

Clinical Appropriateness Guidelines

Molecular Testing of Solid and Hematologic Tumors and Malignancies

EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 7, 2018



6600 West Bryn Mawr Avenue
South Tower - Suite 800 Chicago, IL 60631
www.aimspecialtyhealth.com

Appropriate.Safe.Affordable
© 2018 AIM Specialty Health
2066-1018

Table of Contents

Scope	3
Appropriate Use Criteria	3
NCCN® Criteria	4
Polycythemia Vera.....	4
Essential Thrombocythemia or Thrombocytosis	4
Primary Myelofibrosis	5
Breast Cancer.....	5
Cancer of Unknown Primary/Occult Neoplasm	6
Prostate Cancer.....	6
Thyroid Cancer	6
Confirmed or Highly-Suspected Thyroid Cancer	6
Cytologically Indeterminate Thyroid Nodule.....	6
Colorectal Cancer Screening.....	7
CPT Codes.....	7
Background	9
Myeloproliferative Disorders	9
Polycythemia Vera.....	9
Essential Thrombocythemia or Thrombocytosis	10
Primary Myelofibrosis	10
Solid Tumor Testing.....	10
Breast Cancer.....	10
Lung Cancer	12
Cell-Free Tumor Testing.....	13
Cancer of Unknown Primary/Occult Neoplasm	14
Prostate Cancer.....	14
Thyroid Cancer	15
Cancer Screening.....	15
Indeterminate Thyroid Nodules.....	15
Colorectal Cancer Screening.....	16
Professional Society Guidelines.....	18
Selected References.....	19
Revision History.....	21

PROPRIETARY

Guidelines developed by, and used with permission from, Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. © 2018 Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

Scope

This document addresses molecular testing and gene expression profiling of solid and hematologic tumors and malignancies for the purpose of diagnosis, selecting chemotherapeutic agents and predicting risk, prognosis or recurrence of cancer. All tests listed in this guideline may not require prior authorization, please refer to the health plan.

Appropriate Use Criteria

Somatic tumor testing is medically necessary when all of the following criteria are met:

- Identification of the specific genetic variant or profile has been demonstrated to improve diagnosis, management, or clinical outcomes for the individual's tumor type
- Individual meets specific testing criteria outlined in National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN®) algorithms with a category 1, 2A, or 2B level of evidence or supplemental criteria listed below
- Testing sample type and methodology (e.g., formalin-fixed, paraffin embedded, cell-free tumor DNA, circulating tumor cells, etc.) have been clinically validated and recommended as a companion diagnostic by the FDA or NCCN®

Somatic multi-gene panels for hematology-oncology indications are medically necessary when all of the following are met:

- Sequential testing of individual genes or biomarkers is not practical (i.e. limited tissue available, urgent treatment decisions pending)
- Identification of each or multiple genes or biomarkers on the panel has been demonstrated to improve diagnosis, management, or clinical outcomes for the individual's tumor type
- The panel is targeted and limited to genes that are associated with the specific tumor type, unless otherwise specified in tumor site-specific criteria below

Molecular testing for hematology-oncology indications is not medically necessary in the following situations:

- There are no NCCN® recommendations for molecular testing for the specific tumor type
- The requested genetic variant or profile is correlated with a known therapy, but that therapy does not have clinical utility for the specific tumor type
- Topographic genotyping (e.g., PancaGen)
- Whole exome tumor sequencing
- Whole genome tumor sequencing

PROPRIETARY

Guidelines developed by, and used with permission from, Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. © 2018 Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

NCCN® Criteria

Somatic genetic testing for the following tumor types is medically necessary when an individual meets the testing criteria outlined in the relevant NCCN GUIDELINES®:

- Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia
- Acute Myeloid Leukemia
- Chronic Myelogenous Leukemia
- Colorectal Cancer
- Lymphoplasmacytic Lymphoma
- Melanoma
- Myelodysplastic Syndrome
- Prostate Cancer Early Detection
- Soft Tissue Sarcoma
- Lung Cancer
- Uveal Melanoma

See more specific criteria below for:

- Myeloproliferative neoplasms
- Breast cancer
- Cell-Free Tumor Testing
- Cancer of Unknown Primary/Occult Neoplasm
- Prostate Cancer (confirmed, not screening)
- Thyroid Cancer and Indeterminate Thyroid Nodules
- Colorectal Cancer Screening

Polycythemia Vera

JAK2 mutation testing is medically necessary for the diagnosis of polycythemia vera when both of the following conditions are met:

- Genetic testing impacts medical management
- ONE of the following criteria are met:
 - Hemoglobin >16.5 g/dL in men, >16.0 g/dL in women
 - Hematocrit >49% in men, >48% in women
 - Increased red cell mass (RCM) more than 25% above mean normal predicted value

Essential Thrombocythemia or Thrombocytosis

JAK2 V617F testing is medically necessary for the diagnosis of essential thrombocythemia or thrombocytosis (ET) when both of the following conditions are met:

- Genetic testing impacts medical management
- Platelet count > or = $450 \times 10^9/L$

PROPRIETARY

Guidelines developed by, and used with permission from, Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. © 2018 Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

MPL common variants and CALR exon 9 mutation analysis are medically necessary for the diagnosis of essential thrombocythemia or thrombocytosis (ET) when all of the following conditions are met:

- Genetic testing impacts medical management
- Criteria for JAK2 V617F mutation is met
- JAK2 V617F mutation analysis was previously completed and was negative

Primary Myelofibrosis

JAK2, CALR and MPL mutation testing is medically necessary for the diagnosis of primary myelofibrosis (PMF) when both of the following conditions are met:

- Genetic testing impacts medical management
- Suspicion for PMF or pre-PMF exists based on 2016 WHO diagnostic criteria

Genetic testing of ASXL1, EZH2, TET2, IDH1/IDH2/SRSF2, and SF3B1 is medically necessary for the diagnosis of primary myelofibrosis (PMF) when both of the following conditions are met:

- Genetic testing impacts medical management
- Presence of megakaryocytic proliferation and atypia, accompanied by either reticulin and/or collagen fibrosis grades 2 or 3 OR Megakaryocytic proliferation and atypia, without reticulin fibrosis >grade 1, accompanied by increased age-adjusted bone marrow cellularity, granulocytic proliferation, and often decreased erythropoiesis
- JAK2, CALR and MPL mutation analysis was previously completed and was negative.

Breast Cancer

Oncotype DX™ Breast Cancer Assay is medically necessary to assess the need for adjuvant chemotherapy in a woman with breast cancer when all of the following criteria are met:

- Breast tumor is stage 1 or stage 2
- Axillary-node status is negative or any axillary-node micro metastasis is no greater than 2.0 millimeters
- There is no evidence of distant metastatic breast cancer.
- Breast tumor is estrogen receptor-positive
- Breast tumor is HER2 receptor-negative
- Adjuvant chemotherapy (i.e., chemotherapy not precluded due to other factors) is being considered and this testing is being ordered specifically to guide decision making as to whether or not adjuvant chemotherapy will be utilized

Prosigna PAM50™ is medically necessary to assess the risk for recurrence in a woman when all of the following criteria are met:

- Breast tumor is stage 1 or stage 2
- Axillary-node status is negative or any axillary-node micro metastasis is no greater than 2.0 millimeters

PROPRIETARY

Guidelines developed by, and used with permission from, Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. © 2018 Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

- There is no evidence of distant metastatic breast cancer
- Breast tumor is estrogen receptor-positive
- Breast tumor is HER2 receptor-negative
- Postmenopausal

MammaPrint® is medically necessary to assess the risk for recurrence in a woman when all of the following criteria are met:

- Breast tumor is stage 1 or stage 2
- Node negative or 1-3 positive node breast cancer
- Breast tumor is estrogen receptor positive and/or progesterone receptor positive
- Breast tumor is HER2-negative
- Patient is at high clinical risk for recurrence based on the MINDACT categorization

Cancer of Unknown Primary/Occult Neoplasm

Molecular testing and gene expression profiling for occult neoplasms (cancers of unknown primary) is experimental, investigational and unproven.

