

<b>2.04.66</b>	<b>Serum Biomarker Human Epididymis Protein 4</b>		
<b>Original Policy Date:</b>	July 2, 2010	<b>Effective Date:</b>	February 1, 2022
<b>Section:</b>	2.0 Medicine	<b>Page:</b>	Page 1 of 24

## Policy Statement

Measurement of human epididymis protein 4 (HE4) is considered **investigational** for all indications.

**NOTE:** Refer to [Appendix A](#) to see the policy statement changes (if any) from the previous version.

## Policy Guidelines

### Coding

The following CPT code is specific for this test:

- **86305:** Human epididymis protein 4 (HE4)

If HE4 is performed as part of the Risk of Ovarian Malignancy Algorithm (ROMA™) test (addressed in Blue Shield of California Medical Policy: Multimarker Serum Testing Related to Ovarian Cancer), the following code would be reported:

- **81500:** Oncology (ovarian), biochemical assays of two proteins (CA-125 and HE4), utilizing serum, with menopausal status, algorithm reported as a risk score

## Description

Human epididymis protein 4 (HE4) is a novel biomarker that has been cleared by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration for monitoring patients with epithelial ovarian cancer. HE4 is proposed as a replacement for or a complement to cancer antigen 125 (CA 125) for monitoring disease progression and recurrence. HE4 has also been proposed as a test to evaluate women with ovarian masses and to screen for ovarian cancer in asymptomatic women.

## Related Policies

- Multimarker Serum Testing Related to Ovarian Cancer

## 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

Multiple HE4 test kits have been cleared by the FDA through the 510(k) process and summarized in Table 1. The FDA determined that this device was substantially equivalent to a CA 125 assay kit for use as an aid in monitoring disease progression or recurrence in patients with epithelial

ovarian cancer. The FDA-approved indication states that serial testing for HE4 should be done in conjunction with other clinical methods used for monitoring ovarian cancer and that the HE4 test is not intended to assess the risk of disease outcomes.

**Table 1. Serum Human Epididymis Protein 4 Tests Cleared by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration**

Test	Manufacturer	Location	Date Cleared	510(k) No.
HE4 EIA Kit	Fujirebio Diagnostics	Malvern, PA	06/09/2008	K072939
ARCHITECT HE4 assay (CMIA)	Fujirebio Diagnostics	Malvern, PA	03/18/2010	K093957
ELECSYS HE4 (CMIA)	Roche Diagnostics	Indianapolis, IN	09/10/2012	K112624
Lumipulse G HE4 Immunoreaction Cartridges	Fujirebio Diagnostics	Malvern, PA	11/24/2015	K151378

CMIA: chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay; HE4: human epididymis protein 4; EIA: enzymatic immunoassay.

FDA product code: OIU.

## Rationale

### Background

#### Ovarian Cancer

Ovarian cancer is the fifth most common cause of cancer mortality among U.S. women. According to Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results data, in 2021, an estimated 21,410 women will be diagnosed with ovarian cancer and 13,770 women will die of the disease.<sup>1</sup> The stage at diagnosis is an important predictor of survival; however, most women are not diagnosed until the disease has spread. For the period 1999 to 2006, 62% of women with ovarian cancer were diagnosed when the disease had distant metastases (stage IV), and this was associated with a 5-year survival rate of 28.9%. In contrast, 14.8% of women diagnosed with localized cancer (stage I) had a 5-year survival rate of 92.5%. Epithelial ovarian tumors account for 85% to 90% of ovarian cancers.<sup>2</sup>

### Treatment

The standard treatment for epithelial ovarian cancer is surgical staging and primary cytoreductive surgery followed by chemotherapy in most cases. There is a lack of consensus about an optimal approach to the follow-up of patients with ovarian cancer after or during primary treatment. Patients undergo regular physical examinations and may have imaging studies. In addition, managing patients with serial measurements of the biomarker cancer antigen 125 (CA 125) to detect early recurrence of disease is common. A rising CA 125 level has been found to correlate with disease recurrence and has been found to detect recurrent ovarian cancer earlier than clinical detection. However, a survival advantage of initiating treatment based on early detection with CA 125 has not been demonstrated to date. For example, a 2010 randomized controlled trial in women with ovarian cancer that was in complete remission did not find a significant difference in overall survival when treatment for remission was initiated after CA 125 concentration exceeded twice the limit of normal compared to delaying treatment initiation until symptom onset.<sup>3</sup>

Human epididymis protein 4 (HE4) is a protein that circulates in the serum and has been found to be overexpressed in epithelial ovarian cancer, lung adenocarcinoma, breast cancer, pancreatic cancer, endometrial cancer, and bladder cancer. HE4 is made up of 2 whey acidic proteins with a 4 disulfide core domain and has been proposed as a biomarker for monitoring patients with epithelial ovarian cancer.

**Evaluation of Adnexal Masses**

This evidence review also addresses the use of the HE4 as a stand-alone test for evaluating women with ovarian masses who have not been diagnosed with ovarian cancer. Such patients undergo a diagnostic workup to determine whether the risk of malignancy is sufficiently high to warrant surgical removal. In patients for whom surgery is indicated, further evaluation may be warranted to determine if a surgical referral to a specialist with expertise in ovarian cancer is warranted. The Risk of Ovarian Malignancy Algorithm (ROMA) test combines HE4, CA 125, and menopausal status into a numeric score. The ROMA test has been cleared by U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for predicting the risk that an adnexal mass is malignant; this test and other combination biomarker tests, are considered separately in Blue Shield of California Medical Policy: Multimarker Serum Testing Related to Ovarian Cancer.

**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. The following is a summary of the key literature.

**Biomarker Human Epididymis Protein 4 Testing for Ovarian Cancer****Clinical Context and Test Purpose**

The purpose of testing serum biomarker human epididymis protein 4 (HE4) levels is to provide an alternative to or an improvement on existing testing in patients with ovarian cancer.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of testing with HE4 result in an improvement in net health outcomes when used to monitor patients with ovarian cancer?

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

**Populations**

The relevant populations of interest are individuals with epithelial ovarian cancer and who have had primary treatment.

**Interventions**

The test being considered is testing serum biomarker HE4 levels. These levels are used to monitor for surveillance of progression (response to primary treatment) or recurrence in patients with ovarian cancer.

**Comparators**

Comparators of interest include measurement of the cancer antigen 125 (CA 125) test and measurement of the combination CA 125 plus HE4. Typically, patients with ovarian cancer undergoing primary chemotherapy after cytoreductive surgery will also have monitoring for a response with a computed tomography scan. After the completion of primary treatment, patients may have other monitoring imaging studies such as positron emission tomography.

**Outcomes**

The general outcomes of interest are overall survival (OS), disease-specific survival, test accuracy, test validity, and other test performance measures. Change in disease status is also an outcome of interest in patients with ovarian cancer.

The timing of follow-up after testing HE4 serum levels in a patient with ovarian cancer is based on the stage of the disease, type of prior therapy and guideline recommendations.

### Study Selection Criteria

For the evaluation of clinical validity of HE4 testing, studies that meet the following eligibility criteria were considered:

- Reported on the accuracy of the marketed version of the technology.
- Included a suitable reference standard.
- Patient/sample characteristics were described.
- Patient/sample selection criteria were described.

### 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).

### Review of Evidence

#### Nonrandomized Observational Studies

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) documents included information on the diagnostic performance of HE4 for monitoring the progression and recurrence of ovarian cancer. The FDA materials addressed the noninferiority rather than the superiority of HE4 tests to CA 125. A study reported in the 510(k) substantial equivalence determination decision summary for the HE4 enzyme immunoassay (EIA) evaluated whether this test is noninferior to the CA 125 test. The study included samples from 80 women with epithelial ovarian cancer (EOC) who were undergoing serial surveillance of cancer progression.<sup>4</sup> Blood samples were obtained from a large cancer center in the U.S.; they were not drawn specifically for this study. A total of 354 samples were obtained for the 80 women (women had multiple visits over time). Receiver operating characteristic curve analysis was used to compare the 2 assays, and clinical evidence of progression was used as the reference standard. When a positive change in HE4 level (i.e., to indicate disease progression) was defined as a value at least 25% higher than the previous value of the test, the sensitivity of the test was 76 (60.3%) of 126, and the specificity was 171 (75%) of 228 (N(note that the unit of analysis was the number of samples rather than the number of women.) The area under the receiver operating characteristic curves were found to be similar (HE4=0.725 vs. CA 125=0.709), with an overlap in the confidence intervals (CI); according to the authors, this indicated that the HE4 assay was not inferior to the CA 125 assay for detecting cancer progression.

