and BSGI. (See explanation under the third indication.)

Scintimammography and BSGI are administered in tertiary care centers or other facilities equipped with gamma imaging technology.

**Comparators**

The following tests and practices are currently being used by indication to make decisions about women with breast cancer undergoing screening to detect any axillary metastases: surgical node dissection. Surgical node dissection is performed in a tertiary or other specialized facilities.

**Outcomes**

Test accuracy: true-positives, false-positives, true-negatives, false-negatives. (See explanation under the first indication.)

For women already diagnosed with breast cancer who are using the tests to guide treatment decisions, years of follow-up are necessary to capture recurrence rates and survival rates.

**Study Selection Criteria**

The principles followed to select methodologically credible studies for this section are outlined in the first indication above.

**Systematic Reviews**

Regarding the use of scintimammography to detect axillary metastases, a meta-analysis reviewed 45 studies of scintimammography and also reported summary estimates of 83% (95% CI, 82% to 84%) for sensitivity and 85% (95% CI, 83% to 86%) for specificity.34 In a review of studies published between 1994 and 1998, Taillefer (1999) showed a sensitivity of 77% and a specificity of 89%.35
Case Series
Several case series using different radiopharmaceuticals have shown sensitivities in the high 80% to 90% range.\textsuperscript{36,37}

Section Summary: Detection of Axillary Metastases
Current evidence on BSGI for detection of axillary metastases includes small studies and systematic reviews of these studies. A meta-analysis of 45 small studies found that pooled sensitivity was 93% and pooled specificity was 85%; the diagnostic accuracy of BSGI as reported in the available literature is not high enough for this technology to replace the current standard practice (surgical nodal dissection). The test is not accurate enough to replace surgical nodal dissection. No studies have examined patient outcomes comparing the use of scintimammography to aid in decision making regarding nodal dissection with going directly to nodal dissection.

Radiopharmaceutical and Gamma Detection to Inform Treatment
Sentinel Lymph Node Biopsy for Detection of Axillary Metastases

Clinical Context and Test Purpose
The purpose of radiopharmaceutical and gamma detection is to inform a treatment plan for women with breast cancer undergoing SLNB to detect axillary metastases.

The questions addressed in this evidence review are: Does the use of radiopharmaceutical and gamma detection improve the net health outcome compared with no testing in women with breast cancer who are undergoing SLNB to detect axillary metastases?

The following PICO\textsuperscript{s} were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The relevant population of interest are women with breast cancer who are undergoing SLNB to detect axillary metastases.

Interventions
The therapy being considered is lymphoscintigraphy and radioactive localization for SLNB.

Lymphoscintigraphy and radioactive localization are techniques that map sentinel nodes by identifying the lymph drainage basin, determining the number of sentinel nodes, differentiating the sentinel nodes, and marking the sentinel node over the skin for a biopsy.

Lymphoscintigraphy and radioactive localization are administered in tertiary care centers or other facilities equipped with gamma imaging technology.

Comparators
The following practice is currently being used to make decisions about detecting axillary metastases: localization without radiopharmaceuticals or gamma detection.

Outcomes
Test accuracy: true-positives, false-positives, true-negatives, false-negatives. (See explanation under the first indication.)

True-positives can inform decisions to initiate treatment among newly diagnosed women with breast cancer. For women already diagnosed with breast cancer, true-positives can inform surgical and other management decisions.

False-positives may lead to unnecessary biopsies in women in need of a definitive diagnosis. For women already diagnosed with breast cancer, false-positives may lead to unnecessary treatment.
True-negatives may reduce the number of biopsies in women in need of a definitive breast cancer diagnosis. For women already diagnosed with breast cancer, true-negatives can inform surgical and other management decisions.

False-negatives may prevent women from pursuing the necessary evaluations to determine a breast cancer diagnosis. For women already diagnosed with breast cancer, false-negatives may result in incorrect treatment decisions.

