



## FEP Medical Policy Manual

---

### FEP 6.01.26 Oncologic Applications of Positron Emission Tomography Scanning

---

**Effective Policy Date: January 1, 2021**

**Original Policy Date: June 2012**

#### **Related Policies:**

6.01.06 - Miscellaneous (Noncardiac, Nononcologic) Applications of Fluorine 18 Fluorodeoxyglucose Positron Emission Tomography  
6.01.20 - Cardiac Applications of Positron Emission Tomography Scanning  
6.01.51 - Interim Positron Emission Tomography Scanning in Oncology to Detect Early Response During Treatment

---

## Oncologic Applications of Positron Emission Tomography Scanning

### Description

Positron emission tomography (PET) scans are based on the use of positron-emitting radionuclide tracers coupled to organic molecules, such as glucose, ammonia, or water. The radionuclide tracers simultaneously emit 2 high-energy photons in opposite directions that can be simultaneously detected (referred to as coincidence detection) by a PET scanner, comprising multiple stationary detectors that encircle the area of interest.

A variety of tracers are used for positron emission tomography (PET) scanning, including oxygen 15, nitrogen 13, carbon 11 choline, fluorine 18, gallium 68, and fluciclovine 18. Because of their short half-life, some tracers must be made locally using an onsite cyclotron. The radiotracer most commonly used in oncology imaging has been fluorine 18 coupled with fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG), which correlates with glucose metabolism. Fluorodeoxyglucose has been considered useful in cancer imaging because tumor cells show increased metabolism of glucose. The most common malignancies studied have been melanoma, lymphoma, lung, colorectal, and pancreatic cancer.

This evidence review focuses on the use of radiotracers detected with dedicated PET scanners. Radiotracers, such as FDG, may be detected using single-photon emission computerized tomography cameras, a technique that may be referred to as FDG-single-photon emission computerized tomography imaging. The use of single-photon emission computerized tomography cameras for PET radiotracers presents unique issues of diagnostic performance and is not considered herein.

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

## OBJECTIVE

The objective of this evidence review is to examine whether the use of positron emission tomography for the diagnosis, staging and restaging, and/or surveillance of various carcinomas improves the net health outcome in individuals with cancer.

## POLICY STATEMENT

All policy statements apply to both positron emission tomography (PET) scans and PET plus computed tomography (CT) scans (ie, PET scans with or without PET/CT fusion).

For the clinical situations indicated that may be considered medically necessary, this assumes that the results of the PET scan will influence treatment decisions. If the results will not influence treatment decisions, these situations would be considered not medically necessary.

### Bladder Cancer

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** in the staging or restaging of muscle-invasive bladder cancer when CT or magnetic resonance imaging are not indicated or remained inconclusive on distant metastasis.

PET scanning is considered **investigational** for bladder tumors that have not invaded the muscle (stage less than cT2).

### Bone Sarcoma

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** in the staging or restaging of Ewing sarcoma and osteosarcoma.

PET scanning is considered **investigational** in the staging of chondrosarcoma.

### Brain Cancer

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** in the staging or restaging of brain cancer.

### Breast Cancer

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** in the staging or restaging of breast cancer for the following application:

- Detecting locoregional or distant recurrence or metastasis (except axillary lymph nodes) when suspicion of disease is high and other imaging is inconclusive.

PET scanning is considered **investigational** in the evaluation of breast cancer for all other applications, including but not limited to the following:

- Differential diagnosis in patients with suspicious breast lesions or an indeterminate or low suspicion finding on mammography
- Staging axillary lymph nodes.

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

- Predicting pathologic response to neoadjuvant therapy for locally advanced disease.

## Cervical Cancer

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** in the initial staging of patients with locally advanced cervical cancer.

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** in the evaluation of known or suspected recurrence.

## Colorectal Cancer

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** as a technique for

- Staging or restaging to detect and assess resectability of hepatic or extrahepatic metastases of colorectal cancer, and
- To evaluate a rising and persistently elevated carcinoembryonic antigen levels when standard imaging, including CT scan, is negative.