Another analysis estimated the cutoff values and specificities for the HE4 and CA 125 assays across a range of fixed sensitivities, where the sensitivities of the HE4 and CA 125 assays were set at the same values. The specificity values for CA 125 and HE4 did not differ statistically at the respective cutoffs and sensitivities. These data were also said to confirm that the HE4 EIA test was not inferior to the CA 125 test for detecting ovarian cancer progression.

The 510(k) substantial equivalence determination decision summary for the ARCHITECT HE4 assay reported data from a retrospective study using remnant serial samples from 76 women diagnosed with EOC being monitored after completion of chemotherapy.<sup>5</sup> The eligibility criteria included the availability of at least 3 serial specimens; samples could have been drawn during and/or after treatment. Clinical determination of disease progression was used as the reference standard. A positive test was defined as an HE4 level that was 14% higher than the previous reading. Using this cutoff, the sensitivity of the assay for detecting progressive disease was 53 (53.5%) of 99 events. The specificity of the assay was 260 (78.5%) of 331. Of note, the sensitivity is lower than that previously reported for the HE4 EIA test at a similar specificity, when a cutoff of a 25% increase was used (sensitivity, 60.3%; specificity, 75%).

The FDA documents noted that there is no clinically accepted cutoff for monitoring cancer progression in EOC patients using the HE4 assays. As mentioned, a study included in the HE4 EIA assay materials defined a positive test as a level 25% higher than a previous measurement, and a study on the ARCHITECT HE4 test defined a positive test as an increase of at least 14% in the level of HE4. FDA documents further stated that clinicians may decide whether to use the cutoffs

in the studies or another cutoff that reflects personal preferences in the tradeoff between sensitivity and specificity.

Published observational studies on the diagnostic performance of HE4 for monitoring progression and/or recurrence of EOC are described next.

A study by Braicu et al (2013) evaluated 275 patients with advanced primary ovarian cancer who underwent cytoreductive surgery and adjuvant platinum-based chemotherapy at a specialized clinic (OVCAD study).<sup>6</sup> In 221 (80.4%) of 275 patients, preoperative HE4 and CA 125 levels, as well as data on residual tumor mass after debulking were available. For HE4 levels, the area under the curve (AUC) for residual tumor mass was 0.634. At an HE4 cutoff of 235 pM, the sensitivity was 76.6%, and the specificity was 47.4%. When the cutoff for HE4 was 500 pM, the sensitivity was 51.9%, and the specificity was 70.4%. For CA 125, the AUC for residual tumor mass was 0.64, nearly the same as that for HE4. At a cutoff of 500 IU/mL, the sensitivity of CA 125 for predicting complete tumor resection was 69.4%, and the specificity was 52.3%. Using the most accurate cutoffs for HE4 (235 pM) and CA 125 (500 IU/mL), the combination of the 2 markers had a sensitivity of 64.8% and a specificity of 73.5%. Additional analysis of these data was published by Nassir et al in 2016.<sup>7</sup> Ninety-two (33%) of 275 patients, who had preoperative and follow-up plasma samples for analyzing HE4 and CA 125, were included in the analysis; however, 13 preoperative HE4 samples and 10 postoperative CA 125 samples were missing. Both preoperative HE4 and CA 125 levels significantly predicted 12-month recurrence or death. Among responders, median OS was worse among patients for whom both biomarkers were elevated (hazard ratio [HR], 17.96; 95% CI, 4.00 to 80.85;  $p < .001$ ) compared to patients for whom no biomarker was elevated. The CI for the OS analysis was wide, indicating an imprecise estimate. There was no significant association with median OS when only 1 biomarker was elevated; the sample size may have been inadequate for this analysis.

Steffensen et al (2016) evaluated the ability of HE4 and CA 125, individually and together, to predict ovarian cancer recurrence after first-line chemotherapy.<sup>8</sup> The study included 88 patients with serum samples drawn at the end of chemotherapy and at least twice during the follow-up period. The median length of follow-up for patients still living was 47 months. During the study, 55 (62.5%) of 88 patients had recurrences, and 38 (43%) died. HE4 levels at the end of chemotherapy classified 70 (84.3%) patients as high-risk of relapse and 13 (15.7%) patients as low-risk. The sensitivity of HE4 was 90.0% (95% CI, 79.0% to 96.8%) and the specificity was 25.8% (95% CI, 11.9% to 44.6%). The combination of HE4 and CA 125 levels classified 69 (83%) patients as high-risk of relapse and 14 (16.9%) patients as low-risk, with a sensitivity of 90.0% (95% CI, 79.0% to 96.8%) and a specificity of 29% (95% CI, 14.2% to 48.0%). Based on the analysis of HE4 and CA 125 levels from samples taken 3 months after chemotherapy, an increase of at least 50% relative to baseline was considered the cutoff for predicting a significant worsening of progression-free survival (PFS). Both HE4 and CA 125 as individual markers at 3 and 6 months were significantly associated with poorer PFS. However, on multivariate analysis, HE4 was a significant predictor of PFS at 6 months but not at 3 months, and CA 125 was not significant at 3 or 6 months. For the combination of CA 125 and HE4, there were too few patients positive on both markers at 3 months ( $n=7$ ) to analyze the combination's association with PFS.

Vallius et al (2017) reported a study that was designed to assess fluorodeoxyglucose-positron emission tomography/computed tomography imaging and serum tumor markers in epithelial ovarian cancer staging and chemotherapy response. A substudy analysis evaluated the use of HE4 profiles to predict treatment outcomes during the first line of chemotherapy after primary cytoreductive surgery.<sup>9</sup> HE4 and CA 125 were measured in patients with the Federation of International Gynecology and Obstetrics III/IV EOC who received primary debulking surgery followed by platinum-based chemotherapy or neoadjuvant chemotherapy followed by interval debulking surgery. HE4 at the time of diagnosis was not associated with PFS ( $p=.24$ ), whereas lower CA 125 at the time of diagnosis predicted longer PFS (, HR, 1.45; 95% CI, 1.09 to 1.94;  $p=.01$ ). When patients who underwent either surgical approach were combined ( $n=40$ ), those with no macroscopic residual disease after cytoreductive surgery were more likely to have lower

postoperative HE4 values. Both HE4 and CA 125 nadir values were associated with a greater complete response to chemotherapy. Tables 2 through 5 below summarize findings for this study.

Potenza et al (2020) retrospectively assessed 78 patients with EOC to determine whether HE4 and CA 125 measured at diagnosis and before each platinum-based chemotherapy cycle could predict lack of response to chemotherapy and disease recurrence.<sup>10</sup> The proportions of patients who were sensitive, partially resistant, and refractory to chemotherapy were 73%, 16.6%, and 6.4%, respectively. After a median follow-up of 10 months, both HE4 and CA 125 had a positive correlation to PFS when measured after the third chemotherapy cycle (both  $p=.0001$ ). At the time of diagnosis, HE4 and CA 125 levels lower than the population mean value were also positively correlated to PFS (both  $p<.05$ ).

Salminen et al (2020) conducted a prospective observational study in 143 women with histologically confirmed high-grade serous carcinoma (a common and aggressive form of EOC) to assess biomarkers, including CA 125 and HE4, for treatment monitoring and prognostic stratification.<sup>11</sup> Included patients received primary treatment with either primary debulking surgery followed by chemotherapy ( $n=58$ ) or neoadjuvant chemotherapy with interval debulking surgery plus adjuvant chemotherapy ( $n=85$ ). Chemotherapy regimens consisted of carboplatin plus a taxane ( $n=125$ ), carboplatin alone ( $n=16$ ) or other/unknown ( $n=2$ ). Follow-up times ranged between 1.5 months to 10.2 years. At the time of progression, multivariate analysis showed that HE4 concentration elevations greater than 199.20 pmol/L were significantly associated with a reduction in overall survival (HR, 5.85; 95% CI, 2.07 to 16.51;  $p=.0001$ ); elevations in CA 125 greater than 162 U/mL were not (HR, 1.39; 95% CI, 0.59 to 3.28;  $p=.45$ ). Serum HE4 concentrations were also found to be significantly higher at baseline in patients with a higher tumor burden compared to those with less extensive tumor growth ( $p<.0001$ ) while CA 125 concentrations were not ( $p=.067$ ). At baseline after cytoreductive surgery, neither CA 125 ( $p=.641$ ) or HE4 ( $p=.054$ ) concentrations were significantly associated with the amount of residual disease. Nadir CA 125 and HE4 levels were both found to be significantly elevated in patients who developed platinum-resistant disease ( $p<.0001$ ).