Prostate Cancer

Screening

Prostate cancer early detection assays (e.g. ConfirmMDx) are medically necessary as outlined in the criteria in the NCCN Prostate Cancer Early Detection GUIDELINE®.

Confirmed Malignancy

Gene expression or molecular profiling assays for confirmed prostate tumors are experimental, investigational and unproven.

Thyroid Cancer

Confirmed or Highly-Suspected Thyroid Cancer

BRAF V600E mutation analysis is medically necessary in cases with confirmed or highly-suspected follicular thyroid carcinoma, papillary thyroid carcinoma, medullary thyroid carcinoma, or metastatic differentiated thyroid cancer.

Cytologically Indeterminate Thyroid Nodule

Gene Expression Classifiers (GECs), Afirma® Thyroid FNA Analysis and ThyraMIR™, are medically necessary for surgical candidates with FNA Bethesda category III results (AUS/FLUS) and no additional high risk factors to help guide surgical decision making.

Mutation analysis panels that include BRAF, RAS, RET/PTC, and PAX8/PPARc, such as ThyGenX®, are medically necessary for patients with FNA Bethesda III and IV results (AUS/FLUS and FN/SFN) to help guide surgical decision making.

GECs and/or mutation analysis are not considered medically necessary when FNA results indicate cytology consistent with Hurthle cell carcinoma.

PROPRIETARY

Guidelines developed by, and used with permission from, Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. © 2018 Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

Colorectal Cancer Screening

Cologuard® is medically necessary for average-risk individuals over 49 once every 3 years as an alternative to screening colonoscopy.

CPT Codes

The following codes are associated with the guidelines in this document. This list is not all inclusive.

- 81170 ABL1 (ABL proto-oncogene 1, non-receptor tyrosine kinase) (egg, acquired imatinib tyrosine kinase inhibitor resistance), gene analysis, variants in the kinase domain
- 81270 JAK2 (Janus kinase 2) (egg, myeloproliferative disorder) gene analysis, p.Val617Phe (V617F) variant
- 81219 CALR (calreticulin) (egg, myeloproliferative disorders), gene analysis, common variants in exon 9
- 81218 CEBPA (CCAAT/enhancer binding protein [C/EBP], alpha) (egg, acute myeloid leukemia), gene analysis, full gene sequence
- 81235 EGFR (epidermal growth factor receptor) (egg, non-small cell lung cancer) gene analysis, common variants (egg, exon 19 LREA deletion, L858R, T790M, G719A, G719S, L861Q)
- 81245 FLT3 (fms-related tyrosine kinase 3) (egg, acute myeloid leukemia), gene analysis; internal tandem duplication (ITD) variants (ie, exons 14, 15)
- 81246 FLT3 (fms-related tyrosine kinase 3) (egg, acute myeloid leukemia), gene analysis; tyrosine kinase domain (TKD) variants (egg, D835, I836)
- 81272 KIT (v-kit Hardy-Zuckerman 4 feline sarcoma viral oncogene homolog) (egg, gastrointestinal stromal tumor [GIST], acute myeloid leukemia, melanoma), gene analysis, targeted sequence analysis (egg, exons 8, 11, 13, 17, 18)
- 81273 KIT (v-kit Hardy-Zuckerman 4 feline sarcoma viral oncogene homolog) (egg, mastocytosis), gene analysis, D816 variant(s)
- 81275 KRAS (Kirsten rat sarcoma viral oncogene homolog) (egg, carcinoma) gene analysis; variants in exon 2 (egg, codons 12 and 13)
- 81276 KRAS (Kirsten rat sarcoma viral oncogene homolog) (egg, carcinoma) gene analysis; additional variant(s) (egg, codon 61, codon 146)
- 81287 MGMT (O-6-methylguanine-DNA methyltransferase) (egg, glioblastoma multiforme), methylation analysis

PROPRIETARY

Guidelines developed by, and used with permission from, Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. © 2018 Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

- 81310 NPM1 (nucleophosmin) (egg, acute myeloid leukemia) gene analysis, exon 12 variants
- 81311 NRAS (neuroblastoma RAS viral [v-ras] oncogene homolog) (egg, colorectal carcinoma), gene analysis, variants in exon 2 (egg, codons 12 and 13) and exon 3 (egg, codon 61)
- 81445 Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ neoplasm, DNA analysis, and RNA analysis when performed, 5-50 genes (egg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, EGFR, ERBB2, KIT, KRAS, NRAS, MET, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variant
- 81450 Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, hematolymphoid neoplasm or disorder, DNA and RNA analysis when performed, 5-50 genes (egg, BRAF, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KRAS, KIT, MLL, NRAS, NPM1, NOTCH1), interrogation for sequence variants, and copy number variants or rearrangements, or isoform expression or mRNA expression levels, if performed
- 81455 Targeted genomic sequence analysis panel, solid organ or hematolymphoid neoplasm, DNA and RNA analysis when performed, 51 or greater genes (egg, ALK, BRAF, CDKN2A, CEBPA, DNMT3A, EGFR, ERBB2, EZH2, FLT3, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KIT, KRAS, MLL, NPM1, NRAS, MET, NOTCH1, PDGFRA, PDGFRB, PGR, PIK3CA, PTEN, RET), interrogation for sequence variants and copy number variants or rearrangements, if performed
- 81504 Oncology (tissue of origin), microarray gene expression profiling of > 2000 genes, utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithm reported as tissue similarity scores
- 81519 Oncology (breast), mRNA, gene expression profiling by real-time RT-PCR of 21 genes, utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin embedded tissue, algorithm reported as recurrence score
- 81525 Oncology (colon), mRNA, gene expression profiling by real-time RT-PCR of 12 genes (7 content and 5 housekeeping), utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithm reported as a recurrence score
- 81528 Oncology (colorectal) screening, quantitative real-time target and signal amplification of 10 DNA markers (KRAS mutations, promoter methylation of NDRG4 and BMP3) and fecal hemoglobin, utilizing stool, algorithm reported as a positive or negative result
- 81540 Oncology (tumor of unknown origin), mRNA, gene expression profiling by real-time RT-PCR of 92 genes (87 content and 5 housekeeping) to classify tumor into main cancer type and subtype, utilizing formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue, algorithm reported

PROPRIETARY

- 81545 Oncology (thyroid), gene expression analysis of 142 genes, utilizing fine needle aspirate, algorithm reported as a categorical result (egg, benign or suspicious)
- 0008M Oncology (breast), mRNA analysis of 58 genes using hybrid capture, on formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tissue, prognostic algorithm reported as a risk score

Background

Somatic genetic testing for the purpose of cancer management guidance is a rapidly evolving field of molecular medicine. Genetic testing of a solid or hematologic tumor can provide important information regarding the prognosis, risk for recurrence or help predict tumor response to chemotherapeutic agents. In addition, genetic testing of tissue (e.g. blood) or stool, for evidence of a tumor is becoming an important tool in the early detection of cancer. While this is an area of rapid and ongoing research, clinical validity and utility is proven for only a subset of companion diagnostic genetic tests at this time.

Myeloproliferative Disorders

Myeloproliferative disorders are a group of conditions that cause abnormal growth of blood cells in the bone marrow. They include polycythemia vera (PV), essential thrombocytosis (ET), pre-primary myelofibrosis (pre-PMF), primary myelofibrosis (PMF), and chronic myelogenous leukemia (CML). The World Health Organization (WHO) further classifies PV, ET, and PMF as Philadelphia chromosome-negative myeloproliferative neoplasms (MPN)s. The diagnosis of an MPN is suspected based upon clinical, laboratory, and pathological findings (i.e., bone marrow morphology). MPNs are related to, but distinct from, myelodysplastic syndromes (MDS). In general, MDS are characterized by ineffective or dysfunctional blood cells, while MPN are characterized by an increase in the number of blood cells.

