

EFFECTIVE DATE: 10|01|2018

POLICY LAST UPDATED: 07|01|2019

OVERVIEW

Laboratory tests have been developed that detect the expression of different genes in pigmented lesions or melanoma tumor tissue. Test results may help providers and patients decide whether to biopsy suspicious pigmented lesions, aid in diagnosis of lesions with indeterminate histopathologic findings or determine whether to perform sentinel lymph node biopsy in patients diagnosed with stage I or II cutaneous melanoma.

For coverage of tests filed with PLA codes (0089U Pigmented Lesion Assay (PLA) and 0090U myPath® Melanoma), please refer to the related policy “Proprietary Laboratory Analyses (PLA).”

MEDICAL CRITERIA

Not applicable

PRIOR AUTHORIZATION

BlueCHiP for Medicare and Commercial Products

There is no specific CPT coding for some of the services referenced in this policy. Therefore, an Unlisted CPT code should be used (See Coding Section for details). All Unlisted genetic testing CPT codes require prior authorization to determine what service is being rendered and if the service is covered or not medically necessary. See the Related Policies section.

Prior authorization is required for BlueCHiP for Medicare and recommended for Commercial Products and is obtained via the online tool for participating providers. See the Related Policies section.

POLICY STATEMENT

BlueCHiP for Medicare

Gene expression testing in the evaluation of patients with suspicious pigmented lesions is not covered as the evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Gene expression testing in the evaluation of patients with melanocytic lesions with indeterminate histopathologic features is not covered as the evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Gene expression testing in the evaluation of patients with cutaneous melanoma is not covered for all indications as the evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Commercial Products

Gene expression testing in the evaluation of patients with suspicious pigmented lesions is considered not medically necessary as the evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Gene expression testing in the evaluation of patients with melanocytic lesions with indeterminate histopathologic features is considered not medically necessary as the evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Gene expression testing in the evaluation of patients with cutaneous melanoma is considered not medically necessary for all indications as the evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

COVERAGE

Benefits may vary between groups and contracts. Please refer to the appropriate Benefit Booklet, Evidence of Coverage or Subscriber Agreement for applicable not medically necessary/not covered benefits/coverage.

BACKGROUND

CUTANEOUS MELANOMA

Cutaneous melanoma accounts for more than 90% of cases of melanoma. For many decades, melanoma incidence was rapidly increasing in the United States. However, recent estimates have suggested the rise may be slowing. In 2018, more than 90,000 new cases of melanoma are expected to be diagnosed and more than 9000 people are expected to die of melanoma.

Risk Factors

Exposure to solar ultraviolet radiation is a major risk factor for melanoma. Most melanomas occur on sunexposed skin, particularly those areas most susceptible to sunburn. Likewise, features that are associated with an individual's sensitivity to sunlight, such as light skin pigmentation, red or blond hair, blue or green eyes, freckling tendency, and poor tanning ability are well-known risk factors for melanoma. There is also a strong association between high total body nevus counts and melanoma.

Several genes appear to contribute to melanoma predisposition such as tumor suppressor gene CDKN2A, melanocortin-1 receptor (MC1R) gene, and BAP1 variants. Individuals with either familial or sporadic melanoma have a 2 to 3 times increased risk of developing a subsequent primary melanoma. Several occupational exposures and lifestyle factors, such as body mass index and smoking, have been evaluated as possible risk factors for melanoma.

Diagnosis

Primary care physicians evaluate suspicious pigmented lesions to determine who should be referred to dermatology. Factors considered include both a patient's risk for melanoma as well as visual examination of the lesion. The visual examination assesses whether the lesion has features suggestive of melanoma. Criteria for features suggestive of melanoma have been developed. One checklist is the ABCDE checklist:

- Asymmetry;
- Border irregularities;
- Color variegation;
- Diameter ≥ 6 mm;
- Evolution.

Another criteria commonly used is the "ugly duckling" sign. An ugly duckling is a nevus that is obviously different from others in a given patient. Primary care physicians generally have a low threshold for referral to dermatology.