Plotti et al (2021) studied 69 patients with high-grade serous ovarian cancer to determine whether HE4 (cutoff, 70 pmol/L) could predict response to platinum chemotherapy.<sup>12</sup> All patients had undergone debulking surgery prior to receiving chemotherapy. Breast cancer resistance gene (*BRCA*) status was assessed ( $n=53$  wild-type,  $n=16$  mutated) along with HE4 during every chemotherapy cycle. Recurrence occurred within 12 months in 48% of patients and after 12 months in 52% of patients. HE4 had a sensitivity of 79% and specificity of 97% for predicting response to platinum chemotherapy. Among patients who were *BRCA* wild-type, HE4 had a sensitivity and specificity of 80% and 100%, respectively, for predicting chemotherapy response. Among patients with *BRCA* mutations, HE4 had a sensitivity and specificity of 100% and 100%, respectively, for predicting chemotherapy response.

Rong et al (2021) conducted a retrospective study that assessed the prognostic value of HE4 and CA 125 in 89 patients with EOC.<sup>13</sup> All patients received 6 to 8 cycles of platinum-based chemotherapy after surgery. HE4 (cutoff, 70 pmol/L) and CA 125 (cutoff, 35 U/mL) were measured before treatment, after each cycle, and at the time of recurrence. After a median follow-up of 35 months, 73 patients were platinum-sensitive and 16 patients were platinum-resistant. The sensitivity and specificity of HE4 in predicting platinum responsiveness after the third chemotherapy cycle were 75% and 80.8%, respectively. HE4 had a positive predictive value of 54.5% and negative predictive value of 93.7%. The sensitivity, specificity, and positive and negative predictive values of CA 125 after the first chemotherapy cycle were 75%, 71.2%, 36.4%, and 92.9%, respectively. The combination of both biomarkers had a sensitivity and specificity for predicting platinum responsiveness of 50% and 94.5%, respectively, with a positive predictive value of 66.7% and negative predictive value of 89.6%. HE4 predicted 2-year PFS after the third and sixth chemotherapy cycles ( $p=.001$  and  $p=.011$ , respectively). CA 125 predicted 2-year PFS only after the first chemotherapy cycle ( $p=.023$ ). Prolonged PFS and OS were significantly associated with HE4 after the third cycle ( $p<.0001$ ) and CA 125 after the first cycle ( $p<.0001$ ).



**Table 2. Summary of Observational Study Characteristics**

Study	Study Type	Country	Dates	Participants N	Treatment 1 n	Treatment 2 n
Vallius et al (2017) <sup>2</sup>	Observational cohort	Finland	2009-2014	FIGO Stage III-IV EOC 49	PDS + platinum-based chemotherapy 22	NACT + IDS 27

EOC: epithelial ovarian cancer; FIGO: Federation of International Gynecology and Obstetrics; IDS: interval debulking surgery; NACT: neoadjuvant chemotherapy; PDS: primary debulking surgery.

**Table 3. Summary of Observational Study Results**

Study	Treatment 1	Treatment 2
Vallius et al (2017) <sup>2</sup>	Median (range)	Median (range)
<b>HE4 (pmol/L)</b>		
At diagnosis	573 (59 to 1391)	1070 (156 to 12,128)
Pre-IDS	N/A	104 (35 to 477)
Postoperative	96 (34 to 856)	99 (39 to 384)
Nadir	48 (25 to 204)	69 (31 to 257)
Post-primary therapy	48 (25 to 431)	61 (31 to 175)
<b>CA 125 (U/mL)</b>	1094 (17 to 17,992) N/A	1078 (156 to 20,897)
At diagnosis	181 (32 to 2023)	43 (7 to 464)
Pre-IDS	12 (4 to 162)	42 (6 to 589)
Postoperative	12 (4 to 127)	15 (4 to 447)
Nadir		15 (4 to 37)
Post-primary therapy		

CA 125: cancer antigen 125; HE4: human epididymis protein 4; IDS: interval debulking surgery; N/A: not applicable; NACT: neoadjuvant chemotherapy; PDS: primary debulking surgery; (pmol/L): picomole per liter; Treatment 1: PDS + platinum-based chemotherapy; Treatment 2: NACT +IDS; (U/mL): units per milliliter.

Relevance and relevance design and conduct limitations are reported in Tables 4 and 5.

**Table 4: Study Relevance Limitations**

Study	Population	Intervention	Comparator	Outcomes	Duration of Follow-Up
Vallius et al (2017) <sup>2</sup>	1. Study population is mixed regarding risk factors 2. Clinical context for primary debulking surgery + chemotherapy differs from neoadjuvant chemotherapy + interval debulking surgery				

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

<sup>a</sup> 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.

<sup>b</sup> Intervention key: 1. Classification thresholds not defined; 2. Version used unclear; 3. Not intervention of interest.

<sup>c</sup> 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

<sup>d</sup> Outcomes key: 1. Study dose 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)

<sup>e</sup> 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 5: Study Design and Conduct Limitations**

Study	Selection <sup>a</sup>	Blinding <sup>b</sup>	Delivery of Test <sup>c</sup>	Selective Reporting <sup>d</sup>	Completeness of Follow-Up <sup>e</sup>	Statistical <sup>f</sup>
Vallius et al (2017) <sup>2</sup>			1. Broad date range for obtaining samples	1. Assessment of residual disease solely based on surgeon evaluation	2.	1. Not uniformly reported

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

<sup>a</sup> Selection key: 1. Selection not described; 2. Selection not random or consecutive (i.e., convenience).

<sup>b</sup> Blinding key: 1. Not blinded to results of reference or other comparator tests.

<sup>c</sup> 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.

<sup>d</sup> Selective Reporting key: 1. Not registered; 2. Evidence of selective reporting; 3. Evidence of selective publication.

<sup>e</sup> Data Completeness key: 1. Inadequate description of indeterminate and missing samples; 2. High number of samples excluded; 3. High loss to followup or missing data.

<sup>f</sup> Statistical key: 1. Confidence intervals and/or p values not reported; 2. Comparison to other tests not reported.

### Systematic Reviews

Han et al (2021) published a systematic review and meta-analysis on the value of HE4 in predicting chemotherapy resistance in patients with ovarian cancer.<sup>14</sup> An analysis of 8 studies ( $I^2=74\%$ ) found that preoperative HE4 had a sensitivity of 80% (95% CI, 65% to 90%) and specificity of 67% (95% CI, 54% to 77%) in predicting resistance to platinum chemotherapy. After the third cycle of chemotherapy (5 studies;  $I^2=49\%$ ), the sensitivity and specificity were 86% (95% CI, 72% to 94%) and 85% (95% CI, 70% to 93%), respectively.

### Clinically Useful

The available observational studies have used HE4 alone or in combination with CA 125 to predict residual tumor mass and association with recurrence after primary chemotherapy. In addition, HE4 alone or in combination with CA 125 has been assessed for its association with residual disease and tumor progression during the course of primary chemotherapy after tumor debulking as well during neoadjuvant chemotherapy followed by interval debulking surgery. Improvement in health outcomes would depend on demonstrating that further assessment and management decisions on patients with ovarian cancer were initiated that would improve health outcomes. There is no clear chain of evidence demonstrating that incremental changes in ovarian cancer recurrence detection would lead to improved health outcomes. No prospective studies were identified that compared health outcomes in patients who had ovarian cancer managed with and without HE4 testing, alone or in combination with CA 125 or other disease markers.