PET scanning is considered **investigational** as:

- A technique to assess the presence of scarring vs local bowel recurrence in patients with previously resected colorectal cancer.
- A technique contributing to radiotherapy treatment planning.

## Endometrial Cancer

PET scanning is considered **medically necessary** in the:

- Detection of lymph node metastases, and
- Assessment of endometrial cancer recurrence.

## Esophageal Cancer

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** in the

- Staging of esophageal cancer, and
- Determining response to preoperative induction therapy.

PET scanning is considered **investigational** in other aspects of the evaluation of esophageal cancer, including but not limited to the following applications:

- Detection of primary esophageal cancer.

## Gastric Cancer

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** in the:

- Initial diagnosis and staging of gastric cancer, and
- Evaluation for recurrent gastric cancer after surgical resection, when other imaging modalities are inconclusive.

## Head and Neck Cancer

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** in the evaluation of head and neck cancer in the

- Initial diagnosis of suspected cancer,
- Initial staging of disease, and restaging of residual or recurrent disease during follow-up, and
- Evaluation of response to treatment.

## Lung Cancer

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** for any of the following applications:

- Patients with a solitary pulmonary nodule as a single scan technique (not dual-time) to distinguish between benign and malignant disease when prior CT scan and chest x-ray findings are inconclusive or discordant,
- As staging or restaging technique in those with known non-small-cell lung cancer, and
- To determine resectability for patients with a presumed solitary metastatic lesion from lung cancer.

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** in staging of small-cell lung cancer if limited stage is suspected based on standard imaging.

PET scanning is considered **investigational** in staging of small-cell lung cancer if extensive stage is established and in all other aspects of managing small-cell lung cancer.

## Lymphoma, Including Hodgkin Disease

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** as a technique for staging lymphoma either during initial staging or for restaging at follow-up.

## Melanoma

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** as a technique for assessing extranodal spread of malignant melanoma at initial staging or at restaging during follow-up treatment for advanced disease (stage III or IV).

PET scanning is considered **investigational** in managing stage 0, I, or II melanoma.

PET scanning is considered **investigational** as a technique to detect regional lymph node metastases in patients with clinically localized melanoma who are candidates to undergo sentinel node biopsy.

## Multiple Myeloma

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** in the staging or restaging of multiple myeloma, particularly if the skeletal survey is negative.

## Neuroendocrine Tumors

PET scanning with gallium 68 may be considered **medically necessary** as a technique for staging neuroendocrine tumors either during initial staging or for restaging at follow-up.

PET scanning with other radiotracers is considered **investigational** in all aspects of managing neuroendocrine tumors.

## Ovarian Cancer

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** in the evaluation of patients with signs and/or symptoms of suspected ovarian cancer recurrence (restaging) when standard imaging, including CT scan, is inconclusive.

PET scanning is considered **investigational** in the initial evaluation of known or suspected ovarian cancer in all situations.

## Pancreatic Cancer

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** in the initial diagnosis and staging of pancreatic cancer when other imaging and biopsy are inconclusive.

PET scanning is considered **investigational** as a technique to evaluate other aspects of pancreatic cancer.

## Penile Cancer

PET scanning is considered **investigational** in all aspects of managing penile cancer.

## Prostate Cancer

PET scanning with carbon 11 choline and fluorine 18 fluciclovine may be **medically necessary** for evaluating suspected or biochemically recurrent prostate cancer after primary treatment to detect small volume disease in soft tissues.

PET scanning with gallium 68 is considered **investigational** in all aspects of managing prostate cancer.

PET scanning for all other indications in known or suspected prostate cancer is considered **investigational**.

## Renal Cell Carcinoma

PET scanning is considered **investigational** in all aspects of managing renal cancer.

## Soft Tissue Sarcoma

PET scanning is considered **investigational** in evaluation of soft tissue sarcoma, including but not limited to the following applications:

- Distinguishing between benign lesions and malignant soft tissue sarcoma,
- Distinguishing between low-grade and high-grade soft tissue sarcoma,
- Detecting locoregional recurrence, and
- Detecting distant metastasis.