Melanoma is difficult to diagnose based on visual examination and the criterion standard for diagnosis is histopathology. There is a low threshold for excisional biopsy of suspicious lesions for histopathologic examination due to the procedure's ease and low risk as well as the high probability of missing melanoma. However, the yield of biopsy is fairly low. The number of biopsies performed to yield one melanoma diagnosis has been estimated to be about 15 for U.S. dermatologists. Therefore a test that could accurately identify those lesions not needing biopsy (ie, a rule-out test for biopsy) could be clinically useful.

Treatment and Surveillance

Many treatment and surveillance decisions are determined by a patient's prognostic stage group based the American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) tumor, node, metastasis (TNM) staging system. The prognostic groups are as follows: stage I, T1a through T2a primary melanomas without evidence of regional or distant metastases; stage II, T2b through T4b primary melanomas without evidence of lymphatic disease or distant metastases; stage III: pathologically documented involvement of regional lymph nodes or in transit or satellite metastases (N1 to N3); stage IV: distant metastases.

Patients may also undergo sentinel lymph node biopsy (SLNB) to gain more definitive information about the status of the regional nodes.

Wide local excision is the definite surgical treatment of melanoma. Following surgery, patients with AJCC stage I or II (node-negative) melanoma do not generally receive adjuvant therapy. Patients with higher risk melanoma receive adjuvant immunotherapy or targeted therapy. Ipilimumab has been shown to prolong recurrence-free survival by approximately 25% compared with placebo at a median of 5.3 years in patients with resected, stage III disease. Nivolumab has been shown to further prolong survival compared with ipilimumab by approximately 35% at 18 months. For patients who are BRAF V600 variant-positive with stage III melanoma, the combination of dabrafenib plus trametinib has been estimated to prolong relapse-free survival by approximately 50% over 3 years.

Patients with stage I and II disease should undergo an annual routine physical and dermatologic examination. However, follow-up strategies and intervals have not been standardized or tested, and there is no consensus. These patients typically do not receive surveillance imaging. Patients with stage III melanoma may be managed with more frequent follow-up and imaging surveillance following therapy.

Gene Expression Profiling

Gene expression profiling measures the activity of thousands of genes simultaneously and creates a snapshot of cellular function. Data for gene expression profiles are generated by several molecular technologies including DNA microarrays that measure activity relative to previously identified genes and RNA-Seq that directly sequences and quantifies RNA molecules. Clinical applications of gene expression profiling include disease diagnosis, disease classification, prediction of drug response, and prognosis.

REGULATORY STATUS

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

For individuals with suspicious pigmented lesions (based on ABCDE and/or ugly duckling criteria) being considered for biopsy who receive gene expression profiling with the DermTech Pigmented Lesion Assay to determine which lesions should proceed to biopsy, the evidence includes observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, and resource utilization. The Pigmented Lesion Assay has 1 clinical validity study with many methodologic and reporting limitations. Therefore, performance characteristics are not well-characterized. Also, the test has not been compared with dermoscopy, another tool frequently used to make biopsy decisions. No direct evidence of clinical utility was identified. Given that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have melanocytic lesions with indeterminate histopathologic features who receive gene expression profiling with the myPath Melanoma test added to histopathology to aid in the diagnosis of melanoma, the evidence includes observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, change in disease status, treatment-related morbidity. The myPath test has 1 clinical validity study, which includes long-term follow-up to establish the clinical diagnosis as the reference standard. However, it is not clear if the study population included lesions that were indeterminate following histopathology and the study had other methodologic and reporting limitations. Therefore, performance characteristics are not well-characterized. No direct evidence of clinical utility was identified. Given that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance, no inferences can be made about