### 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.

### 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.



**Section Summary: Individuals with Ovarian Cancer**

For individuals who have ovarian cancer who receive a measurement of serum biomarker HE4, the evidence includes 7 nonrandomized prospective and retrospective studies comparing the diagnostic accuracy of HE4 with CA 125 for predicting disease progression and/or recurrence. Data submitted to the FDA for approval of commercial HE4 tests found that HE4 was not inferior to CA 125 for detecting ovarian cancer recurrence. Although a single prospective observational study found that elevated levels of HE4, but not CA 125, at the time of cancer progression was significantly associated with reduced OS, a direct comparison between biomarkers was not provided. Overall, the superiority of HE4 to CA 125 (alone or in combination), the key question in the evidence review, was not demonstrated in the available literature. In addition, there is no established cutoff in HE4 levels for monitoring disease progression, and cutoffs in studies varied. There is no direct evidence from prospective controlled studies on the impact of HE4 testing on health outcomes, and no clear chain of evidence that changes in management based on HE4 would lead to an improved health outcome.

**Biomarker Human Epididymis Protein 4 Testing for Adnexal Masses****Clinical Context and Test Purpose**

The purpose of testing serum biomarker HE4 levels is to provide an alternative to or an improvement on existing testing in patients with adnexal masses.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of testing with HE4 result in an improvement in net health outcomes when used as adjunctive testing for diagnosing patients with adnexal masses?

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

**Populations**

The relevant populations of interest are individuals with adnexal masses.

**Interventions**

The test being considered is testing serum biomarker HE4 levels. These levels are used to evaluate women with adnexal masses who are undergoing diagnostic workup for ovarian cancer.

**Comparators**

Comparators of interest include measurement of the combination CA 125 plus HE4.

**Outcomes**

The general outcomes of interest are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy, test validity, and other test performance measures.

Evaluation of an adnexal mass would be determined by whether or not the patient has surgical management, and typical clinical follow-up in the absence of a pathological diagnosis would be every 6 months.

**Study Selection Criteria**

For the evaluation of clinical validity of HE4 testing, studies that meet the following eligibility criteria were considered:

- Reported on the accuracy of the marketed version of the technology.
- Included a suitable reference standard.
- Patient/sample characteristics were described.
- Patient/sample selection criteria were described.

**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).

## Review of Evidence

### Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses

A number of meta-analyses have assessed studies on the accuracy of HE4 for diagnosing ovarian cancer. Table 6 presents the pooled sensitivities and specificities of HE4 from meta-analyses that conducted quality assessments of individual studies and that limited their selections to studies using pathologic findings as to the reference standard for ovarian cancer diagnosis.<sup>15-24</sup>

**Table 6. Meta-Analyses of Human Epididymis Protein 4 for Diagnosing Ovarian Cancer**

Meta-Analyses (Year)	No. of Studies	Pooled Sensitivity (95% CI), %	Pooled Specificity (95% CI), %
Olson et al (2021) <sup>15</sup>	7	79.4 (74.1 to 83.8)	84.1 (79.6 to 87.8)
Suri et al (2021) <sup>16</sup>	25	73 (71 to 75)	90 (89 to 91)
Huang et al (2018) <sup>17</sup>	18	81 (77 to 85)	91 (86 to 93)
Dayyani et al (2016) <sup>18</sup>	5	82 (68 to 90)	85 (72 to 93)
Macedo et al (2014) <sup>19</sup>	45	78 (77 to 79)	86 (85 to 87)
Wang et al (2014) <sup>20</sup>	28	76 (72 to 80)	93 (90 to 96)
Zhen et al (2014) <sup>21</sup>	25	74 (72 to 76)	90 (89 to 91)
Yang et al (2013) <sup>22</sup>	31	73 (71 to 75)	89 (88 to 90)
Ferraro et al (2013) <sup>23</sup>	14	79 (76 to 81)	93 (92 to 94)
Yu et al (2012) <sup>24</sup>	12	80 (77 to 83)	92 (90 to 93)

CI, confidence interval; HE4: human epididymis protein 4.

Meta-analyses differed somewhat in their study inclusion criteria, search dates, and other factors, but, as shown in Table 6, had similar results in terms of the diagnostic value of HE4; pooled sensitivities ranged from 73% to 82%, and pooled specificities ranged from 84.1% to 93%.

Several of the previous meta-analyses also pooled data from studies on the diagnostic accuracy of CA 125, alone and/or in combination with HE4 and findings are shown in Table 7.

**Table 7. Meta-Analyses of Cancer Antigen 125 Alone or Combined With Human Epididymis Protein 4 for Diagnosing Ovarian Cancer**

Meta-Analyses (Year)	No. of Studies	Pooled Sensitivity (95% CI), %	Pooled Specificity (95% CI), %
<b>CA 125 alone</b>			
Olson et al (2021) <sup>15</sup>	8	81.4 (74.6 to 86.2)	56.8 (47.9 to 65.4)
Suri et al (2021) <sup>16</sup>	26	84 (82 to 85)	73 (72 to 74)
Dayyani et al (2016) <sup>18</sup>	5	80 (66 to 89)	83 (66 to 92)
Wang et al (2014) <sup>20</sup>	28	79 (74 to 84)	82 (77 to 87)
Zhen et al (2014) <sup>21</sup>	25	74 (72 to 76)	83 (81 to 84)
Ferraro et al (2013) <sup>23</sup>	13	79 (77 to 82)	78 (76 to 80)
Yu et al (2012) <sup>24</sup>	10	66 (62 to 70)	87 (85 to 89)
<b>HE4 and CA 125</b>			
Zhen et al (2014) <sup>21</sup>	9	90 (87 to 92)	85 (82 to 87)
Ferraro et al (2013) <sup>23</sup>	4	82 (78 to 86)	76 (72 to 80)

CA 125: cancer antigen 125; CI: confidence interval; HE4: human epididymis protein 4.

All meta-analyses included in Table 7, except Dayyani et al (2016), Olson et al (2021), and Suri et al (2021) reported statistical comparisons between the diagnostic performance of HE4 and CA 125. None found that the performance (a combination of sensitivity and specificity) of HE4 and CA 125 differed significantly. However, both Wang et al (2014)<sup>20</sup> and Zhen et al (2014)<sup>21</sup> found that the specificity (but not sensitivity) of HE4 was significantly higher than CA 125.

Findings differed in the 2 meta-analyses that compared the diagnostic performance of HE4 and CA 125 with CA 125 alone. Ferraro et al (2013) did not find that the sensitivity and specificity of HE4 in combination with CA 125 differed significantly from that of CA 125 alone.<sup>23</sup> Zhen et al (2014) found that both the sensitivity and specificity of HE4 combined with CA 125 were

significantly better than CA 125 alone.<sup>21</sup>In the subgroup of 9 studies that made direct comparisons in the Zhen et al (2014) meta-analysis, the sensitivity of HE4 plus CA 125 was 90% (95% CI, 87% to 92%) and 74% (95% CI, 69% to 78%) for CA 125 alone, and the specificity of HE4 plus CA 125 was 85% (95% CI, 82% to 87%) and 73% (95% CI, 69% to 76%) for CA 125 alone. In addition, in the Zhen et al (2014) meta-analysis, the overall diagnostic accuracy (measured by the diagnostic odds ratio) was significantly higher for the combination of HE4 and CA 125 than for HE4 alone. Pooled diagnostic odds ratio were 10.31 (95% CI, 6.18 to 17.21) for CA 125 and 53.92 (95% CI, 26.07 to 111.54) for HE4 plus CA 125. Zhen et al (2014) noted several limitations to their meta-analysis, including substantial publication bias for HE4, heterogeneity among studies, and a lack of consideration given to clinical factors such as menopausal status.

### Nonrandomized Observational Studies

Several studies have evaluated the diagnostic performance of HE4 as a second-line test after the subjective assessment of transvaginal ultrasound. The final histologic diagnosis was used as the reference standard.

Kaijser et al (2014) enrolled 389 patients with a suspicious pelvic mass who were scheduled for surgery.<sup>25</sup>Data on 360 (93%) patients were available for analysis. Experienced ultrasonographers categorized each mass as benign, borderline, or invasive malignant. Serum samples were obtained before surgery, and HE4 levels were measured, using a cutoff of at least 70 pmol/L to indicate malignancy. Overall, subjective ultrasound evaluation by an experienced examiner had higher sensitivity and specificity than serum HE4. Sensitivity was 97% with subjective assessment ultrasound and 74% with HE4, and specificity was 90% and 85%, respectively. The additional consideration of HE4 levels after sonographers categorized a mass as benign resulted in a slight increase in sensitivity and a large increase in the number of false positives. Moreover, the sequential use of serum HE4 after sonographers categorized a mass as malignant resulted in lower sensitivity and an increase in specificity.

