Circulating Tumor DNA and Circulating Tumor Cells for Cancer Management (Liquid Biopsy)

Policy # 00497
Original Effective Date: 07/20/2016
Current Effective Date: 07/11/2018

Applies to all products administered or underwritten by Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana and its subsidiary, HMO Louisiana, Inc. (collectively referred to as the “Company”), unless otherwise provided in the applicable contract. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Medical Policy periodically.

Note: Genetic and Protein Biomarkers for the Diagnosis and Cancer Risk Assessment of Prostate Cancer is addressed separately in medical policy 00272.

Note: Genetic Cancer Susceptibility Panels Using Next-Generation Sequencing is addressed separately in medical policy 00382.

Note: Gene Expression Profiling and Protein Biomarkers for Prostate Cancer Management is addressed separately in medical policy 00403.

Note: Molecular Panel Testing of Cancers to Identify Targeted Therapies is addressed separately in medical policy 00423.

Note: Miscellaneous Genetic and Molecular Diagnostic Tests is addressed separately in medical policy 00577.

Note: Circulating Tumor DNA Management of Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer (Liquid Biopsy) is addressed separately in medical policy 00597.

Services Are Considered Investigational
Coverage is not available for investigational medical treatments or procedures, drugs, devices or biological products.

Based on review of available data, the Company considers the use of circulating tumor deoxyribonucleic acid (ctDNA) and circulating tumor cells (CTCs) to be investigational* for all indications (see Policy Guidelines).

Policy Guidelines
This policy does not address the use of blood-based testing for epidermal growth factor receptor variants in non-small-cell lung cancer or the use of AR-V7 CTCs for metastatic prostate cancer.

Background/Overview
Liquid biopsy refers to the analysis of ctDNA or CTCs as methods of noninvasively characterizing tumors and tumor genome from the peripheral blood.
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CIRCULATING TUMOR DNA
Normal and tumor cells release small fragments of DNA into the blood, which is referred to as cell-free DNA (cfDNA). cfDNA from nonmalignant cells is released by apoptosis. Most cell-free tumor DNA is derived from apoptotic and/or necrotic tumor cells, either from the primary tumor, metastases, or CTCs. Unlike apoptosis, necrosis is considered a pathologic process and generates larger DNA fragments due to incomplete and random digestion of genomic DNA. The length or integrity of the circulating DNA can potentially distinguish between apoptotic and necrotic origin. ctDNA can be used for genomic characterization of the tumor.

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

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

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

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

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

Examples of liquid biopsy tests related to indications covered in this review are shown in Table 1. Note that targeted therapy in non-small-cell lung cancer and use of AR-V7 CTC liquid biopsy for metastatic prostate cancer are addressed in separate reviews.
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Table 1. Examples of Liquid Biopsy Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Type of Liquid Biopsy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biocept</td>
<td>Liquid Biopsies for breast, colorectal, gastric, prostate, and melanoma</td>
<td>ctDNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CellMax Life</td>
<td>CellMax-LBx Liquid Biopsy</td>
<td>CTC plus ctDNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CellMax-CRC Colorectal Cancer Early Detection Test</td>
<td>CTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CellMax-Variation Monitoring Test</td>
<td>CTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CellMax-Prostate Cancer Test</td>
<td>CTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynvenio</td>
<td>ClearID™‡ Solid Tumor Panel</td>
<td>ctDNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Medicine</td>
<td>ClearID™‡HER2 Expression LiquidBiopsy</td>
<td>CTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardant Health</td>
<td>FoundationACT™‡</td>
<td>ctDNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVDiagnostics</td>
<td>Velox™‡</td>
<td>CTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway Genomics</td>
<td>CancerIntercept™‡ Detect</td>
<td>ctDNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Genome Diagnostics</td>
<td>PlasmaSELECT™‡</td>
<td>ctDNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sysmex Inostics</td>
<td>OncoBEAM™‡</td>
<td>ctDNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulogene Theranostics</td>
<td>Theranostics</td>
<td>ctDNA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CTC: circulating tumor cell; ctDNA: circulating tumor DNA.

**FDA or Other Governmental Regulatory Approval**

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

The CellSearch™‡ System (Janssen Diagnostics, formerly Veridex) is the only FDA-approved device for monitoring patients with metastatic disease and CTCs. In 2004, the CellSearch System was cleared by FDA for marketing through the 510(k) process for monitoring metastatic breast cancer, in 2007 for monitoring metastatic CRC, and in 2008 for monitoring metastatic prostate cancer. The system uses automated instruments manufactured by Immunicon for sample preparation (CellTracks™‡ AutoPrep) and analysis (CellSpotter Analyzer™‡), together with supplies, reagents, and epithelial cell control kits manufactured by Veridex. FDA product code: NQI.

**Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS)**
There is no national coverage determination. In the absence of a national coverage determination, coverage decisions are left to the discretion of local Medicare carriers. Palmetto GBA has issued a local noncoverage determination (L35071) for all CTC assay.

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

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

This evidence review evaluates uses for liquid biopsies not addressed in other reviews. If a separate evidence review exists, then conclusions reached there supersede conclusions here. The main criterion for inclusion in this review is the limited evidence on the clinical validity. The use of liquid biopsy for non-small-cell lung cancer is addressed in medical policy 00597. The use of AR-V7 CTC liquid biopsy for metastatic prostate cancer will be addressed in medical policy 00403.

**SELECTING TREATMENT IN ADVANCED CANCER**

**Clinical Context and Test Purpose**

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

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does use of ctDNA or CTCs testing to select treatment in patients with cancer to improve the net health outcome compared with standard tissue testing?

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

**Patients**

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

**Interventions**

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

**Comparators**

For patients who are able to undergo biopsy, molecular characterization of the tumor is performed using standard tissue biopsy samples. Patients unable to undergo biopsy generally receive standard therapy.
Outcomes
Liquid biopsies are easier to obtain and less invasive than tissue biopsies. True-positive liquid biopsy test results lead to the initiation of appropriate treatment (e.g., targeted therapy) without tissue biopsy. False-positive liquid biopsy test results lead to the initiation of inappropriate therapy, which could shorten progression-free survival.

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

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

Setting
The setting of interest is oncology care.

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

Clinically Valid
A test must detect the presence or absence of a condition, the risk of developing a condition in the future, or treatment response (beneficial or adverse).

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

Much of the literature to date on the use of ctDNA to guide treatment selection is for non-small-cell lung cancer, which is addressed in medical policy 00597 and is not discussed here. Merker et al (2018) concluded that while a wide range of ctDNA assays have been developed to detect driver mutations, there is limited evidence of the clinical validity of ctDNA analysis in tumor types outside of lung cancer and colorectal cancer (CRC). Preliminary clinical studies of ctDNA assays for detection of potentially targetable variants in other cancers such as BRAF variants in melanoma and PIK3CA and ESR1 variants in breast cancer were identified.
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The clinical validity of the OncoBEAM RAS CRC assay has been evaluated in 115 patients with metastatic CRC. Study characteristics, and results are shown in Tables 2 and 3. Study relevance, design, and conduct gaps are described in Tables 4 and 5. Given the breadth of molecular diagnostic methodologies available to assess ctDNA, the clinical validity of each commercially available test must be established independently. Multiple high-quality studies are needed to establish the clinical validity of a test.

Table 2. Clinical Validity Study Characteristics of the OncoBEAM RAS CRC Assay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Population</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Reference Standard</th>
<th>Timing of Tissue Biopsy and OncoBEAM</th>
<th>Blinding of Assessors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Vidal et al (2017) | Patients from Spain with histologically confirmed metastatic CRC  
Anti-EGFR treatment-naïve  
Enrolled from 2009 to 2016 | Retrospective-prospective | Analysis of tissue samples conducted using institutional standard-of-care procedures | Tissue collected before blood  
Median interval, 48 d (range, 0-1783 d) | Yes |

CRC: colorectal cancer; EGFR: epidermal growth factor receptor.

Table 3. Clinical Validity Study Results of the OncoBEAM RAS CRC Assay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Initial N</th>
<th>Final N</th>
<th>Excluded Samples</th>
<th>RAS Variant Positive, %a</th>
<th>Sensitivityb</th>
<th>Specificityb</th>
<th>PPVb</th>
<th>NPVb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vidal et al (2017)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>No description of samples excluded from comparison to tissue results</td>
<td>51 (87 to 100)</td>
<td>96 (79 to 96)</td>
<td>90 (79 to 96)</td>
<td>90 (88 to 100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CI: confidence interval; CRC: colorectal cancer; NA: not available; NPV: negative predictive value; PPV: positive predictive value.

a With tissue biopsy reference standard.

b Values are percent with 95% confidence interval.

Confidence intervals not reported in publication; calculated from data provided.