Molecular testing for certain somatic mutations is included in the World Health Organization diagnostic criteria for myeloproliferative neoplasms. Specific treatments may be initiated for some individuals with a confirmed diagnosis of myeloproliferative disorder. Targeted genetic testing of the JAK2, CALR, and MPL genes may be helpful in individuals who would not otherwise meet diagnostic criteria without it. At this time, mutations in other genes associated with MPN, including mutations within ASXL1, TET2, SRSF2, U2AF1, IDH1/IDH2, TP53, DNMT3A, IKZF1, LNK, SF3B1, EZH2, CBL, and SETBP1, are recommended only in the evaluation for primary and pre-primary myelofibrosis.

Polycythemia Vera

Polycythemia vera is a chronic myeloproliferative disease characterized by increased hemoglobin, hematocrit, and red blood cell mass. There is an associated increased risk for thrombosis and transformation to acute myelogenous leukemia or primary myelofibrosis; however, patients are often asymptomatic. Polycythemia vera (PV) is included among the differential for those who have negative BCR-ABL testing. The proposed revised World Health Organization (WHO) criteria for diagnosis includes presence of the somatic JAK2 V617F mutation or functionally similar exon 12 mutation. Other diagnostic criteria include elevated hemoglobin and abnormal bone marrow morphology. The JAK2 V617F mutation is present in the vast majority (greater than 90%) of cases of PV. Functionally similar mutations in JAK2 exon 12 account for most remaining cases of JAK2 V617F mutation-negative PV. These mutations lead to sustained activation of the JAK2 protein, which causes excess cell production, independent of erythropoietin levels. Together, they are identified in 98% of PV cases and lead to high diagnostic certainty. Absence of a JAK2 mutation, combined with normal or increased serum

PROPRIETARY

erythropoietin level, greatly decreases the likelihood of a PV diagnosis. WHO proposed revision criteria for PV do not address additional molecular markers, including CALR mutation status.

Essential Thrombocythemia or Thrombocytosis

Essential thrombocythemia is a disorder of sustained increased platelet count, characterized by persistently elevated platelet count greater than 450,000/ μ L; megakaryocytic hyperplasia (seen in bone marrow); not meeting WHO criteria for CML, PV, PMF, MDS or other myeloid neoplasm; and the demonstration of JAK2 V617F or other clonal marker or no evidence of reactive thrombocytosis. In addition, patients can have splenomegaly and a clinical course complicated by thrombotic or hemorrhagic episodes (or both). The majority of ET patients (60%) carry a somatic JAK2 V617F mutation, while a smaller percentage (5-10%) have activating MPL mutations. Proposed criteria additionally state that 70% of patients without a JAK2 or MPL mutation carry a somatic mutation of the calreticulin (CALR) gene. Among confirmed ET cases, mutations in CALR are more common than MPL. Positive CALR mutation status is suggested as indicating a more indolent course (Klampfl, 2013). It is important to note that JAK2/CALR//MPL mutation screening, by itself, cannot distinguish masked PV from JAK2-mutated ET, WHO-defined ET from prefibrotic/early PMF or triple-negative ET from other causes of thrombocytosis (Barbui, 2015).

Primary Myelofibrosis

Primary myelofibrosis (PMF) is a rare disorder in which the bone marrow is replaced with fibrous tissue, leading to bone marrow failure. Clinical features are similar to ET. The approximate incidence is 1 in 100,000 individuals. Persons can be asymptomatic in the early stages of the disease. For such patients, treatment may not initially be necessary. Progression of the disease can include transformation to acute myeloid leukemia. Treatment is generally symptomatic and aimed at preventing complications.

Demonstration of a clonal marker is important for diagnosis. Somatic molecular markers in PMF patients are similar to those in patients with ET, and include JAK2 V617F, MPL, and CALR. Somatic mutations in JAK2 are identified in 55-65% of PMF cases, and MPL mutations in 10%. Mutations in CALR are less common than JAK2, but more common than MPL. When all of these are absent, testing for additional markers, such as ASXL1, EZH2, TET2, IDH1/IDH2, SRSF2 and SF3B1 can be considered. Many of these additional markers have prognostic significance for survival and progression to leukemia as well (NCCN[®], v.2.2018; Tefferi, 2016). Identification of a clonal marker is one of the required major criteria in the diagnosis of PMF (NCCN[®], v.2.2018).

Solid Tumor Testing

Breast Cancer

While NGS panels are not currently recommended for use to guide chemotherapeutic treatment decisions, molecular testing may be used to predict prognosis and recurrence risk for breast cancer. The strongest prognostic factors to predict future recurrence or death from breast cancer include patient age, comorbidity, tumor size, tumor grade, number of involved axillary lymph nodes, and HER2 tumor status (NCCN[®] v.2.2017).

Breast cancer gene expression profiling refers to testing performed on breast cancer tumor tissue to identify expression levels of sets of genes that, taken together, may predict recurrence risk and/or treatment response. The National Comprehensive Cancer Network incorporates the Oncotype Dx Breast 21-gene assay into the treatment determination algorithm for individuals with invasive breast cancer with subtypes including ductal, lobular, mixed, and metaplastic, with no lymph node involvement or minimal lymph node involvement with micro metastasis of 2 mm or less, whose tumor

PROPRIETARY

is >0.5 cm (NCCN®, v.2.2017). These guidelines specifically note the limitation of other multi-gene or multi-gene expression assay systems as not yet sufficiently validated to predict response to chemotherapy.

The American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO, 2016) recommends use of the Oncotype Dx assay to guide decisions on adjuvant chemotherapy in patients treated with tamoxifen who are node-negative and estrogen-receptor positive (Harris et al., 2016).

Sufficient data supports the use of the Oncotype Dx assay for recurrence risk prediction and determination of adjuvant chemotherapy for:

- Early stage (I or II) invasive breast cancer, AND
- Axillary lymph node negative / no evidence of distant metastatic breast cancer / any axillary-node micro metastasis is 2 mm or less, AND
- Estrogen receptor positive AND
- HER2 receptor negative AND
- Patients who are candidates for adjuvant chemotherapy

The 2016 ASCO practice guideline published in the *Journal of Clinical Oncology* supports the use of certain tumor biomarker assays beyond the Oncotype Dx Breast assay described above, in select populations to guide treatment. Importantly, these recommendations are based on review of evidence in which no true prospective trials have been performed. Specifically, ASCO supports the use of the following tests in the outlined scenarios:

- EndoPredict for women with ER/PR-positive, HER2-negative, node-negative breast cancer to guide decisions on adjuvant systemic chemotherapy. This is an evidence-based recommendation with reported intermediate evidence quality, and a moderate strength of recommendation.
- PAM50/Prosigna Breast Cancer Prognostic Gene Signature Assay for women with ER/PR-positive, HER2-negative, node-negative breast cancer to be used in conjunction with other clinicopathologic variables to guide decisions on adjuvant systemic therapy. This is an evidence-based recommendation with reported high quality evidence and a strong strength of recommendation.
- Breast Cancer Index (BCI) for women with ER/PR-positive, HER2-negative, node-negative breast cancer to guide decisions on adjuvant systemic therapy. This is an evidence-based recommendation with intermediate quality evidence, and a moderate strength of recommendation.