Moszynski et al (2013) retrospectively reviewed records on 253 women with adnexal masses.<sup>26</sup>Women were examined with transvaginal ultrasound by an experienced examiner before surgery. The sonographer categorized masses as certainly benign, probably benign, uncertain, probably malignant, and certainly malignant. Tumors in the certainly benign and certainly malignant categories were excluded from further analysis, and the remainder (n=145) were considered suspicious tumors. HE4 and CA 125 levels were measured in serum, and a cutoff of 65 pmol/L was used for HE4. The sensitivity and specificity of ultrasound evaluation for diagnosing the suspicious tumors were 93.3% and 90.6%, respectively. Neither HE4 nor CA 125 improved the diagnostic accuracy for suspicious tumors. The sensitivity and specificity of HE4 were 80.0% and 91.7%, respectively, and the sensitivity and specificity of CA 125 were 85.8% and 74.7%, respectively. A logistic regression analysis confirmed that neither HE4 nor CA 125 improved the diagnostic accuracy beyond that of subjective assessment of ultrasonography.

Nikolova et al (2017) conducted a study to measure the effectiveness of HE4 compared with CA 125 for differentiating ovarian endometriosis from EOC in premenopausal women. In the observational study, 164 patients were divided into 4 study groups: ovarian endometriosis (n=37), other benign pelvic masses (n=57), EOCs (n=11), and a control group (n=59).<sup>27</sup>Analysis of biomarkers in blood samples from all 4 groups determined that HE4 performed the best at differentiating endometriosis from EOC (specificity, 100%; accuracy, 95.83%), while the Copenhagen Index (CPH-I) also performed well (specificity, 97.30%; accuracy, 93.75%). CA 125 was found to have significantly lower specificity and accuracy. Limitations of the study include the relatively small cohort.

Gentry-Maharaj et al (2020) performed a cohort study nested within the screening population of a larger multicenter randomized controlled trial to assess the ability of HE4 and CA 125 to diagnose ovarian cancer in postmenopausal women with adnexal masses.<sup>28</sup>The initial trial (United Kingdom Collaborative Trial of Ovarian Cancer Screening; UKCTOCS) randomized 202,638 postmenopausal women to be screened for ovarian cancer to multimodal screening

with CA 125 levels, transvaginal ultrasound, or no screening. Women who were randomized to 1 of the screening groups who had an abnormality received a repeat of the initial screening test that they received, and those with persistent abnormalities were further assessed by a clinical team subsequently managed with surgery or conservative management, and had serum CA 125 and HE4 levels taken within 6 months of the scan. A total of 1590 women met these criteria and were found to have adnexal masses. Follow-up occurred for a median of 10.9 years. Clinical validity results for the Risk of Ovarian Malignancy Algorithm (ROMA) test (CA 125 plus HE4), ultrasound plus CA 125, ultrasound plus HE4, and a combination of ultrasound plus CA 125 plus HE4 are described in Tables 8 and 9 below. In addition, reported AUC values at a specificity of 90% were as follows: 0.896 (95% CI, 0.847 to 0.935) for ultrasound plus CA 125 plus HE4, 0.893 (95% CI, 0.844 to 0.933) for ultrasound plus CA125, 0.854 (95% CI, 0.8 to 0.9) for ROMA, and 0.854 (95% CI, 0.802 to 0.9) for ultrasound plus HE4. Reported AUC values were significantly lower for the ROMA and ultrasound plus HE4 groups compared to the ultrasound plus CA 125 plus HE4 group ( $p=.0554$  and  $.033$ , respectively); AUC values were not significantly different when comparing the ultrasound plus CA 125 plus HE4 group to the ultrasound plus CA 125 group ( $p=.4527$ ). These 2 groups were also reported to have a similar sensitivity at 90% specificity ( $p=.564$ ); comparison of sensitivity among other groups was not provided.

**Table 8. Characteristics of Diagnostic Studies Evaluating Human Epididymis Protein 4 as a Test for Ovarian Cancer**

Study	Country	Participants	Evaluated Tests
Kaijser et al (2014) <sup>25</sup>	EU	Women with adnexal masses scheduled for surgery (N=289)	HE4
Moszynski et al (2013) <sup>26</sup>	EU	Women with adnexal masses (N=253)	HE4, CA 125, individually
Nikolova et al (2017) <sup>27</sup>	Macedonia, Serbia	Women with ovarian endometriosis, benign pelvic masses, EOCs (N=164)	HE4, CA 125, individually
Gentry-Maharaj et al (2020) <sup>28</sup>	England, Wales, Ireland	Postmenopausal women with adnexal masses (N=1590)	HE4, CA 125, individually and combined

CA 125: cancer antigen 125; EOC: epithelial ovarian cancer; HE4: human epididymis protein 4.

**Table 9. Clinical Validity of Human Epididymis Protein 4 as a Test for Ovarian Cancer**

Study	Initial N	Final N	Excluded Samples	Prevalence of Condition	Clinical Validity (95% Confidence Interval)			
					Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV
Kaijser et al (2014) <sup>25</sup>	389	360	29	40%				
HE4					74%	85%		
SA					97%	90%		
Moszynski et al (2013) <sup>26</sup>		253		41.4%				
HE4					80.0%	91.7%	87.3%	86.7%
SA					93.3%	90.6%	87.5%	95.1%
ROMA					88.9% (p=1.0)	89.2% (p<.001)	68.6%	96.8%
Nikolova et al (2017) <sup>27</sup>		164						
CA 125					81.8% (48.2 to 97.7)	48.7% (31.9 to 65.6)	32.1% (15.9 to 52.4)	90.0% (68.3 to 98.8)
HE4					81.8% (48.2 to 97.7)	100% (90.5 to 100)	100% (66.4 to 100)	94.87% (82.7 to 99.4)
ROMA					90.9% (58.7 to 99.8)	83.8% (68 to 93.8)	62.5% (35.4 to 84.8)	96.9% (83.8 to 99.9)
Gentry-Maharaj et al (2020) <sup>28</sup>		1590						
CA 125 <sup>a</sup>					74.4% (63.8 to 83.3)		27.8% (21.8 to 34.3)	98.6% (97.8 to 99.1)

Study	Initial N	Final N	Excluded Samples	Prevalence of Condition	Clinical Validity (95% Confidence Interval)
HE4 <sup>a</sup>				67.9% (57.5 to 78.4)	26% (20.1 to 32.6) 98.2% (97.3 to 98.8)
CA 125 plus HE4 <sup>a</sup>				75.6% (65.4 to 84.3)	28.1% (22.1 to 34.7) 98.6% (97.9 to 99.2)
ROMA <sup>a</sup>				69.2% (58.2 to 78.9)	26.3% (20.5 to 32.9) 98.3% (97.4 to 98.9)

CA 125: cancer antigen 125; HE4: human epididymis protein 4; NPV: negative predictive value; PPV: positive predictive value; ROMA: Risk of Ovarian Malignancy Algorithm; SA: subjective assessment.

<sup>a</sup>All clinical validity measures reported at a fixed 90% specificity

Study relevance and study design and conduct limitations are reported in Tables 10 and 11.

**Table 10: Study Relevance Limitations**

Study	Population	Intervention	Comparator	Outcomes	Duration of Follow-Up
Kaijser et al (2014) <sup>25</sup>	1. 7% of data unavailable from population	2.			
Moszynski et al (2013) <sup>26</sup>					
Nikolova et al (2017) <sup>27</sup>					
Gentry-Maharaj et al (2020) <sup>28</sup>					

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

<sup>a</sup> 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.

<sup>b</sup> Intervention key: 1. Classification thresholds not defined; 2. Version used unclear; 3. Not intervention of interest.