**Study Selection Criteria**
The principles followed to select methodologically credible studies for this section are outlined in the first indication above.

**Systematic Reviews**
Pesek et al (2012) published a meta-analysis based on a search between 1993 and 2011; 183 articles met inclusion criteria (total n=9306 patients). This analysis examined the false-negative rate of SLNB in patients with breast cancer by localization technique: radioactive tracer alone, dye alone, or a combination of radioactive tracer and dye. The false-negative rate was highest for the dye-only group at 8.6% (95% CI, 6.7% to 10.8%) while the tracer-only group had a false-negative rate of 7.4% (95% CI, 5.6% to 9.3%), and the combination of dye-and-tracer had the lowest false-negative rate at 5.9% (95% CI, 4.8% to 7.1%). The Q statistic for heterogeneity indicated that the 3 groups were not all equal (p=0.050). Subsequent pairwise comparisons revealed a difference between the dye-only and the dye-and-tracer categories (p=0.018), but no significant difference was seen between tracer-only and dye-only (p=0.370) or between tracer-only and dye-and-tracer (p=0.178).

**Randomized Controlled Trials**
A randomized study by van der Vorst et al (2012) compared Tc 99m radiotracer plus near-infrared fluorescence imaging using indocyanine green with or without the use of a patent blue dye for localization of sentinel lymph nodes. Twenty-four consecutive breast cancer patients who were all undergoing SLNB were studied. Of the 23 cases with successful sentinel lymph node mapping, the lymph nodes were both radioactive and fluorescent in 100% of cases, whereas only 84% of the lymph nodes showed blue dye staining. In addition, for 25% of cases, the gamma probe was needed to identify and locate the sentinel nodes during the first 15 minutes of localization.

**Nonrandomized Trials**
Johnson et al (2011) conducted a single institution study assessing 699 patients with operable breast cancer for SLNB. Using intraoperative Tc 99m-labeled radiopharmaceutical tracer subareolar injection, the sentinel node was localized in 98.6% of cases.

Martin et al (2000) reported a prospective multi-institutional study examining 758 patients who were clinical stage T1-2, N0, M0 invasive breast cancer and who received radioactive colloid and isosulfan blue dye injections before axillary SLNB. Localization of sentinel nodes was successful in 89% of cases and 33% of histologically positive sentinel lymph nodes showed no blue dye staining.

Some studies have examined whether preoperative lymphoscintigraphy improves sentinel node localization and detection in clinically node-negative patients and have found little or no incremental value for lymphoscintigraphy imaging of the axilla. Note that lymphoscintigraphy uses planar or tomographic imaging that differs from the use of a hand-held gamma detection probe of radioactive nodes during surgery.

**Section Summary: SLNB for Detection of Axillary Metastases**
For individuals who have breast cancer, are undergoing SLNB to detect any axillary metastases, and who have received radiopharmaceutical and gamma detection for localization of sentinel lymph nodes, the evidence includes three studies and a meta-analysis. These studies provide
consistent evidence that diagnostic performance using radiopharmaceutical and gamma
detection yields high success rates in identifying sentinel lymph nodes; further, these studies
would suggest that diagnostic performance trends toward better detection rates using
radiopharmaceutical (as opposed to alternative methods using only blue dye). Clinical utility is
demonstrated for this indication when the high diagnostic yield of sentinel lymph nodes using
radiopharmaceutical and gamma detection is considered together with the evidence
that SLNB provides similar long-term outcomes as full axillary lymph node dissection for control of
breast cancer and offers more favorable early results with reduced arm swelling and
postsurgical morbidity.