The American Society of Clinical Oncology recently published a special addendum (Krop et al., 2017) regarding use of MammaPrint® for women with hormone receptor- positive, HER2-negative, node negative tumors based on preliminary MINDACT data. The prior recommendation for this group [women with HR+, HER2-(node positive or node-negative) breast cancer] was that the clinician should not use MammaPrint® to guide decisions on adjuvant systemic chemotherapy. The recent updated guideline separates this group into 3 categories and recommendations:

- **Recommendation 1.1.1:** MammaPrint® assay may be used for women with hormone receptor- positive, HER2-negative, node negative cancer who are considered high clinical

PROPRIETARY

risk per MINDACT categorization to inform decision making regarding withholding adjuvant systemic chemotherapy due to its ability to identify a good prognosis population with potentially limited chemotherapy benefit. (Evidence Quality: High and Strength of Recommendation: Strong)

- **Recommendation 1.1.2:** MammaPrint® assay should not be used for women with hormone receptor- positive, HER2-negative, node negative cancer who were considered low clinical risk per MINDACT categorization because women in the low clinical risk category had excellent outcomes and did not seem to benefit from chemotherapy even with a genomically high risk cancer. (Evidence Quality: High and Strength of Recommendation: Strong)
- **Recommendation 1.2.1:** MammaPrint® assay may be used in patients with hormone receptor- positive, HER2-negative, node positive (with 1-3 positive nodes) cancer and at high clinical risk per MINDACT categorization to inform decision making regarding withholding adjuvant systemic chemotherapy because of its ability to identify a good prognosis population with potentially limited chemotherapy benefit. Patients should be informed that benefit of chemotherapy cannot be excluded, particularly in patients with more than one involved lymph node. (Evidence Quality: High; Strength of Recommendation: Moderate).

The following tests are not supported within the ASCO practice guideline under any circumstances at this time: MammoStrat or any assays performed using circulating tumor cells or tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes.

Given the relatively lower quality evidence and moderate strength recommendation from ASCO provided for EndoPredict and Breast Cancer Index, these tests have not yet been adequately validated for clinical use. For the PAM50 Prosigna test, however, retrospective studies have suggested higher utility and ASCO's recommendation is strong.

Lung Cancer

Epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutation status has been shown to be significantly associated with tumor response to EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors (Lynch et al., 2004; Mok et al., 2009). This has led to the routine assessment of the presence of EGFR mutations in advanced non-small cell lung cancers (NSCLC), particularly adenocarcinomas (Keedy et al., 2011; Salto-Tellez et al., 2011). The anaplastic lymphoma kinase (ALK) gene rearrangements have been identified in a subset of patients with NSCLC and represent a unique subset of patients for whom ALK inhibitors may be a very effective treatment strategy. According to the National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN®) Clinical Practice Guidelines, for metastatic NSCLC (particularly adenocarcinoma), EGFR and ALK testing of tumor tissue is considered the standard of care (Ettinger et al., 2014). ROS1 gene rearrangement testing is also recommended by the most recent NCCN® Clinical Practice Guideline update based on data showing efficacy of treatment with crizotinib in patients with ROS1 rearrangements and recent FDA approval (v.8.2017). PD-L1 testing is recommended as expression levels are currently used to determine the most appropriate course of treatment in this rapidly evolving area of lung cancer care.

KRAS mutations are associated with primary EGFR TKI resistance, and according to the most recent NCCN GUIDELINES®, KRAS gene sequencing could be useful for the selection of patients as candidates

PROPRIETARY

Guidelines developed by, and used with permission from, Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. © 2018 Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

for EGFR TKI therapy. Although targeted therapy for KRAS mutations is currently unavailable, KRAS testing may identify patients who may not benefit from further molecular diagnostic testing.

In addition, current NCCN GUIDELINES® recommend testing for these and other gene alterations utilizing next-generation sequencing (NGS), a technology that can detect specific mutations and gene rearrangements. The other genetic alterations more recently found to be associated with NSCLC and for which targeted therapies have been developed include: HER2 (ERBB2) mutations, BRAF mutations, RET gene rearrangements, and MET amplification. As targeted agents are available for patients with NSCLC who have these genetic alterations, the NCCN GUIDELINES® recommend testing for these specific genetic alterations using NGS to ensure that patients with NSCLC receive the most appropriate treatment. The NCCN® NSCLC Guidelines Panel also endorses broader molecular profiling (also known as precision medicine) to identify rare driver mutations in other genes with the goal of identifying patients who may be eligible for clinical trials (v.8.2017).

While there has been some success in broad molecular profiling and targeted therapies for NSCLC, there is a lack of evidence to support tumor testing for patients diagnosed with small cell lung cancer (SCLC) (NCCN®, v.1.2018). To date, there have been limited advances in the treatment of SCLC and there are specific challenges in performing genomic analysis on SCLC tumors compared to NSCLC tumors. Genomic profiling is currently being evaluated as an option, but more research is needed to demonstrate its effectiveness in this population (Umamura, 2015). Additionally, recent NCCN GUIDELINES® for SCLC do not give any recommendations to support the use of molecular profiling to aid in the treatment of SCLC.

Cell-Free Tumor Testing

Tumor testing for EGFR and ALK rearrangements is not always possible, primarily due to inadequate tissue sample. It is estimated that 15% of patients with NSCLC who undergo biopsy have an inadequate sample for molecular testing (Douillard, 2014). In addition, many patients with late-stage metastatic NSCLC may be poor candidates for biopsy.

There has been growing interest and research into alternative methodologies of assessing tumor mutation status, including cell-free plasma based tests. Primary and metastatic tumors shed circulating tumor cells (CTCs) into the bloodstream. These remain at very low concentration in the plasma and are difficult to detect. CTCs release DNA through various mechanisms. This cell-free tumor DNA or ctDNA is easier to isolate and, with the increasing capabilities of next-generation sequencing, offers an alternate opportunity to assess somatic tumor-specific mutations. While several studies have shown that ctDNA is not as sensitive or specific as direct tumor testing (Janku, 2016; Zhang, 2016), there are potential applications where ctDNA testing might be indicated (e.g., when a biopsy sample is insufficient, when repeat biopsy is overly risky, or when chemotherapy response has changed and there is a concern for intra- or inter-tumor heterogeneity). It has also been proposed that ctDNA may improve minimal residual disease monitoring. Cell-free tumor DNA analysis is an active area of ongoing research; however, few ctDNA tests have been clinically validated.

At this time, there is no testing algorithm that incorporates both plasma and tumor testing for NSCLC. Based on its inferior performance, there is insufficient evidence to recommend plasma-based testing (ctDNA) over tumor-based testing when a tumor sample is available. However, in cases of metastatic NSCLC where an inadequate tissue biopsy is available, ctDNA EGFR testing may be reasonable to aid in treatment selection.

PROPRIETARY

Guidelines developed by, and used with permission from, Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. © 2018 Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

Cancer of Unknown Primary/Occult Neoplasm

Occult neoplasms, or cancers of unknown primary, are defined as histologically proven metastatic malignant tumors whose primary site cannot be identified during pretreatment evaluation. These may have a wide clinical presentation and typically a poor prognosis. Several laboratories offer gene expression profiling or NGS tests to aid in the identification of the tissue of origin of a metastatic tumor. NCCN® Clinical Practice Guidelines for Occult Primary Cancer (v.2.2017) state that the literature evaluating molecular testing in the diagnosis and management of occult primaries has focused much more on establishing the tissue of origin rather than establishing whether such identification leads to better outcomes for patients. Although these results may have diagnostic benefit, there is limited evidence for clinical utility at this time. The NCCN panel does not recommend molecular profiling for the identification of tissue of origin as standard management in the diagnostic workup of patients with occult primary tumors (category 3).

The European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO) also notes the potential promise of molecular assays to assist with tissue of origin identification for cancers of unknown primary; however, the ESMO clinical practice guideline goes on to note insufficient evidence related to further using assay-predicted tumor type to then administer primary site-specific therapy (Fizazi, 2015).