<sup>c</sup> 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

<sup>d</sup> Outcomes key: 1. Study dose 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)

<sup>e</sup> 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 11: Study Design and Conduct Limitations**

Study	Selection <sup>a</sup>	Blinding <sup>b</sup>	Delivery of Test <sup>c</sup>	Selective Reporting <sup>d</sup>	Completeness of Follow-Up <sup>e</sup>	Statistical <sup>f</sup>
Kaijser et al (2014) <sup>25</sup>	2. Selection retrospective and not randomized	1. Results were not blinded				1. P-values/CI not reported
Moszynski et al (2013) <sup>26</sup>	2. Selection retrospective and not randomized	1. Results were not blinded				1. P-values/CI not reported
Nikolova et al (2017) <sup>27</sup>	2. Selection not randomized; small cohort	1. Results were				1. P-values not reported

Study	Selection <sup>a</sup>	Blinding <sup>b</sup>	Delivery of Test <sup>c</sup>	Selective Reporting <sup>d</sup>	Completeness of Follow-Up <sup>e</sup>	Statistical <sup>f</sup>
		not blinded				
<b>Gentry-Maharaj et al (2020)<sup>28</sup></b>						1. P-values not reported for all comparisons

CI: confidence interval.

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

<sup>a</sup> Selection key: 1. Selection not described; 2. Selection not random or consecutive (i.e., convenience).

<sup>b</sup> Blinding key: 1. Not blinded to results of reference or other comparator tests.

<sup>c</sup> 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.

<sup>d</sup> Selective Reporting key: 1. Not registered; 2. Evidence of selective reporting; 3. Evidence of selective publication.

<sup>e</sup> Data Completeness key: 1. Inadequate description of indeterminate and missing samples; 2. High number of samples excluded; 3. High loss to followup or missing data.

<sup>f</sup> Statistical key: 1. Confidence intervals and/or p values not reported; 2. Comparison to other tests not reported.

### Clinically Useful

Although HE4 levels are associated with the presence of ovarian cancer, the test does not have high sensitivity or specificity. Thus it cannot be used to rule in or rule out ovarian cancer before surgery. No prospective studies were identified that compared health outcomes in patients with adnexal masses managed with and without HE4 testing, alone or in combination with CA 125 or other disease markers. There is no strong chain of evidence demonstrating that clinical decisions based on HE4 testing would improve patient outcomes.

### 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.

### 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.

### Section Summary: Individuals with Adnexal Masses

For individuals who have adnexal masses who receive a measurement of serum biomarker HE4, the evidence includes diagnostic accuracy studies and meta-analyses. Meta-analyses have generally found that HE4 and CA 125 have a similar overall diagnostic accuracy (i.e., sensitivity, specificity), and several found that HE4 has significantly higher specificity than CA 125 but not sensitivity. Two meta-analyses had mixed findings on whether the combination of HE4 and CA 125 is superior to CA 125 alone for the initial diagnosis of ovarian cancer. The number of studies evaluating the combined test is relatively low, and publication bias in studies of HE4 has been identified. In addition, studies have not found that HE4 improves diagnostic accuracy beyond that of subjective assessment of transvaginal ultrasound. There is no direct evidence from prospective controlled studies on the impact of HE4 testing on health outcomes, and no clear chain of evidence that changes in management based on HE4 would lead to an improved health outcome.



## **Biomarker Human Epididymis Protein 4 Screening for Asymptomatic Individuals Not at High Risk of Ovarian Cancer**

### **Clinical Context and Test Purpose**

The purpose of testing serum biomarker HE4 levels is for diagnosis in patients who are asymptomatic and not at high-risk of ovarian cancer.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of testing with HE4 result in an improvement in net health outcomes when used in asymptomatic individuals not at high-risk of ovarian cancer?

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

### **Populations**

The relevant populations of interest are asymptomatic individuals not at high-risk of ovarian cancer.

### **Interventions**

The test being considered is testing serum biomarker HE4 levels. These levels are used for screening in asymptomatic individuals.

### **Comparators**

Comparators of interest include no ovarian cancer screening (asymptomatic individuals).

### **Outcomes**

The general outcomes of interest are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy, test validity, and other test performance measures.

Though not completely standardized, follow-up for patients who are asymptomatic and not at high-risk of ovarian cancer would typically occur in the years before diagnosis.

### **Study Selection Criteria**

For the evaluation of clinical validity of HE4 testing, studies that meet the following eligibility criteria were considered:

- Reported on the accuracy of the marketed version of the technology.
- Included a suitable reference standard.
- Patient/sample characteristics were described.
- Patient/sample selection criteria were described.

### **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).

### **Review of Evidence**

#### **Observational Studies**

Several retrospective studies aimed at determining the potential value of using HE4 and other biomarkers in early identification of ovarian cancer in asymptomatic women. Anderson et al (2010) published data on 34 women with ovarian cancer and 70 matched controls, all of whom were participating in an unrelated randomized controlled trial on smokers at increased risk of lung cancer.<sup>29</sup> Blood samples were available for the women between 0 years and 18 years before ovarian cancer diagnosis. In descriptive analyses, individual serum markers, including HE4, CA 125, and mesothelin, showed increasing accuracy over time approaching the diagnosis of ovarian cancer. Mean concentrations of these markers, which were measured by visually read immunoassays, began to increase approximately 3 years before diagnosis but attained detectable levels only within the final year before diagnosis. The study had a small sample size,

limiting the ability to conduct quantitative analysis, and included only heavy smokers and therefore may not be representative of the population of women at risk of ovarian cancer.

Urban et al (2011) retrospectively reviewed preclinical serum samples to evaluate the potential utility of HE4 and other markers as a secondary screening test in women found to have epithelial ovarian cancer.<sup>30</sup> There were samples from 112 ovarian cancer patients and 706 matched controls. Individuals participated in the Prostate, Lung, Colorectal, and Ovarian trial and had been screened annually for 6 years with CA 125. Serum samples to evaluate potential markers were taken from the year proximate to that in which women were diagnosed with ovarian cancer. Serum samples were not available for the fourth screen, so they were taken from the third year for the women diagnosed with ovarian cancer between the third and fourth screens. Investigators evaluated the associations between CA 125, HE4, and levels of 5 other markers with malignancy, accounting for increasing CA 125 levels and adjusting for demographic characteristics. Increase in CA 125 levels was associated with statistically significant increases in all of the markers. Levels of HE4 were most elevated compared to controls (i.e., the highest average HE4 level was 4.26 standard deviations above the mean HE4 level in control samples).

Terry et al (2016) retrospectively analyzed prospectively collected data from the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition study, a multicenter cohort study investigating the relationship between diet and cancer.<sup>31</sup> The analysis used a nested case-control design. A total of 197 women who developed invasive ovarian cancer were matched with 725 randomly selected ovarian cancer-free controls. Baseline and follow-up blood samples were analyzed for levels of several biomarkers (i.e., CA 125, HE4, cancer antigen 15.3, cancer antigen 72.4) and the sensitivity, specificity, and area under the receiver operating characteristic curve were calculated. CA 125 was best able to discriminate between cases and controls within 6 months of ovarian cancer diagnosis (C statistic, 0.92), followed by HE4 (C statistic, 0.84). The ability of the markers to discriminate between cases and controls decreased with longer intervals between blood draws and cancer diagnosis. For example, with a 1- to 2-year time lag, C statistic values were 0.72 for CA 125 and 0.65 for HE4; for a 3- to 6-year time lag, the C statistic was 0.55 for CA 125. Data on HE4 were not available for the 3- to 6-year time lag analysis.

### **Clinically Useful**

No randomized controlled trials or nonrandomized comparative studies evaluating the clinical utility of screening asymptomatic women with HE4 were identified. The studies have not estimated the sensitivity and specificity of HE4 in the screening setting, and thus the chain of evidence supporting screening is incomplete.

### **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.

### **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.

### **Section Summary: Screening Asymptomatic Individuals Not at High-Risk of Ovarian Cancer**

For individuals who are asymptomatic and not at high-risk of ovarian cancer who receive screening with a serum biomarker HE4 test, the evidence includes several retrospective comparative studies and no prospective studies comparing health outcomes in asymptomatic women managed with and without HE4 screening. The retrospective studies found that HE4 levels increased over time in women ultimately diagnosed with ovarian cancer. Prospective comparative studies are needed to determine definitively whether HE4 testing is a useful screening tool.