Summary of Evidence

Scintimammography, BSGI, and MBI for Diagnosis

For individuals who have dense breasts or high-risk for breast cancer who receive
scintimammography, BSGI, or MBI as an adjunct to mammography, the evidence includes
diagnostic accuracy studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test
validity, and treatment-related morbidity. Three prospective studies have assessed the
incremental difference in diagnostic accuracy when BSGI or MBI is added to mammography in
women at increased risk. Sensitivity was higher with combined BSGI or MBI and mammography
but specificity was lower. Studies of women at increased risk of breast cancer and negative
mammograms found that a small number of additional cancers were detected but the recall
rate was relatively high. Studies tended to include women at different risk levels (e.g., women
with dense breasts and those with BRCA1). Moreover, any potential benefits need to be
weighed against the potential risks of additional radiation exposure. The evidence is insufficient
to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have indeterminate or suspicious breast lesions who receive
scintimammography, BSGI, or MBI, the evidence includes diagnostic accuracy
studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test validity, and treatment-
related morbidity. In the available studies, compared with biopsy, the NPV of BSGI (or MBI)
varied from 83% to 94%. Given the relative ease and diagnostic accuracy of the criterion
standard of biopsy, coupled with the adverse consequences of missing a breast cancer,
the NPV of BSGI (or MBI) would have to be extremely high to alter treatment decisions. The
evidence to date does not demonstrate this level of NPV. Moreover, the value of BSGI in
evaluating indeterminate or suspicious lesions must be compared with other modalities that
would be used, such as spot views for diagnostic mammography. The evidence is insufficient
to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Scintimammography and BSGI for Treatment

For individuals who have breast cancer undergoing detection of residual tumor after
neoadjuvant therapy who receive scintimammography and BSGI, the evidence includes
diagnostic accuracy studies and a meta-analysis. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-
specific survival, test validity, and treatment-related morbidity. The meta-analysis of studies
evaluating the accuracy of BSGI for detecting residual tumor after neoadjuvant therapy found
a pooled sensitivity of 86% and a pooled specificity of 69% compared with histopathologic
analysis. No studies were identified that compared the diagnostic accuracy of BSGI with other
imaging approaches, or that investigated the clinical utility of this potential application of BSGI.
The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.
For individuals who have breast cancer undergoing surgical planning for breast-conserving
therapy who receive scintimammography and BSGI, the evidence includes a retrospective
observational study. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test validity, and
treatment-related morbidity. In the retrospective study, results suggested that MRI identified
more patients than BSGI who were not appropriate candidates for breast-conserving therapy.
Prospective comparative studies are needed. The evidence is insufficient to determine the
effects of the technology on health outcomes.
For individuals who have breast cancer undergoing detection of axillary metastases who receive scintimammography and BSGI, the evidence includes diagnostic accuracy studies and systematic reviews of diagnostic accuracy studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test validity, and treatment-related morbidity. A meta-analysis of the available diagnostic accuracy studies found that the sensitivity and specificity of BSGI are not high enough for this technology to replace the current standard practice, surgical nodal dissection. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Radiopharmaceutical and Gamma Detection for Treatment

For individuals who have breast cancer undergoing sentinel lymph node biopsy for detection of axillary metastases who receive radiopharmaceutical and gamma detection for localization of sentinel lymph nodes, the evidence includes three studies and a meta-analysis. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test validity, and treatment-related morbidity. A meta-analysis and three additional studies have provided evidence that using radiopharmaceutical and gamma detection for localization of sentinel lymph nodes yields high success rates in identifying sentinel lymph nodes; additionally, the diagnostic performance generally offers better detection rates with radiopharmaceutical than with alternative methods (e.g., using only blue dye). The evidence has indicated that sentinel lymph node biopsy provides similar long-term outcomes as full axillary lymph node dissection for control of breast cancer and offers more favorable early results with reduced arm swelling and better quality of life. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Supplemental Information
Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

Society of Nuclear Medicine

The Society of Nuclear Medicine (2010) released a procedure guideline on breast scintigraphy using breast-specific gamma cameras. The guideline was based on consensus, not on a systematic review of the literature or assessment of study quality, and most of it discusses procedures and specifications of the examination, documentation and recording, quality control, and radiation safety. The guidelines also listed common clinical indications for breast-specific gamma imaging but did not discuss the level of evidence for each indication.