PET scanning is considered **medically necessary** for evaluating response to imatinib and other treatments for gastrointestinal stromal tumors.

## Testicular Cancer

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** in evaluation of residual mass following chemotherapy of stage IIB and III seminomas ( the scan should be completed no sooner than 6 weeks after chemotherapy ).

Except as noted above for seminoma, PET scanning is considered **investigational** in evaluation of testicular cancer, including but not limited to the following applications:

- Initial staging of testicular cancer,
- Distinguishing between viable tumor and necrosis/fibrosis after treatment of testicular cancer, and
- Detection of recurrent disease after treatment of testicular cancer.

## Thyroid Cancer

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** in the restaging of patients with differentiated thyroid cancer when thyroglobulin levels are elevated and whole-body iodine-131 imaging is negative.

PET scanning is considered **investigational** in the evaluation of known or suspected differentiated or poorly differentiated thyroid cancer in all other situations.

## Cancer of Unknown Primary

PET scanning may be considered **medically necessary** in patients with a cancer of unknown primary who meet ALL of the following criteria:

- In patients with a single site of disease outside the cervical lymph nodes, and
- Patient is considering local or regional treatment for a single site of metastatic disease, and
- After a negative workup for an occult primary tumor, and
- PET scan will be used to rule out or detect additional sites of disease that would eliminate the rationale for local or regional treatment.

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

PET scanning is considered **investigational** for other indications in patients with a cancer of unknown primary, including, but not limited to the following:

- As part of the initial workup of a cancer of unknown primary, and
- As part of the workup of patients with multiple sites of disease.

## Cancer Surveillance

PET scanning is considered **investigational** when used as a surveillance tool for patients with cancer or with a history of cancer. A scan is considered surveillance if performed more than 6 months after completion of cancer therapy (12 months for lymphoma) in patients without objective signs or symptoms suggestive of cancer recurrence (see Policy Guidelines section).

## POLICY GUIDELINES

### Patient Selection

As with any imaging technique, the medical necessity of positron emission tomography (PET) scanning depends in part on what imaging techniques are used before or after the PET scanning. Due to its expense, PET scanning is typically considered after other techniques, such as computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), or ultrasonography, provide inconclusive or discordant results. In patients with melanoma or lymphoma, PET scanning may be considered an initial imaging technique. If so, the medical necessity of subsequent imaging during the same diagnostic evaluation is unclear. Thus, PET should be considered for the medically necessary indications above only when standard imaging (eg, CT, MRI) is inconclusive or not indicated.

Patient selection criteria for PET scanning also may be complex. For example, it may be difficult to determine from claims data whether a PET scan in a patient with malignant melanoma is being done primarily to evaluate extranodal disease or regional lymph nodes. Similarly, it may be difficult to determine whether a PET scan in a patient with colorectal cancer is being performed to detect hepatic disease or evaluate local recurrence. Due to the complicated hierarchy of imaging options in patients with malignancy and complex patient selection criteria, a possible implementation strategy for this policy is its use for retrospective review, possibly focusing on cases with multiple imaging tests, including PET scans.

Use of PET scanning for surveillance as described in the policy statement and policy rationale refers to the use of PET to detect disease in asymptomatic patients at various intervals. This is not the same as the use of PET for detecting recurrent disease in symptomatic patients; these applications of PET are considered within tumor-specific categories in the policy statements.

### Coding

A PET scan involves 3 separate activities: (1) manufacture of the radiopharmaceutical, which may be on site or at a regional center with delivery to the institution performing PET; (2) actual performance of the PET scanner; and (3) interpretation of the results. There are CPT and HCPCS codes available to code for PET scans.

When the radiopharmaceutical is provided by an outside distribution center, there may be an additional separate charge, or this charge may be passed through and included in the hospital bill. In addition, an extra transportation charge will be likely for radiopharmaceuticals that are not manufactured on site.