clinical utility through a chain of evidence. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals with American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) stage I or II cutaneous melanoma who receive gene expression profiling with the DecisionDx-Melanoma test to determine whether to perform sentinel lymph node biopsy (SLNB), selection for active surveillance or adjuvant chemotherapy, the evidence includes observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, change in disease status, resource utilization and treatment-related morbidity. The DecisionDx-Melanoma test has 2 independent clinical validity studies that have reported 5-year recurrence-free survival (RFS) in AJCC stage I or II patients. Gerami et al (2015) reported RFS rates of 98% in DecisionDx class 1 (low risk) without confidence intervals (CIs), in AJCC stage I or II patients. Zager et al (2017) reported RFS rates of 96% (95% CI, 94% to 99%) for DecisionDx class 1 in patients with AJCC stage I disease; they also reported RFS rates of 74% (95% CI, 60% to 91%) for DecisionDx class 1 in patients with AJCC stage II disease. Although CIs were not available for the first study, RFS does not appear to be well-characterized as evidenced by the variation in estimates across studies. Zager et al (2017) also reported that in 56 patients who were DecisionDx class 1 (low risk) but SLNB-positive, 22 recurrences (39%) occurred over 5 years. If the DecisionDx test were used as a triage for SLNB, these patients would not undergo SLNB and would likely not receive adjuvant therapy, which has shown to be effective at prolonging time to recurrence in node-positive patients. In the setting where DecisionDx is used to select patients for active surveillance, there is no direct evidence that changes to the frequency and methods for surveillance are clinical appropriate. No direct evidence of clinical utility was identified. Given that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence. There is also not an explicated, evidence-based management pathway for the use of the test. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

CODING

BlueCHiP for Medicare and Commercial Products

The following Unlisted CPT codes require prior authorization for BlueCHiP for Medicare and Commercial Products. These codes can be used for any test identified in this policy that does not have a specific CPT code.

81479 Unlisted molecular pathology procedure
81599 Unlisted multianalyte assay with algorithmic analysis
84999 Unlisted chemistry procedure

RELATED POLICIES

Genetic Testing Services
Proprietary Laboratory Analyses (PLA)

PUBLISHED

Provider Update, April 2019
Provider Update, August 2018

REFERENCES

1. Chang AE, Karnell LH, Menck HR. The National Cancer Data Base report on cutaneous and noncutaneous melanoma: a summary of 84,836 cases from the past decade. The American College of Surgeons Commission on Cancer and the American Cancer Society. *Cancer*. Oct 15 1998;83(8):1664-1678. PMID 9781962
2. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2018. *Jan 2018*;68(1):7-30. PMID 29313949
3. Gilchrest BA, Eller MS, Geller AC, et al. The pathogenesis of melanoma induced by ultraviolet radiation. *N Engl J Med*. Apr 29 1999;340(17):1341-1348. PMID 10219070
4. Gandini S, Sera F, Cattaruzza MS, et al. Meta-analysis of risk factors for cutaneous melanoma: III. Family history, actinic damage and phenotypic factors. *Eur J Cancer*. Sep 2005;41(14):2040-2059. PMID 16125929