American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (2017) updated its 2011 practice bulletin on breast cancer screening in average-risk women. There was no discussion or recommendation for scintimammography or any other gamma imaging techniques for routine screening.

American College of Radiology

Appropriateness Criteria from the American College of Radiology rated breast-specific gamma imaging a 1 or 2 (indicating "usually not appropriate" for breast cancer screening), in patients with high or intermediate breast cancer risk (last reviewed in 2016), palpable breast masses (last reviewed in 2017), and workup of breast pain (last reviewed in 2016). New guidelines on screening for breast cancer in above average-risk patients (last reviewed in 2017) do not mention breast-specific gamma imaging.

The American College of Radiology (2018) issued guidelines on the use of MBI for breast cancer screening. The guidelines state, “further advances in detector technology to allow lower dosing, more widespread penetration of MBI-guided biopsy capabilities, and additional large prospective trials (to include incidence screening results) will be needed before MBI can be embraced as a screening tool, even in women at elevated risk.”
American Society of Clinical Oncology
The American Society of Clinical Oncology (2016) reaffirmed its 2014 recommendations on the use of sentinel node biopsy for patients with early-stage breast cancer. The recommendations were based on randomized controlled trials, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and clinical practice guidelines from 2012 through July 2016. The recommendations included:

"Women without sentinel lymph node (SLN) metastases should not receive axillary lymph node dissection (ALND). Women with one to two metastatic SLNs who are planning to undergo breast-conserving surgery with whole-breast radiotherapy should not undergo ALND (in most cases). Women with SLN metastases who will undergo mastectomy should be offered ALND. These three recommendations are based on randomized controlled trials. Women with operable breast cancer and multicentric tumors, with ductal carcinoma in situ, who will undergo mastectomy, who previously underwent breast and/or axillary surgery, or who received preoperative/neoadjuvant systemic therapy may be offered SNB [sentinel node biopsy]. Women who have large or locally advanced invasive breast cancer (tumor size T3/T4), inflammatory breast cancer, or ductal carcinoma in situ (when breast-conserving surgery is planned) or are pregnant should not undergo SNB."

National Comprehensive Cancer Network
The National Comprehensive Cancer Network's guidelines (v.2.2019) an invasive breast cancer with clinical stage I, IIA, IIB, and IIIA T3, N1, M0 (BINV-D) include sentinel node mapping and excision for clinically node-negative patients at time of diagnosis or following negative fine-needle aspiration or core biopsy of clinically positive nodes at time of diagnosis. If the sentinel nodes are found to be negative on pathologic examination, then no further axillary surgery is suggested (category 1 recommendation).

Network guidelines on breast cancer screening and diagnosis (v.1.2019) state: “Current evidence does not support the routine use of molecular imaging (e.g. breast-specific gamma imaging, sestamibi scan, or positron emission mammography) as screening procedures, but there is emerging evidence that these tests may improve detection of early breast cancers among women with mammographically dense breasts. However, the whole-body effective radiation dose with these tests is between 20-30 times higher than that of mammography.”

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.

Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials
Some currently ongoing and unpublished trials that might influence this review are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Key Trials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCTNo.</th>
<th>Trial Name</th>
<th>Planned Enrollment</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCT03082456</td>
<td>Molecular Breast Imaging in Screening Breast Cancer</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Jun 2018 (ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT02324387</td>
<td>Tc99m Sestamibi Molecular Breast Imaging</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Jun 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT02556684</td>
<td>Breast-Specific Gamma Imaging and Locally Advanced Breast Cancer Undergoing Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy (BSGLAB)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Oct 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCT02744053</td>
<td>Multimodality Breast Imaging for the Assessment of Tumor Response to Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy in Triple Negative Breast Cancer Patients</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Nov 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NCT: national clinical trial.
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Documentation for Clinical Review

Please provide the following documentation (if when requested):

- History and physical and/or consultation notes including:
Post Service
- Procedure (imaging) report

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.