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services added 2 new modifiers in 2009 to facilitate the changes in the Medicare national coverage policy for PET. The modifiers are:

PI - Positron emission tomography (PET) or PET/computed tomography (CT) to inform the initial treatment strategy of tumors that are biopsy proven or strongly suspected of being cancerous based on other diagnostic testing, 1 per cancer diagnosis.

PS - Positron emission tomography (PET) or PET/computed tomography (CT) to inform the subsequent treatment strategy of cancerous tumors when the beneficiary's treating physician determines that the PET study is needed to inform subsequent anti-tumor strategy.

## BENEFIT APPLICATION

Experimental or investigational procedures, treatments, drugs, or devices are not covered (See General Exclusion Section of brochure).

## FDA REGULATORY STATUS

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) website includes various PET-related documents.<sup>1</sup>

As of July 2020, the following radiopharmaceuticals have been granted approval by the FDA, to be used with PET for carcinoma-related indications (see Table 1).<sup>2</sup>

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.



**Table 1. Radiopharmaceuticals Approved for Use With PET for Oncologic Applications**

<b>Radiopharmaceutical</b>	<b>Manufacturer</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Carcinoma-Related Indication With PET</b>
Carbon-11 choline (C-11)	Various		Suspected prostate cancer recurrence based on elevated blood PSA after therapy and noninformative bone scintigraphy, CT, or MRI
Fluorine-18 fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG)	Various		Suspected or existing diagnosis of cancer, all types
Fluorine-18 fluoroestradiol	Zionexa USA	Cerianna™	Detection of ER-positive lesions as an adjunct to biopsy in patients with recurrent or metastatic breast cancer
Fluorine-18 fluciclovine	Blue Earth Diagnostics	Axumin™	Suspected prostate cancer recurrence based on elevated blood PSA levels after treatment
Gallium-68 dotatoc	UIHC - P E T Imaging Center		Localization of somatostatin receptor-positive NETs in adult and pediatric patients
Gallium-68 dotatate	Advanced Accelerator Applications	NETSPOT™	Localization of somatostatin receptor-positive NETs in adult and pediatric patients

Approved on May 27, 2020. Projected release date in late 2020/early 2021.<sup>3</sup>

CT: computerized tomography; ER: estrogen receptor; MRI: magnetic resonance imaging; NET: neuroendocrine tumors; PET: positron emission tomography; PSA: prostate-specific antigen.

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

## RATIONALE

### Summary of Evidence

#### Bladder Cancer

For individuals who have suspected or diagnosed bladder cancer in need of staging or restaging information who receive fluorine 18 ( $^{18}\text{F}$ ) coupled with fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG) positron emission tomography (PET) or FDG-PET/computed tomography (CT), the evidence includes a systematic review and meta-analysis. Relevant outcome is test validity. Pooled analyses showed relatively high sensitivity and specificity. Clinical guidelines include PET and PET/CT as considerations in staging bladder cancer, though CT, magnetic resonance imaging, and chest radiographs are also appropriate techniques for staging purposes. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who are asymptomatic after completing bladder cancer treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, there is no evidence. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

#### Bone Sarcoma

For individuals who have suspected or diagnosed bone sarcoma and in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Relevant outcome is test validity. Pooled analyses have shown that PET or PET/CT can effectively diagnose and stage bone sarcoma, including chondrosarcoma. Use of PET or PET/CT has high sensitivities and specificities in detecting metastases in bone and lymph nodes; however, the tests have low sensitivity in detecting lung metastases. Clinical guidelines include PET and CT to inform management decisions that may offer clinical benefit. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who are asymptomatic after completing bone sarcoma treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, there is no evidence. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