Table 4. Relevance Gaps for Clinical Validity Studies of the OncoBEAM RAS CRC Assay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Populationa</th>
<th>Interventionb</th>
<th>Comparatorb</th>
<th>Outcomesb</th>
<th>Duration of Follow-Upb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vidal et al (2017)</td>
<td>None noted</td>
<td>None noted</td>
<td>None noted</td>
<td>None noted</td>
<td>None noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evidence gaps stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment. CRC: colorectal cancer.

a 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.

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

c 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.

d Outcomes key: 1. Study does not directly assess a key health outcome; 2. Evidence chain or decision model not explicated; 3. Key clinical validity outcomes not reported (sensitivity, specificity and predictive values); 4. Reclassification of diagnostic or risk categories not reported; 5. Adverse events of the test not described (excluding minor discomforts and inconvenience of venipuncture or noninvasive tests).

e 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).
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Table 5. Study Design and Conduct Gaps for Clinical Validity Studies of the OncoBEAM RAS CRC Assay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Selectiona</th>
<th>Blindingb</th>
<th>Delivery of Test</th>
<th>Selective Reportingc</th>
<th>Completeness of Follow-Upd</th>
<th>Statisticalf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vidal et al (2017)</td>
<td>1. Not clear whether samples were consecutive or convenience</td>
<td>None noted</td>
<td>None noted</td>
<td>1. Registration not described</td>
<td>1. Not clear whether there were samples that were insufficient for analysis or failed to produce results</td>
<td>1. CIs not reported but calculated based on data provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

CI: confidence interval; CRC: colorectal cancer.

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

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

c 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.


e Follow-Up key: 1. Inadequate description of indeterminate and missing samples; 2. High number of samples excluded; 3. High loss to follow-up or missing data.

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

Circulating Tumor Cells

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

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

Clinically Useful

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

Circulating Tumor DNA

Direct Evidence

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

Merker et al (2018) concluded that no such trials have been reported for ctDNA tests.
Chain of Evidence
To develop a chain of evidence or a decision model requires explication of the elements in the model and evidence that is sufficient to demonstrate each of the links in the chain of evidence or the validity of the assumptions in the decision model.

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

The evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance for currently available ctDNA tests except for lung cancer (see Medical policy 00597); therefore, no inferences can be made about clinical utility.

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

Trials of using CTCs to select treatment are ongoing.

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

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

Section Summary: Selecting Treatment in Advanced Cancer
Circulating Tumor DNA
For indications reviewed herein, there is no direct evidence that selecting targeted treatment using ctDNA improves the net health outcome compared with selecting targeted treatment using tumor tissue testing. Given the breadth of methodologies available to assess ctDNA, the clinical validity of each commercially available test must be established independently. One commercially available test (OncoBEAM RAS CRC assay) has promising clinical validity data that needs replication. The evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance for currently available ctDNA tests that are reviewed herein; therefore, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence.

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

**MONITORING TREATMENT RESPONSE IN CANCER**

**Clinical Context and Test Purpose**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Setting**
The setting of interest is oncology care.

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

Circulating Tumor DNA

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

Circulating Tumor Cells

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

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

Clinically Useful

Circulating Tumor DNA

Direct Evidence

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

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

Chain of Evidence

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

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

Circulating Tumor Cells

Direct Evidence

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

Smerage et al (2014) reported on the results of a randomized controlled trial of patients with metastatic breast cancer and persistently increased CTC levels to test whether changing chemotherapy after 1 cycle of first-line therapy could improve overall survival (OS; the primary study outcome). Patients who did not have increased CTC levels at baseline remained on initial therapy until progression (arm A), patients with initially increased CTC levels that decreased after 21 days of therapy remained on initial therapy (arm B), and...
patients with persistently increased CTC levels after 21 days of therapy were randomized to continue initial therapy (arm C1) or change to an alternative chemotherapy (arm C2). There were 595 eligible and evaluable patients, 276 (46%) of whom did not have increased CTC levels (arm A). Of patients with initially increased CTC levels, 31 (10%) were not retested, 165 were assigned to arm B, and 123 were randomized to arms C1 or C2. There was no difference in median OS between arms C1 (10.7 months) and C2 12.5 months; p=0.98). CTC levels were strongly prognostic, with a median OS for arms A, B, and C (C1 and C2 combined) of 35 months, 23 months, and 13 months, respectively (p<0.001). This trial showed the prognostic significance of CTCs in patients with metastatic breast cancer receiving first-line chemotherapy, but also that there was no effect on OS if patients with persistently increased CTC levels after 21 days of first-line chemotherapy were switched to alternative cytotoxic therapy.