MN/IE
The following services may be considered medically necessary in certain instances and investigational in others. Services may be considered medically necessary when policy criteria are met. Services may be considered investigational when the policy criteria are not met or when the code describes application of a product in the position statement that is investigational.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPT®</strong></td>
<td>78800</td>
<td>Radiopharmaceutical localization of tumor or distribution of radiopharmaceutical agent(s); limited area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78801</td>
<td>Radiopharmaceutical localization of tumor or distribution of radiopharmaceutical agent(s); multiple areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78803</td>
<td>Radiopharmaceutical localization of tumor or distribution of radiopharmaceutical agent(s); tomographic (SPECT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78195</td>
<td>Lymphatics and lymph nodes imaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HCPCS</strong></td>
<td>A4641</td>
<td>Radiopharmaceutical, diagnostic, not otherwise classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A9500</td>
<td>Technetium tc-99m sestamibi, diagnostic, per study dose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A9502</td>
<td>Technetium Tc-99m tetrofosmin, diagnostic, per study dose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A9520</td>
<td>Technetium tc-99m, tilmanocept, diagnostic, up to 0.5 millicuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A9541</td>
<td>Technetium Tc-99m sulfur colloid, diagnostic, per study dose, up to 20 millicuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S8080</td>
<td>Scintimammography (radioimmunoscintigraphy of the breast), unilateral, including supply of radiopharmaceutical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICD-10</strong></td>
<td>BH030ZZ</td>
<td>Plain Radiography of Right Single Mammary Duct using High Osmolar Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>BH031ZZ</td>
<td>Plain Radiography of Right Single Mammary Duct using Low Osmolar Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BH03YZZ</td>
<td>Plain Radiography of Right Single Mammary Duct using Other Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BH040ZZ</td>
<td>Plain Radiography of Left Single Mammary Duct using High Osmolar Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BH041ZZ</td>
<td>Plain Radiography of Left Single Mammary Duct using Low Osmolar Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BH04YZZ</td>
<td>Plain Radiography of Left Single Mammary Duct using Other Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BH050ZZ</td>
<td>Plain Radiography of Right Multiple Mammary Ducts using High Osmolar Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BH051ZZ</td>
<td>Plain Radiography of Right Multiple Mammary Ducts using Low Osmolar Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BH05YZZ</td>
<td>Plain Radiography of Right Multiple Mammary Ducts using Other Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BH060ZZ</td>
<td>Plain Radiography of Left Multiple Mammary Ducts using High Osmolar Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BH061ZZ</td>
<td>Plain Radiography of Left Multiple Mammary Ducts using Low Osmolar Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BH06YZZ</td>
<td>Plain Radiography of Left Multiple Mammary Ducts using Other Contrast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Policy History

This section provides a chronological history of the activities, updates and changes that have occurred with this Medical Policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/25/1998</td>
<td>Adopted policy from BCBSA TEC</td>
<td>Medical Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/02/2002</td>
<td>Coding Update</td>
<td>Administrative Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2011</td>
<td>Policy title change from Scintimammography</td>
<td>Medical Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy revision with no position change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/2015</td>
<td>Coding update</td>
<td>Administrative Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2015</td>
<td>Policy title change from Scintimammography/Breast-Specific Gamma Imaging/Molecular Breast Imaging</td>
<td>Medical Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/2017</td>
<td>Policy revision with position change</td>
<td>Medical Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/2017</td>
<td>Policy revision without position change</td>
<td>Medical Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/2018</td>
<td>Policy revision without position change</td>
<td>Medical Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/2019</td>
<td>Policy revision without position change</td>
<td>Medical Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Definitions of Decision Determinations

**Medically Necessary:** A treatment, procedure, or drug is medically necessary only when it has been established as safe and effective for the particular symptoms or diagnosis, is not investigational or experimental, is not being provided primarily for the convenience of the patient or the provider, and is provided at the most appropriate level to treat the condition.

**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. Please call (800) 541-6652 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.