5. Caini S, Gandini S, Sera F, et al. Meta-analysis of risk factors for cutaneous melanoma according to anatomical site and clinico-pathological variant. *Eur J Cancer*. Nov 2009;45(17):3054-3063. PMID 19545997
6. Goldstein AM, Chan M, Harland M, et al. Features associated with germline CDKN2A mutations: a GenoMEL study of melanoma-prone families from three continents. *J Med Genet*. Feb 2007;44(2):99-106. PMID 16905682
7. Wendt J, Rauscher S, Burgstaller-Muehlbacher S, et al. Human determinants and the role of melanocortin-1 receptor variants in melanoma risk independent of UV radiation exposure. *JAMA Dermatol*. Jul 1 2016;152(7):776-782. PMID 27050141
8. Wiesner T, Obenauf AC, Murali R, et al. Germline mutations in BAP1 predispose to melanocytic tumors. *Nat Genet*. Aug 28 2011;43(10):1018-1021. PMID 21874003
9. Chen T, Fallah M, Forsti A, et al. Risk of next melanoma in patients with familial and sporadic melanoma by number of previous melanomas. *JAMA Dermatol*. Jun 2015;151(6):607-615. PMID 25671687
10. Jiang AJ, Rambhatla PV, Eide MJ. Socioeconomic and lifestyle factors and melanoma: a systematic review. *Br J Dermatol*. Apr 2015;172(4):885-915. PMID 25354495
11. Abbasi NR, Shaw HM, Rigel DS, et al. Early diagnosis of cutaneous melanoma: revisiting the ABCD criteria. *Jama*. Dec 8 2004;292(22):2771-2776. PMID 15585738
12. Grob JJ, Bonerandi JJ. The 'ugly duckling' sign: identification of the common characteristics of nevi in an individual as a basis for melanoma screening. *Arch Dermatol*. Jan 1998;134(1):103-104. PMID 9449921
13. Wilson RL, Yentzer BA, Isom SP, et al. How good are US dermatologists at discriminating skin cancers? A number-needed-to-treat analysis. *J Dermatolog Treat*. Feb 2012;23(1):65-69. PMID 21756146
14. Gershenwald JES, R.A.; Hess, K.R.; et al. *Melanoma of the Skin*. Chicago, IL: American Joint Committee on Cancer; 2017.
15. Eggermont AM, Chiarion-Sileni V, Grob JJ, et al. Prolonged survival in stage III melanoma with ipilimumab adjuvant therap. *N Engl J Med*. Nov 10 2016;375(19):1845-1855. PMID 27717298
16. Weber J, Mandala M, Del Vecchio M, et al. Adjuvant nivolumab versus ipilimumab in resected stage III or IV melanoma. *N Engl J Med*. Nov 9 2017;377(19):1824-1835. PMID 28891423
17. Long GV, Hauschild A, Santinami M, et al. Adjuvant dabrafenib plus trametinib in stage III BRAFmutated melanomas. *N Engl J Med*. Nov 9 2017;377(19):1813-1823. PMID 28891408
18. National Center for Biotechnology Information. PRAME preferentially expressed antigen in melanoma. 2018; <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/gene/23532>. Accessed March 30, 2018.
19. DermTech. Pigmented Lesion Assay: Non-invasive gene expression analysis of pigmented skin lesions. Performance and Development Notes. 2015; <http://dermtech.com/wpcontent/uploads/2015/10/White-Paper-DermTech-Melanoma-Assay-.pdf>. Accessed March 16, 2018.
20. Wachsman W, Morhenn V, Palmer T, et al. Noninvasive genomic detection of melanoma. *Br J Dermatol*. Apr 2011;164(4):797-806. PMID 21294715
21. Gerami P, Alsobrook JP, 2nd, Palmer TJ, et al. Development of a novel noninvasive adhesive patch test for the evaluation of pigmented lesions of the skin. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. Aug 2014;71(2):237-244. PMID 24906614
22. Gerami P, Yao Z, Polsky D, et al. Development and validation of a noninvasive 2-gene molecular assay for cutaneous melanoma. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. Jan 2017;76(1):114-120 e112. PMID 27707590
23. Vestergaard ME, Macaskill P, Holt PE, et al. Dermoscopy compared with naked eye examination for the diagnosis of primary melanoma: a meta-analysis of studies performed in a clinical setting. *Br J Dermatol*. Sep 2008;159(3):669-676. PMID 18616769
24. Murzaku EC, Hayan S, Rao BK. Methods and rates of dermoscopy usage: a cross-sectional survey of US dermatologists stratified by years in practice. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. Aug 2014;71(2):393-395. PMID 25037790
25. Engasser HC, Warshaw EM. Dermoscopy use by US dermatologists: a cross-sectional survey. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. Sep 2010;63(3):412-419, 419.e411-412. PMID 20619490

CLICK THE ENVELOPE ICON BELOW TO SUBMIT COMMENTS

This medical policy is made available to you for informational purposes only. It is not a guarantee of payment or a substitute for your medical judgment in the treatment of your patients. Benefits and eligibility are determined by the member's subscriber agreement or member certificate and/or the employer agreement, and those documents will supersede the provisions of this medical policy. For information on member-specific benefits, call the provider call center. If you provide services to a member which are determined to not be medically necessary (or in some cases medically necessary services which are non-covered benefits), you may not charge the member for the services unless you have informed the member and they have agreed in writing in advance to continue with the treatment at their own expense. Please refer to your participation agreement(s) for the applicable provisions. This policy is current at the time of publication; however, medical practices, technology, and knowledge are constantly changing. BCBSRI reserves the right to review and revise this policy for any reason and at any time, with or without notice. Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Rhode Island is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