Prostate Cancer

Prostate cancer is a common malignancy in men and the worldwide burden of this disease is rising. Early detection of prostate cancer by prostate-specific antigen (PSA) screening is controversial, but changes in the PSA threshold, frequency of screening, and the use of other biomarkers have the potential to minimize the overdiagnosis associated with PSA screening. Several new biomarkers for individuals with raised PSA concentrations or those diagnosed with prostate cancer are likely to identify individuals who can be spared aggressive treatment (Cuzick et al., 2014). Multiple molecular biomarker tests for prostate cancer prognosis (e.g., Prolaris and Oncotype DX Prostate cancer) have been developed with extensive industry support, guidance, and involvement, and have been marketed under the less rigorous FDA regulatory pathway for biomarkers.

Although the intended use of most of these tests is to distinguish prostate cancer from benign prostatic conditions and many appear to have better sensitivity and specificity than PSA, many studies have shown that these tests may also be useful in the differentiation of aggressive from non-aggressive forms of prostate cancer. However, additional research is needed to fully determine the clinical utility of testing (Sartori, 2014). Research is ongoing for several biomarkers that have been proposed for screening, detection, monitoring and prognosis for prostate cancer.

The NCCN® guidelines note that men with clinically localized disease may consider the use of tumor-based molecular assays as retrospective studies have shown that molecular assays performed on biopsy or prostatectomy specimens provide prognostic information independent of NCCN® risk groups such as likelihood of death with conservative management, likelihood of biochemical progression after radical prostatectomy or external beam therapy, and likelihood of developing metastasis after radical prostatectomy or salvage radiotherapy. Naryan et al (2017), performed an evidence-based review for biomarker assays used for prostate cancer. The group reviewed Prolaris and Oncotype DX Prostate and commented that although these tests have been incorporated into NCCN guidelines and may be beneficial for men with low-volume Gleason 6 disease on biopsy, these tests have not been thoroughly studied in minority populations and it is unclear how initial test results may change with repeat assessments. They recommend that these tests should be used with discretion as they add to the cost of prostate cancer care and that providers should discuss the indications and limitations thoroughly with their patients (Narayan et al., 2017). Similarly, Lamy et al (2017) performed a systematic review of prostate cancer biomarkers and conclude the Prostate Health Index and the 4K score have the

PROPRIETARY

highest level of evidence in predicting which cancers may be more aggressive. They also note that other assays, including OncotypeDx Prostate, Prolaris, and Decipher, are promising but need further evidence to confirm their clinical validity.

Thyroid Cancer

Per NCCN GUIDELINES[®], BRAF V600E testing is indicated for patients with confirmed or highly suspected thyroid cancer (FTC, MTC, PTC, or patients with metastatic differentiated thyroid carcinoma). Testing can aid in medication selection and/or surgical decisions. Aggressive BRAF-positive papillary carcinomas have been found to be associated with the overexpression of the microRNA known as miR-146b. Currently, miRs are considered independent of BRAF mutational status and may be used to assist in risk stratification for BRAF-positive cases (Ludvíková, 2016). RNA classifiers are not yet considered standard of care in evaluating the BRAF V600E somatic variant.

Molecular diagnostic testing to detect individual mutations (e.g., BRAF, RET/PTC, RAS, PAX8/PPAR) has been proven in the evaluation of FNA samples that are indeterminate to assist in management decisions; however, large scale, prospective studies have not been performed which demonstrate the clinical utility of such testing in patients with confirmed thyroid cancer. Further studies on the clinical utility of these tests are needed in individuals who have already been diagnosed with thyroid malignancy (NCCN[®], v.2.2017).

Medullary thyroid cancer (MTC) is an aggressive form of thyroid cancer that is often not definitively identified by cytology alone. About 40% of patients with MTC do not undergo central neck dissection (the recommended treatment for MTC). Molecular assays have been suggested to assist with the diagnosis of medullary thyroid carcinoma and/or aid in management. There is insufficient data at this time to support the use of genomic classifiers for this cohort (Kloos, 2013).

Cancer Screening

Indeterminate Thyroid Nodules

Cytological examination of fine needle aspiration (FNA) samples is currently the standard of care for classifying thyroid nodules as malignant or benign; however, approximately 25% of samples are classified as indeterminate. There is growing evidence that molecular diagnostic testing can be useful in the reclassification of these indeterminate lesions. The NCCN[®] Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology, Thyroid Carcinoma (v.2.2017) states that molecular diagnostic testing to detect individual mutations (e.g., BRAF, RET/PTC, RAS, PAX8/PPAR) or pattern recognition using molecular classifiers may be useful in evaluation of FNA samples that are indeterminate to assist in management directions. Indeterminate cytology results are defined as FNA results that are suspicious for 1) follicular neoplasms, 2) atypia of undetermined significance/follicular lesion of undetermined significance (AUS/FLUS). Molecular diagnostics are not recommended for Hurthle cell neoplasms (NCCN[®], v.2.2017).

The American Thyroid Association (ATA) issued a statement in July 2015 regarding the surgical application of molecular profiling for thyroid nodules. This statement highlights a 7-gene molecular panel including BRAF V600E, three isoforms of RAS point mutations, and translocations within PAX8/PPARy and RET/PTC genes as having been clinically validated to predict the presence of differentiated thyroid cancer with 86-94% specificity and 87-100% PPV. This test is noted to have been performed on over 1500 indeterminate cytology specimens and correlated with histologic results to generate a real-time algorithm for management of thyroid nodules with the ultimate goal of appropriate initial oncologic total thyroidectomy rather than lobectomy with subsequent completion thyroidectomy when total thyroidectomy is indicated. This 7-gene molecular testing panel has been demonstrated to

PROPRIETARY

Guidelines developed by, and used with permission from, Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. © 2018 Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

add to the specificity of indeterminate FNA cytology and successfully refine the initial operative management of thyroid nodules and thyroid cancer. The ATA report goes on to highlight a large prospective single-center study of this 7-gene molecular test noting overall, "for thyroid lesions of indeterminate cytology, the detection of any mutation translated into a malignancy risk for AUS/FLUS, FN, and SMC of 88%, 87%, and 95% respectively, compared to 6%, 14%, and 28% in mutation-negative lesions," where AUS/FLUS refers to atypia of uncertain significance/follicular lesion of undetermined significance, FN refers to follicular neoplasm, and SMC refers to suspicious for malignant cells.

The ATA summarizes the above noted professional statement by suggesting a role exists for both molecular tumor profiling and gene expression classifier (GEC) systems in assisting with the appropriate management of cytologically indeterminate nodules; however, the type of test chosen may be dependent upon additional clinical and sonographic features. GEC is described as a "rule out" test whereas molecular profiling is described as more of a "rule in" test. An example is provided suggesting "GEC may perform better in a setting of lower cancer frequency, as well as in a cytologic category of low cancer frequency such as AUS/FLUS or FN, than it will in a setting of higher cancer frequency such as SMC or a site with a high prevalence of malignancy in a given cytologic category. Conversely, a "rule in" test such as the 7-gene MT will perform better in settings and categories of higher cancer frequency, for example if a clinician is specifically selecting "high risk" cases thereby enriching the prevalence of cancer in the examined population, or if the local malignancy rate is high at baseline" (Ferris et al., 2015).

The rate of diagnosis of a follicular variant of papillary thyroid cancer has been on the rise and is now the most common variant of PTC. In early 2017, the American Thyroid Association (Haugen et al., 2017) recommended a change in nomenclature from follicular variant of papillary thyroid carcinoma (FVPTC) to noninvasive follicular thyroid neoplasm with papillary-like nuclear features (NIFTP) in a subset of this population with certain noninvasive features. This move was based on evidence that these noninvasive tumors were indolent compared to infiltrative FVPTC and could be managed in a much less aggressive manner. Thus they emphasized that NIFTP should not be considered a carcinoma. This change in nomenclature and treatment for NIFTP impacts the performance of both GECs and mutation analyses by lowering their overall PPV. At this time, the clearest clinical utility for GECs appears to be for those with Bethesda type III cytopathology with a lower a priori risk for malignancy. A negative test result could result in a change in medical management.