### Summary of Evidence

For individuals who have ovarian cancer who receive a measurement of serum biomarker HE4, the evidence includes 7 nonrandomized prospective and retrospective studies comparing the diagnostic accuracy of HE4 with CA 125 for predicting disease progression and/or recurrence. Relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test validity, other test performance measures, and change in disease status. Data submitted to the U.S. FDA for approval of commercial HE4 tests found that HE4 was not inferior to CA 125 for detecting ovarian cancer recurrence. Although a single prospective observational study found that elevated levels of HE4, but not CA 125, at the time of cancer progression was significantly associated with reduced OS, a direct comparison between biomarkers was not provided. Overall, the superiority of HE4 to CA 125 (alone or in combination), the key question in the evidence review, was not demonstrated in the available literature. In addition, there is no established cutoff in HE4 levels for monitoring disease progression, and cutoffs in studies varied. There is no direct evidence from prospective controlled studies on the impact of HE4 testing on health outcomes, and no clear chain of evidence that changes in management based on HE4 would lead to an improved health outcome. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have adnexal masses who receive a measurement of serum biomarker HE4, the evidence includes diagnostic accuracy studies and meta-analyses. Relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test validity, and other test performance measures. Meta-analyses have generally found that HE4 and CA 125 have a similar overall diagnostic accuracy (i.e., sensitivity, specificity) and several found that HE4 has significantly higher specificity than CA 125 but not sensitivity. Two meta-analyses had mixed findings on whether the combination of HE4 and CA 125 is superior to CA 125 alone for the initial diagnosis of ovarian cancer. The number of studies evaluating the combined test is relatively low, and publication bias in studies of HE4 has been identified. In addition, studies have not found that HE4 improves diagnostic accuracy beyond that of subjective assessment of transvaginal ultrasound. There is no direct evidence from prospective controlled studies on the impact of HE4 testing on health outcomes, and no clear chain of evidence that changes in management based on HE4 would lead to an improved health outcome. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who are asymptomatic and not at high-risk of ovarian cancer who receive screening with a serum biomarker HE4 test, the evidence includes several retrospective comparative studies and no prospective studies comparing health outcomes in asymptomatic women managed with and without HE4 screening. Relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test validity, and other test performance measures. The retrospective studies found that HE4 levels increased over time in women ultimately diagnosed with ovarian cancer. Prospective comparative studies are needed to determine definitively whether HE4 testing is a useful screening tool. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

### Supplemental Information

The purpose of the following information is to provide reference material. Inclusion does not imply endorsement or alignment with the evidence review conclusions.

### Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

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

### **American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists**

Guidelines from the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) on evaluation and management of adnexal masses (2016, reaffirmed 2021) state that measurement of cancer antigen 125 (CA 125) is the most extensively studied serum marker to be used in combination with imaging to determine the likelihood of malignancy.<sup>32</sup> The authors also suggest that measurement of CA 125 is most useful for identification of nonmucinous epithelial cancer in postmenopausal women. Although the guideline mentions that human epididymis protein 4 (HE4) has recently been identified as a biomarker that may be useful for distinguishing between benign and malignant masses, no further recommendations regarding HE4 are provided.

In 2017 (reaffirmed 2019), a committee opinion document from ACOG and the Society of Gynecologic Oncology stated that tumor markers such as CA 125 and transvaginal ultrasound, alone or in combination, have not improved early detection or survival in women with average risk for ovarian cancer.<sup>33</sup> There is also a potential for harm if surgery is performed in response to a positive test result.

### **National Comprehensive Cancer Network**

The NCCN ovarian cancer guidelines (v. 3.2021) state that, for monitoring and follow-up of patients with stage I to IV ovarian cancer with a complete response to initial treatment, "CA-125 [cancer antigen 125] or other tumor marker" should be used at "every visit if initially elevated".<sup>34</sup> The guidelines do not specify any marker other than CA 125 for monitoring patients after treatment.

Elsewhere, the NCCN guideline provides the following comment about screening using HE4: "Some evidence suggests that HE4 [human epididymis protein 4] may be a useful prognostic marker in patients with ovarian cancer, decreases during response to treatment, and may improve early detection of recurrence relative to CA-125 alone. The utility of HE4 before surgery has varied among studies so the guidelines do not recommend routinely checking this marker preoperatively."

Several biomarker combination tests have received Food and Drug Administration approval for estimating the risk of ovarian cancer in patients with adnexal masses and planned surgery. The Risk of Ovarian Malignancy Algorithm (ROMA) test includes HE4 and CA-125 alone or in combination, the OVA1 test includes 5 markers including CA-125 (but not HE4), and the OVERA test includes 5 markers including both CA-125 and HE4. The NCCN guidelines state the following about using these biomarker tests : " Currently, the NCCN Panel does not recommend the use of these biomarker tests for determining the status of an undiagnosed adnexal/pelvic mass."

The NCCN guidelines state the following on screening for ovarian cancer:

"Very few biomarkers have been tested prospectively to determine whether they can detect ovarian cancer or predict development of ovarian cancer in women who have no other signs or symptoms of cancer. Data show that several markers (including CA-125, HE4, mesothelin, B7-H4, decoy receptor 3 [DcR3], and spondin-2) do not increase early enough to be useful in detecting early-stage ovarian cancer."

### **National Institute for Health and Care Excellence**

In 2011, NICE recommended using CA 125 to test for ovarian cancer in patients presenting to primary care providers with symptoms of ovarian cancer.<sup>35</sup> No other biomarker tests are mentioned in the NICE guidance.

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

The U.S. Preventive Services Task Force updated its recommendations for screening for ovarian cancer in February 2018.<sup>36</sup> The Task Force recommended against screening for ovarian cancer in asymptomatic women (D recommendation). HE4 was not specifically discussed.

### 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 12.

**Table 12. Summary of Key Trials**

NCT No.	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
<b>Ongoing</b>			
<b>NCT03982914</b>	The Use of a New Biomarker, HE4, in Combination With Simple Ultrasound Rules in the Prediction of Malignancy in a Pelvic Mass Detected on Ultrasound	814	Aug 2021
<b>NCT02595281</b>	Determination of the Interest of HE4 as a Relapse Biomarker in Ovarian Cancers Stages IIIb, IIIc and IV After Neo-adjuvant Chemotherapy and Surgery	90	Mar 2023
<b>Unpublished</b>			
<b>NCT01768156</b>	Determination of the Prognostic and Predictive Value of the New Marker HE4 in Metastatic Ovarian Cancer Monitoring	101	Nov 2016

NCT: national clinical trial.

### References

1. Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results Program (SEER). SEER Stat Fact: Ovarian Cancer. n.d.; <http://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/ovary.html>. Accessed November 5, 2021.
2. Ledermann JA, Raja FA, Fotopoulou C, et al. Newly diagnosed and relapsed epithelial ovarian carcinoma: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Ann Oncol.* Oct 2013; 24 Suppl 6: vi24-32. PMID 24078660
3. Rustin GJ, van der Burg ME, Griffin CL, et al. Early versus delayed treatment of relapsed ovarian cancer (MRC OV05/EORTC 55955): a randomised trial. *Lancet.* Oct 02 2010; 376(9747): 1155-63. PMID 20888993
4. Food and Drug Administration, 510(k) substantial equivalence determination decision summary: assay only (K072939). n.d.; [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh\\_docs/reviews/K072939.pdf](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/reviews/K072939.pdf). Accessed November 5, 2021.
5. Food and Drug Administration. 510(k) substantial equivalence determination decision summary: assay only (K093957). n.d.; [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh\\_docs/reviews/K093957.pdf](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/reviews/K093957.pdf). Accessed November 5, 2021.
6. Braicu EI, Fotopoulou C, Van Gorp T, et al. Preoperative HE4 expression in plasma predicts surgical outcome in primary ovarian cancer patients: results from the OVCAD study. *Gynecol Oncol.* Feb 2013; 128(2): 245-51. PMID 23178313
7. Nassir M, Guan J, Luketina H, et al. The role of HE4 for prediction of recurrence in epithelial ovarian cancer patients-results from the OVCAD study. *Tumour Biol.* Mar 2016; 37(3): 3009-16. PMID 26419591
8. Steffensen KD, Waldstrom M, Brandslund I, et al. Identification of high-risk patients by human epididymis protein 4 levels during follow-up of ovarian cancer. *Oncol Lett.* Jun 2016; 11(6): 3967-3974. PMID 27313725
9. Vallius T, Hynninen J, Auranen A, et al. Postoperative human epididymis protein 4 predicts primary therapy outcome in advanced epithelial ovarian cancer. *Tumour Biol.* Feb 2017; 39(2): 1010428317691189. PMID 28218038
10. Potenza E, Parpinel G, Laudani ME, et al. Prognostic and predictive value of combined HE-4 and CA-125 biomarkers during chemotherapy in patients with epithelial ovarian cancer. *Int J Biol Markers.* Dec 2020; 35(4): 20-27. PMID 33126819