Trials demonstrating that use of CTCs to monitor treatment for the purpose of making treatment changes are needed to demonstrate clinical utility.

**Chain of Evidence**

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

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

**Section Summary: Monitoring Treatment Response in Cancer**

**Circulating Tumor DNA**

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

**Circulating Tumor Cells**

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

**PREDICTING RISK OF RELAPSE**

**Clinical Context and Test Purpose**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Setting**
The setting of interest is oncology care.

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

**Clinically Valid**

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

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

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

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

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

**Circulating Tumor DNA and Circulating Tumor Cells**

*Direct Evidence*
Direct evidence of clinical utility is provided by studies that have compared health outcomes for patients managed with and without the test. Because these are intervention studies, the preferred evidence would be from randomized controlled trials. Merker et al (2018) concluded that there is no evidence that early treatment before relapse, based on changes in ctDNA, improves patient outcomes. Similarly, no trials were identified demonstrating that treatment before relapse based on changes in CTCs improves patient outcomes.

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

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

**Section Summary: Predicting Risk of Relapse**

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

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

SCREENING FOR CANCER IN ASYMPTOMATIC INDIVIDUALS
Clinical Context and Test Purpose
It has also been proposed that liquid biopsies could be used to screen asymptomatic patients for early detection of cancer, which could allow for initiating treatment at an early stage, potentially improving outcomes.

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

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

Patients
The relevant population of interest is asymptomatic individuals.

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

Comparators

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

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

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

Setting
The setting of interest is primary care or oncology care.

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

Circulating Tumor DNA

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

Circulating Tumor Cells

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

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

Clinically Useful

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

Circulating Tumor DNA and Circulating Tumor Cells

Direct Evidence

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

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

Chain of Evidence

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

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

Section Summary: Screening for Cancer in Asymptomatic Individuals

Circulating Tumor DNA

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

**Circulating Tumor Cells**

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

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE**

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

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

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

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

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

For individuals who are asymptomatic and at high risk for cancer who receive testing of CTCs to screen for cancer, the evidence includes observational studies. Relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy, and test validity. Given the breadth of methodologies available to assess CTCs, the clinical validity of each commercially available test must be established independently, and these data are lacking. Published studies reporting clinical outcomes and/or clinical utility are lacking. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.
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Coding
The five character codes included in the Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines are obtained from Current Procedural Terminology (CPT®), copyright 2017 by the American Medical Association (AMA).
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CPT is developed by the AMA as a listing of descriptive terms and five character identifying codes and modifiers for reporting medical services and procedures performed by physician.

The responsibility for the content of Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines is with Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana and no endorsement by the AMA is intended or should be implied. The AMA disclaims responsibility for any consequences or liability attributable or related to any use, nonuse or interpretation of information contained in Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines. Fee schedules, relative value units, conversion factors and/or related components are not assigned by the AMA, are not part of CPT, and the AMA is not recommending their use. The AMA does not directly or indirectly practice medicine or dispense medical services. The AMA assumes no liability for data contained or not contained herein. Any use of CPT outside of Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines should refer to the most current Current Procedural Terminology which contains the complete and most current listing of CPT codes and descriptive terms. Applicable FARS/DFARS apply.

CPT is a registered trademark of the American Medical Association.

Codes used to identify services associated with this policy may include (but may not be limited to) the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>81479, 86152, 86153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCPCS</td>
<td>No codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICD-10 Diagnosis</td>
<td>All related diagnoses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Investigational – A medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is Investigational if the effectiveness has not been clearly tested and it has not been incorporated into standard medical practice. Any determination we make that a medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is Investigational will be based on a consideration of the following:

A. Whether the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product can be lawfully marketed without approval of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and whether such approval has been granted at the time the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is sought to be furnished; or

B. Whether the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product requires further studies or clinical trials to determine its maximum tolerated dose, toxicity, safety, effectiveness, or effectiveness as compared with the standard means of treatment or diagnosis, must improve health outcomes, according to the consensus of opinion among experts as shown by reliable evidence, including:

1. Consultation with the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association technology assessment program (TEC) or other nonaffiliated technology evaluation center(s);
2. Credible scientific evidence published in peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community; or
3. Reference to federal regulations.

† Indicated trademarks are the registered trademarks of their respective owners.

NOTICE: Medical Policies are scientific based opinions, provided solely for coverage and informational purposes. Medical Policies should not be construed to suggest that the Company recommends, advocates, requires, encourages, or discourages any particular treatment, procedure, or service, or any particular course of treatment, procedure, or service.
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