Notably, the majority of RAS mutations identified are subsequently associated with an NIFTP diagnosis. Wong et al (2016) and Hang et al (2017) also note the majority of tumors detected by Afirma are ultimately classified as NIFTP. Hang et al (2017) further report that from their pooled analysis the NPV for Afirma in particular is 97% for Bethesda category III and 90% for Bethesda category IV. The authors also note a significant increase in total versus partial thyroidectomy within the past 4 years and speculate it may be due to incorrectly assuming a suspicious GEC result is equivalent to a suspicious FNA results. They note concern for potential for overtreatment, particularly in the AUS group with a suspicious result from a GEC where lobectomy, instead of total thyroidectomy, would be ideal. This would be most beneficial in patients who are ultimately diagnosed with NIFTP.

Colorectal Cancer Screening

Colorectal cancer is the fourth most common cancer type diagnosed in the United States (NCCN®, 1.2017). Best practice guidelines are available from multiple professional organizations (e.g. NCCN®, American Cancer Society, ACOG, USPSTF, etc.) detailing recommendations for standard frequency and starting age for screening based on risk category. Underutilization of screening colonoscopy has led to the study and inclusion of stool-based testing methods in professional guidelines as well as prompting

PROPRIETARY

Guidelines developed by, and used with permission from, Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. © 2018 Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

the study of plasma-based screening techniques. Screening modalities other than standard colonoscopy have been recognized by professional organizations as reasonable for individuals unable or unwilling to undergo this procedure; however, benefits and limitations of each screening method must be considered given the sensitivity for detection of not only colorectal cancer, but also polyps.

General concerns raised surrounding colorectal cancer screening via stool DNA testing and/or cell free DNA (cfDNA) testing include potential population uptake bias with those individuals with more significant comorbidities (and potentially lower or no mortality gain from screening) more likely to use these screening methods. Conversely, low-risk individuals who are considered candidates for screening colonoscopy may opt for these alternate screening options and cancers may be missed due to lower sensitivities (Parikh, 2016). The 2016 USPSTF final recommendations focus not on the level of evidence supporting each individual screening modality or which method should be used, but rather on the likelihood of screening utilization and the need for shared decision making in the selection of screening type.

The American College of Gastroenterology last published recommendations for general population colorectal cancer screening in 2017 and note colonoscopy and fecal immunochemical test (FIT) as tier 1 tests. If colonoscopy is declined, patients should be offered FIT. Second tier tests include CT colonography, FIT-fecal DNA test and flexible sigmoidoscopy (Rex et al., 2017). Similarly, a 2008 joint recommendation by the American Cancer Society, US multi-society task force on colorectal cancer, and the American College of Radiology recommend colorectal cancer prevention modalities (e.g. colonoscopy, flexible sigmoidoscopy, etc.) prior to offering colorectal cancer detection methods which are noted to include gFOBT, FIT, and stool DNA testing.

Stool DNA Testing is a method of colorectal cancer screening in which stool is evaluated for specific somatic mutations known to frequently be a part of the carcinogenesis of colorectal cancer. Some stool DNA testing has gained FDA approval and has been demonstrated to have higher sensitivity over FIT for colorectal cancer and certain types of polyps. DNA-based stool testing has been incorporated into the most recent NCCN GUIDELINES® update and is recommended for screening average-risk individuals. However, the NCCN® discussion section notes that there is limited data about how stool DNA testing may fit into an overall screening program and how long the interval should be between screening. The NCCN® currently recommends that stool DNA testing as a primary screening modality should be individualized, particularly in high-risk individuals (1.2017). The USPSTF 2016 recommendations include FIT-DNA combination testing (FIT in addition to stool-based DNA testing) with noted limitations including insufficient evidence about appropriate longitudinal follow-up of abnormal findings after a negative diagnostic colonoscopy, in addition to potential overly intensive surveillance due to concerns from the genomic component of testing.

Circulating Tumor Marker screening is a method of cell free DNA (cfDNA) testing of plasma to identify potential tumor markers sloughed off into circulating plasma cells in order to identify colorectal cancer. The NCCN® is currently silent on this methodology. The primary marker studied to date includes methylation of the SEPT9 gene (mSEPT9). Prospective evaluation of adults >50 years of age via mSEPT9 in circulating plasma was performed via the PRESEPT study concurrent to screening colonoscopy, including subjects in the US and Germany. 53 cases of colorectal cancer and approximately 1500 controls were evaluated. Sensitivity of mSEPT9 for detection of colorectal cancer varied by stage: Stage I (35.0%), Stage II (63.0%), Stage III (46.0%), Stage IV (77.4%). Specificity was 91.5% for colorectal cancer, but only 11.2% for advanced adenomas. This clinical trial data published by Church et al (2014) noted the need for improved sensitivity for early cancers and advanced adenomas for use in general population colorectal cancer screening. Other case-control study designs have demonstrated higher sensitivities for colorectal cancer ranging from 67-96% (Heichman, 2014). The USPSTF 2016 recommendations include mSEPT9 as an optional screening modality. Within this

PROPRIETARY

publication's table for the Characteristics of Colorectal Cancer Screening Strategies, a footnote states the following: "Although a serology test to detect methylated SEPT9 DNA was included in the systematic evidence review, this screening method currently has limited evidence evaluating its use (a single published test characteristic study met inclusion criteria, which found it had a sensitivity to detect colorectal cancer of <50%). It is therefore not included in this table."

Professional Society Guidelines

Arber DA, Orazi A, Hasserjian R et al. The 2016 revision to the World Health Organization classification of myeloid neoplasms and acute leukemia. *Blood*. 2016 May 19;127(20):2391-405.

Febbo PG, Ladanyi M, Aldape KD, et al. NCCN® Task Force report: Evaluating the clinical utility of tumor markers in oncology. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw*. 2011 Nov;9 Suppl 5:S1-32.

Ferris RL, Baloch Z, Bernet V, et al. American Thyroid Association statement on surgical application of molecular profiling for thyroid nodules: current impact on perioperative decision making. *Thyroid*. 2015 Jul;25(7):760-8.

Hanna N, Johnson D, Temin S, et al. Systemic Therapy for Stage IV Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer: American Society of Clinical Oncology Clinical Practice Guideline Update. *J Clin Oncol*. 2017 Oct 20;35(30):3484-3515.

Harris LN, Ismaila N, McShane LM, et al. Use of biomarkers to guide decisions on adjuvant systemic therapy for women with early-stage invasive breast cancer: American Society of Clinical Oncology clinical practice guideline. *J Clin Oncol*. 2016 Apr 1;34(10):1134-50.

Haugen BR, Alexander EK, Bible KC, et al. 2015 American Thyroid Association management guidelines for adult patients with thyroid nodules and differentiated thyroid cancer: the American Thyroid Association Guidelines Task Force on Thyroid Nodules and Differentiated Thyroid Cancer. *Thyroid*. 2016 Jan;26(1):1-133.

Haugen BR, Sawka AM, Alexander EK, Bible KC, Caturegli P, Doherty GM, Mandel SJ, Morris JC, Nassar A, Pacini F, Schlumberger M, Schuff K, Sherman SI, Somerset H, Sosa JA, Steward DL, Wartofsky L, Williams MD. American Thyroid Association Guidelines on the Management of Thyroid Nodules and Differentiated Thyroid Cancer Task Force Review and Recommendation on the Proposed Renaming of Encapsulated Follicular Variant Papillary Thyroid Carcinoma Without Invasion to Noninvasive Follicular Thyroid Neoplasm with Papillary-Like Nuclear Features. *Thyroid*. 2017 Apr;27(4):481-483.

Keedy VL, Temin S, Somerfield MR, et al. American Society of Clinical Oncology provisional clinical opinion: epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutation testing for patients with advanced non-small-cell lung cancer considering first-line EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitor therapy. *J Clin Oncol*. 2011 May 20;29(15):2121-7.