11. Salminen L, Gidwani K, Grenman S, et al. HE4 in the evaluation of tumor load and prognostic stratification of high grade serous ovarian carcinoma. *Acta Oncol.* Dec 2020; 59(12): 1461-1468. PMID 33030975
12. Plotti F, Terranova C, Guzzo F, et al. Role of BRCA Mutation and HE4 in Predicting Chemotherapy Response in Ovarian Cancer: A Retrospective Pilot Study. *Biomedicines.* Jan 08 2021; 9(1). PMID 33435590
13. Rong Y, Li L. Early clearance of serum HE4 and CA125 in predicting platinum sensitivity and prognosis in epithelial ovarian cancer. *J Ovarian Res.* Jan 04 2021; 14(1): 2. PMID 33397458
14. Han Y, Jiang L, Liu K, et al. Predictive Value of HE4 in Platinum-Based Chemotherapy for Ovarian Cancer : A Systematic Review. *Front Oncol.* 2021; 11: 703949. PMID 34307173
15. Olsen M, Lof P, Stiekema A, et al. The diagnostic accuracy of human epididymis protein 4 (HE4) for discriminating between benign and malignant pelvic masses: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand.* Oct 2021; 100(10): 1788-1799. PMID 34212386
16. Suri A, Perumal V, Ammali P, et al. Diagnostic measures comparison for ovarian malignancy risk in Epithelial ovarian cancer patients: a meta-analysis. *Sci Rep.* Aug 27 2021; 11(1): 17308. PMID 34453074
17. Huang J, Chen J, Huang Q. Diagnostic value of HE4 in ovarian cancer: A meta-analysis. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol.* Dec 2018; 231: 35-42. PMID 30317143
18. Dayyani F, Uhlig S, Colson B, et al. Diagnostic Performance of Risk of Ovarian Malignancy Algorithm Against CA125 and HE4 in Connection With Ovarian Cancer: A Meta-analysis. *Int J Gynecol Cancer.* Nov 2016; 26(9): 1586-1593. PMID 27540691
19. Macedo AC, da Rosa MI, Lumertz S, et al. Accuracy of serum human epididymis protein 4 in ovarian cancer diagnosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Gynecol Cancer.* Sep 2014; 24(7): 1222-31. PMID 25078339
20. Wang J, Gao J, Yao H, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of serum HE4, CA125 and ROMA in patients with ovarian cancer: a meta-analysis. *Tumour Biol.* Jun 2014; 35(6): 6127-38. PMID 24627132
21. Zhen S, Bian LH, Chang LL, et al. Comparison of serum human epididymis protein 4 and carbohydrate antigen 125 as markers in ovarian cancer: A meta-analysis. *Mol Clin Oncol.* Jul 2014; 2(4): 559-566. PMID 24940495
22. Yang Z, Wei C, Luo Z, et al. Clinical value of serum human epididymis protein 4 assay in the diagnosis of ovarian cancer: a meta-analysis. *Onco Targets Ther.* 2013; 6: 957-66. PMID 23901285
23. Ferraro S, Braga F, Lanzoni M, et al. Serum human epididymis protein 4 vs carbohydrate antigen 125 for ovarian cancer diagnosis: a systematic review. *J Clin Pathol.* Apr 2013; 66(4): 273-81. PMID 23426716
24. Yu S, Yang HJ, Xie SQ, et al. Diagnostic value of HE4 for ovarian cancer: a meta-analysis. *Clin Chem Lab Med.* Feb 03 2012; 50(8): 1439-46. PMID 22868811
25. Kaijser J, Van Gorp T, Smet ME, et al. Are serum HE4 or ROMA scores useful to experienced examiners for improving characterization of adnexal masses after transvaginal ultrasonography?. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol.* Jan 2014; 43(1): 89-97. PMID 23828371
26. Moszynski R, Szubert S, Szpurek D, et al. Usefulness of the HE4 biomarker as a second-line test in the assessment of suspicious ovarian tumors. *Arch Gynecol Obstet.* Dec 2013; 288(6): 1377-83. PMID 23722285
27. Nikolova T, Zivadinovic R, Evtimovska N, et al. Diagnostic performance of human epididymis protein 4 compared to a combination of biophysical and biochemical markers to differentiate ovarian endometriosis from epithelial ovarian cancer in premenopausal women. *J Obstet Gynaecol Res.* Dec 2017; 43(12): 1870-1879. PMID 29027715
28. Gentry-Maharaj A, Burnell M, Dille J, et al. Serum HE4 and diagnosis of ovarian cancer in postmenopausal women with adnexal masses. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* Jan 2020; 222(1): 56.e1-56.e17. PMID 31351062



29. Anderson GL, McIntosh M, Wu L, et al. Assessing lead time of selected ovarian cancer biomarkers: a nested case-control study. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* Jan 06 2010; 102(1): 26-38. PMID 20042715
30. Urban N, Thorpe JD, Bergan LA, et al. Potential role of HE4 in multimodal screening for epithelial ovarian cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* Nov 02 2011; 103(21): 1630-4. PMID 21917606
31. Terry KL, Schock H, Fortner RT, et al. A Prospective Evaluation of Early Detection Biomarkers for Ovarian Cancer in the European EPIC Cohort. *Clin Cancer Res.* Sep 15 2016; 22(18): 4664-75. PMID 27060155
32. Eskander R, Berman M, Keder L. Practice Bulletin No. 174: Evaluation and Management of Adnexal Masses. *Obstet Gynecol.* Nov 2016; 128(5): e210-e226. PMID 27776072
33. Committee Opinion No. 716: The Role of the Obstetrician-Gynecologist in the Early Detection of Epithelial Ovarian Cancer in Women at Average Risk. *Obstet Gynecol.* Sep 2017; 130(3): e146-e149. PMID 28832487
34. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Ovarian Cancer Including Fallopian Tube Cancer and Primary Peritoneal Cancer. Version 3.2021. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/ovarian.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/ovarian.pdf). Accessed November 5, 2021.
35. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Ovarian cancer: recognition and initial management [CG122]. 2011; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg122>. Accessed November 5, 2021.
36. U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Recommendation Statement: Screening for Ovarian Cancer. 2018; file:///C:/Users/alt/Downloads/ovarian-cancer-final-rec-statement.pdf. Accessed November 5, 2021.
37. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association. Medical Policy Reference Manual, No. 2.04.66 (December 2021).

## 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.*

*The following codes are included below for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Policy Statements are intended to provide member coverage information and may include the use of some codes for clarity. The Policy Guidelines section may also provide additional information for how to interpret the Policy Statements and to provide coding guidance in some cases.*

Type	Code	Description
CPT®	81500	Oncology (ovarian), biochemical assays of two proteins (CA-125 and HE4), utilizing serum, with menopausal status, algorithm reported as a risk score
	86305	Human epididymis protein 4 (HE4)
HCPCS	None	

## Policy History

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

Effective Date	Action
07/02/2010	New Policy
01/11/2013	Policy revision with position change effective March 11, 2013
01/23/2013	Administrative update
03/11/2013	Policy revision with position change
06/30/2015	Policy title change from Human Epididymis Protein 4 (HE4) Testing
04/01/2016	Policy revision without position change
02/01/2017	Policy revision without position change
02/01/2018	Policy revision without position change
03/01/2019	Policy revision without position change
02/01/2020	Annual review. No change to policy statement. Literature review updated.
02/01/2021	Annual review. No change to policy statement. Literature review updated.
02/01/2022	Annual review. No change to policy statement. Literature review updated.

## 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](http://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.*

**Appendix A**

POLICY STATEMENT (No changes)	
BEFORE	AFTER
<p>Serum Biomarker Human Epididymis Protein 4 2.04.66</p> <p><b>Policy Statement:</b> Measurement of human epididymis protein 4 (HE4) is considered <b>investigational</b> for all indications.</p>	<p>Serum Biomarker Human Epididymis Protein 4 2.04.66</p> <p><b>Policy Statement:</b> Measurement of human epididymis protein 4 (HE4) is considered investigational for all indications.</p>