Krop I, Ismaila N, Andre F, et al. Use of biomarkers to guide decisions on adjuvant systemic therapy for women with early-stage invasive breast cancer: American Society of Clinical Oncology clinical practice guideline focused update. *J Clin Oncol*. 2017 Aug 20;35(24):2838-2847.

NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology™ (NCCN). © 2017 National Comprehensive Cancer Network, Inc. For additional information visit the NCCN website: <http://www.nccn.org/index.asp>.¹

- Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia (Version 5.2017). Accessed February 29, 2018.

PROPRIETARY

Guidelines developed by, and used with permission from, Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. © 2018 Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

- Acute Myeloid Leukemia (Version 1.2018). Accessed February 29, 2018.
- Breast Cancer (Version 4.2017). Accessed February 29, 2018.
- Chronic Myeloid Leukemia (Version 4.2018). Accessed February 29, 2018.
- Colon Cancer (Version 1.2018). Accessed February 29, 2018.
- Colorectal Cancer Screening (Version 2.2017). Accessed February 29, 2018.
- Melanoma (Version 2.2018). Accessed February 29, 2018.
- Myelodysplastic Syndromes (Version 2.2018). Accessed February 29, 2018.
- Myeloproliferative Neoplasms (Version 2.2018). Accessed February 29, 2018.
- Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer (Version 3.2018). Accessed February 29, 2018.
- Occult Primary (Version 1.2018). Accessed February 29, 2018.
- Prostate Cancer (Version 1.2018). Accessed February 29, 2018.
- Prostate Cancer Early Detection (Version 2.2017). Accessed February 29, 2018.
- Rectal Cancer (Version 4.2017). Accessed February 29, 2018.
- Small Cell Lung Cancer (Version 2.2018). Accessed February 29, 2018.
- Soft Tissue Sarcoma (Version 1.2018). Accessed February 29, 2018.
- Thyroid Carcinoma (Version 2.2017). Accessed February 29, 2018.
- Uveal Melanoma (Version 1.2018). Accessed March 15, 2018.
- Waldenstrom's Macroglobulinemia/Lymphoplasmacytic Lymphoma (Version 1.2017). Accessed February 29, 2018.

Rex DK, Boland CR, Dominitz J. Colorectal Cancer Screening: Recommendations for Physicians and Patients from the U.S. Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 2017 Jul;112(7):1016-1030.

US Preventative Services Task Force. Screening for colorectal cancer: US Preventive Services Task Force recommendation statement. *JAMA.* 2016;315(23):2564-2575.

¹Referenced with permission from the NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology (NCCN Guidelines®) Available at: <http://www.nccn.org>. Accessed September 28, 2017 ©National Comprehensive Cancer Network, 2017. To view the most recent and complete version of the Guideline, go online to www.nccn.org.*

These Guidelines are a work in progress that may be refined as often as new significant data becomes available.

The NCCN Guidelines® are a statement of consensus of its authors regarding their views of currently accepted approaches to treatment. Any clinician seeking to apply or consult any NCCN Guidelines® is expected to use independent medical judgment in the context of individual clinical circumstances to determine any patient's care or treatment. The National Comprehensive Cancer Network makes no warranties of any kind whatsoever regarding their content, use or application and disclaims any responsibility for their application or use in any way.

Selected References

PROPRIETARY

Guidelines developed by, and used with permission from, Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. © 2018 Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

- 1 Alghasham N, Alnouri Y, Abalkhil H, et al. Detection of mutations in JAK2 exons 12-15 by Sanger sequencing. *Int J Lab Hematol*. 2016 Feb;38(1):34-41.
- 2 Albain KS, Barlow WE, Shak S, et al. Prognostic and predictive value of the 21-gene recurrence score assay in postmenopausal women with node-positive, oestrogen-receptor-positive breast cancer on chemotherapy: a retrospective analysis of a randomised trial. *Lancet Oncol*. 2010 Jan;11(1):55-65.
- 3 Alexander EK, Schorr M, Klopper J, et al. Multicenter clinical experience with the Afirma Gene Expression Classifier. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2014 Jan;99(1):119-25.
- 4 Arpino G, Generali D, Sapino A, et al. Gene expression profiling in breast cancer: A clinical perspective. *Breast*. 2013 Apr;22(2):109-20.
- 5 Azim HA Jr, Michiels S, Zagouri F, et al. Utility of prognostic genomic tests in breast cancer practice: The IMPAKT 2012 Working Group Consensus Statement. *Ann Oncol*. 2013;24(3):647-54.
- 6 Barbui T, Thiele J, Vannucchi AM, et al. Rationale for revision and proposed changes of the WHO diagnostic criteria for polycythemia vera, essential thrombocythemia and primary myelofibrosis. *Blood Cancer J*. 2015 Aug 14;5:e337.
- 7 Bombard Y, Bach PB, Offit K. Translating genomics in cancer care. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw*. 2013 Nov;11(11):1343-53.
- 8 Cantara S, Capezzone M, Marchisotta S, et al. Impact of proto-oncogene mutation detection in cytological specimens from thyroid nodules improves the diagnostic accuracy of cytology. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2010 Mar;95(3):1365-9.
- 9 Cardoso F, van't Veer LJ, Bogaerts J, et al. 70-Gene Signature as an aid to treatment decisions in early-stage breast cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2016 Aug 25; 375(8):717-29.
- 10 Church TR, Wandell M, Lofton-Day C, et al. Prospective evaluation of methylated SEPT9 in plasma for detection of asymptomatic colorectal cancer. *Gut*. 2014 Feb;63(2):317-25.
- 11 Cuzick J, Thorat MA, Andriole G, et al. Prevention and early detection of prostate cancer. *Lancet Oncol*. 2014 Oct;15(11):e484-92.
- 12 Douillard JY, Ostoros G, Cobo M, et al. Gefitinib treatment in EGFR mutated caucasian NSCLC: circulating- free tumor DNA as a surrogate for determination of EGFR status. *J Thorac Oncol* 2014;9:1345-53.
- 13 Duffy MJ, Harbeck N, Nap M, et al. Clinical use of biomarkers in breast cancer: updated guidelines from the European Group on Tumor Markers (EGTM). *Eur J Cancer*. 2017 Apr;75:284-298.
- 14 Duick D, Klopper J, Diggans J, et al. The impact of benign gene expression classifier test results on the endocrinologist-patient decision to operate on patients with thyroid nodules with indeterminate fine-needle aspiration cytopathology. *Thyroid*. Oct 2012; 22(10): 996-1001.
- 15 Engelman JA, Chen L, Tan X, et al. Effective use of PI3K and MEK inhibitors to treat mutant Kras G12D and PIK3CA H1047R murine lung cancers. *Nat Med*. 2008 Dec;14(12):1351-6.
- 16 Fiala O, Pesek M, Finek J, et al. Gene mutations in squamous cell NSCLC: insignificance of EGFR, KRAS and PIK3CA mutations in prediction of EGFR-TKI treatment efficacy. *Anticancer Res*. 2013 Apr;33(4):1705-11.
- 17 Fidler MJ, Morrison LE, Basu S, et al. PTEN and PIK3CA gene copy numbers and poor outcomes in non-small cell lung cancer patients with gefitinib therapy. *Br J Cancer*. 2011 Dec 6;105(12):1920-6.
- 18 Fizazi K, Greco FA, Pavlidis N, et al. Cancers of unknown primary site: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Ann Oncol*. 2015 Sep;26 Suppl 5:v133-8.
- 19 Gore JL, du Plessis M, Santiago-Jimenez M, et al. Decipher test impacts decision making among patients considering adjuvant and salvage treatment after radical prostatectomy: Interim results from the Multicenter Prospective PRO-IMPACT study. *Cancer*. 2017 Aug 1;123(15):2850-9.
- 20 Hang JF, Westra WH, Cooper DS, Ali SZ. The impact of noninvasive follicular thyroid neoplasm with papillary-like nuclear features on the performance of the Afirma gene expression classifier. *Cancer*. 2017 Sep; 125(9):683-91.
- 21 Heichman KA. Blood-based testing for colorectal cancer screening. *Mol Diagn Ther*. 2014 Apr;18(2):127-135.
- 22 Janku F, Huang HJ, Claes B, et al. BRAF mutation testing in cell-free DNA from the plasma of patients with advanced cancers using a rapid, automated molecular diagnostics system. *Mol Cancer Ther*. 2016 Jun;15(6):1397-404.
- 23 Klampfl T, Gisslinger H, Harutyunyan AS, et al. Somatic mutations of calreticulin in myeloproliferative neoplasms. *N Engl J Med*. 2013 Dec 19; 369(25):2379-90.
- 24 Kloos RT, Reynolds JD, Walsh PS, et al. Does addition of BRAF V600E mutation testing modify sensitivity or specificity of the Afirma Gene Expression Classifier in cytologically indeterminate thyroid nodules? *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2013 Apr;98(4):E761-8.
- 25 Ludvíková M, Kalfeřt D, Kholová I. Pathobiology of microRNAs and their emerging role in thyroid fine-needle aspiration. *Acta Cytol*. 2015;59(6):435-44.
- 26 Lamy PJ, Allory Y, Gauchez AS, et al. Prognostic Biomarkers Used for Localised Prostate Cancer Management: A Systematic Review. *Eur Urol Focus*. 2017 Mar 7. pii: S2405-4569(17)30065-2.
- 27 Lynch TJ, Bell DW, Sordella R, et al. Activating mutations in the epidermal growth factor receptor underlying responsiveness of non-small-cell lung cancer to gefitinib. *N Engl J Med*. 2004 May 20;350(21):2129-39.
- 28 McIver B, Castro MR, Morris JC, et al. An independent study of a gene expression classifier (Afirma) in the evaluation of cytologically indeterminate thyroid nodules. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2014 Nov;99(11):4069-77.
- 29 Mok TS, Wu YL, Thongprasert S, et al. Gefitinib or carboplatin-paclitaxel in pulmonary adenocarcinoma. *N Engl J Med*. 2009 Sep 3;361(10):947-57.
- 30 Parikh RB, Prasad V. Blood-based screening for colon cancer: A disruptive innovation or simply a disruption? *JAMA*. 2016 Jun 21;315(23):2519-20.
- 31 Pinsky PF, Prorok PC, Kramer BS. Prostate cancer screening - a perspective on the current state of the evidence. *N Engl J Med*. 2017 Mar 30;376(13):1285-9.
- 32 Ragon BK, Savona MR. The challenge of treating myelodysplastic syndromes/myeloproliferative neoplasms. *Clin Lymphoma Myeloma Leuk*. 2017 Jul; 17S:S37-42.
- 33 Salto-Tellez M, Tsao MS, Shih JY, et al. Clinical and testing protocols for the analysis of epidermal growth factor receptor mutations in East Asian patients with non-small cell lung cancer: a combined clinical-molecular pathological approach. *J Thorac Oncol*. 2011 Oct;6(10):1663-9.
- 34 Samuels Y, Wang Z, Bardelli A, et al. High frequency of mutations of the PIK3CA gene in human cancers. *Science*. 2004 Apr 23;304(5670):554.

PROPRIETARY

Guidelines developed by, and used with permission from, Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. © 2018 Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

- 35 Sartori DA, Chan DW. Biomarkers in prostate cancer: what's new? *Curr Opin Oncol*. 2014 May;26(3):259-64.
- 36 Song L, Li Y. SEPT9: A specific circulating biomarker for colorectal cancer. *Adv Clin Chem*. 2015;72:171-204.
- 37 Spivak JL. Myeloproliferative neoplasms. *N Engl J Med*. 2017 Jun 1;376(22):2168-81.
- 38 Tefferi A. Primary myelofibrosis: 2017 update on diagnosis, risk-stratification, and management. *Am J Hematol*. 2016 Dec;91(12):1262-71.
- 39 Umemura S, Tsuchihara K, Goto K. Genomic profiling of small-cell lung cancer: the era of targeted therapies. *Jpn J Clin Oncol*. 2015 Jun;45(6):513-9.
- 40 Vatandoost N, Ghanbari J, Mojaver M, et al. Early detection of colorectal cancer: from conventional methods to novel biomarkers. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol*. 2016 Feb;142(2):341-51.
- 41 Wong KS, Angell TE, Strickland KC, et al. Noninvasive follicular variant of papillary thyroid carcinoma and the Afirma gene-expression classifier. *Thyroid*. 2016 Jul; 26(7):911-5.
- 42 Zhang L, Zeng J, Zeng Z, et al. MGMT in colorectal cancer: a promising component of personalized treatment. *Tumour Biol*. 2016 Aug;37(8):11443-56.

Revision History

Medical Advisory Board Review:

v1.2018 03/31/2018: Reviewed

Clinical Steering Committee Review:

v1.2018 02/28/2018: Approved

v5.2017 11/01/2017: Approved

v4.2017 09/20/2017: Approved

v3.2017 08/09/2017: Approved

v2.2017 05/03/2017: Approved

v1.2017 01/25/2017: Approved

Revisions:

Version	Date	Editor	Description
v1.2018	03/31/2018	Gwen Fraley, MS, CGC	Semi-annual review. Added disclaimer sentence to scope section. Added uveal melanoma to list of tumor types for somatic genetic testing. Added exclusion criteria for prostate cancer tumor testing. Revised Mammaprint criteria. Updated background, professional society/NCCN guidelines and references. Renumbered to 2018. Submitted to CSC for approval.
v5.2017	11/01/2017	Gwen Fraley, MS, CGC	Revised criteria for indeterminate thyroid nodules. Updated background and references.

PROPRIETARY

Guidelines developed by, and used with permission from, Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. © 2018 Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

			Renumbered to v5.2017 and submitted to CSC for approval.
v4.2017	09/18/17	Megan Czarniecki, MS, CGC	Removed specific criteria for lung cancer. Formatting changes: converted references to NLM style. Incorporated “methodological considerations” to appropriate use criteria and background. Renumbered to v4.2017 and submitted to CSC for approval.
v3.2017	08/09/2017	Gwen Fraley, MS, CGC	Changed nomenclature of “occult primary” to “cancer of unknown primary/occult neoplasm”. Changed stance on MammaPrint to allow for coverage when criteria met. Removed separate lung cancer criteria and referred to NCCN®. Updated references. Added additional codes to Coding Considerations.
v2.2017	06/30/2017	Denise Jones, MS, CGC	Quarterly review. No criteria changes. Updated references.
v2.2017	04/25/2017	Cheryl Thomas, MS, CGC	Quarterly review. Added changes to indeterminate thyroid nodules (removed Hurthle cell from indication per NCCN® update). Added PD-L1 to NSCLC molecular targets. Updated references.
v1.2017	01/23/2017	Gwen Fraley, MS, CGC	Quarterly review. Updated MPN criteria. Edited EGFR criteria regarding erlotinib. Updated references. Renumbered to 2017.
v4.2016	09/29/2016	Jenna McLosky, MS, CGC	Updated background regarding occult primaries. Updated references.
v3.2016	06/30/2016	Jenna McLosky, MS, CGC	Added EGFR Cobas cell-free test for NSCLC. Updated references.

PROPRIETARY

Guidelines developed by, and used with permission from, Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. © 2018 Informed Medical Decisions, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

v2.2016	04/04/2016	Jenna McLosky, MS, CGC	Updated and reviewed prostate cancer screening criteria. Updated references.
v1.2016	03/18/2016	Jenna McLosky, MS, CGC	Updated and revised stance on breast cancer prognosis assays (Prosigna). Updated references.
v1.2015	09/24/2015	Jenna McLosky, MS, CGC	Original version

Original Effective Date: 09/24/2015

Primary Author: Jenna McLosky, MS, CGC