#### Brain Tumors

For individuals who have diagnosed brain tumors and in need of staging or restaging information or who have suspected brain tumor who receive FDG-PET,  $^{18}\text{F}$  fluoro-ethyl-tyrosine PET, or carbon 11 ( $^{11}\text{C}$ ) methionine PET, the evidence includes several systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Relevant outcome is test validity. Pooled analyses have shown that PET or PET/CT can be effective in distinguishing brain tumors from normal tissue. Indirect comparisons between the radiotracers  $^{11}\text{C}$ -methionine and FDG have shown that  $^{11}\text{C}$ -methionine may have better diagnostic performance. Clinical guidelines include PET to inform management decisions that may offer clinical benefit. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who are asymptomatic after completing brain cancer treatment who receive FDG-PET,  $^{18}\text{F}$  fluoro-ethyl-tyrosine-PET, or  $^{11}\text{C}$ -methionine PET, the evidence includes systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Relevant outcome is test validity. Pooled analyses did not support the use of PET for surveillance of brain cancer following treatment. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

## Breast Cancer

For individuals who have diagnosed breast cancer and inconclusive results from other imaging techniques who receive adjunctive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT for staging or restaging, the evidence includes meta-analyses. Relevant outcome is test validity. While studies included in the meta-analyses reported variability in estimates of sensitivity and specificity, FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT may be helpful in situations in which standard staging results are equivocal or suspicious, particularly in patients with locally advanced or metastatic disease. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have suspected or diagnosed breast cancer and in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes a TEC Assessment, several systematic reviews, and meta-analyses. Relevant outcome is test validity. There is no evidence supporting the use of PET in diagnosing breast cancer. The false-negative rates (5.5% to 8.5%) using PET in patients with breast cancer can be considered unacceptable, given that breast biopsy can provide more definitive results. Use of PET/CT may be considered for the detection of metastases only when results from other imaging techniques are inconclusive. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who are asymptomatic after completing breast cancer treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, there is no evidence. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Cervical Cancer

For individuals who have diagnosed cervical cancer and in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes an Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) report and a meta-analysis. Relevant outcome is test validity. Pooled results have shown that PET can be used for staging or restaging and for detecting recurrent disease. Clinical guidelines include PET and CT to inform management decisions that may offer clinical benefit. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have suspected cervical cancer or who are asymptomatic after completing cervical cancer treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, there is no evidence. Relevant outcomes are test accuracy and test validity. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Colorectal Cancer

For individuals who have diagnosed colorectal cancer (CRC) and in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes a TEC Assessment and several meta-analyses. Relevant outcome is test validity. Several pooled analyses evaluating staging or restaging using PET or PET/CT resulted in wide ranges of sensitivities and specificities, from 16% to 99%. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have suspected CRC or who are asymptomatic after completing CRC treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes a TEC Assessment and meta-analysis. Relevant outcome is test validity. A meta-analysis evaluating the diagnostic accuracy of PET or PET/CT showed high sensitivity but low specificity. The evidence for the use of PET or PET/CT does not show a benefit over the use of contrast CT in patients with CRC. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Endometrial Cancer

For individuals who have diagnosed endometrial cancer in need of staging or restaging information or who are asymptomatic after completing endometrial cancer treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes a systematic review and meta-

analysis. Relevant outcome is test validity. Pooled estimates from the meta-analysis showed high sensitivities and specificities for FDG-PET/CT in detecting lymph node metastases and endometrial cancer recurrence following treatment. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

## Esophageal Cancer

For individuals who have diagnosed esophageal cancer and in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes several meta-analyses. Relevant outcome is test validity. Pooled estimates have shown high sensitivities and specificities compared to other diagnostic imaging techniques. Clinical guidelines include PET and CT to inform management decisions that may offer clinical benefit. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have suspected esophageal cancer or who are asymptomatic after completing esophageal cancer treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes meta-analyses. Relevant outcome is test validity. Pooled analyses have shown adequate sensitivities but low specificities. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Gastric Cancer

For individuals who have suspected or diagnosed gastric cancer and in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes several meta-analyses. Relevant outcome is test validity. Pooled analyses, with sensitivities and specificities ranging from 78% to 88%, have shown that PET or PET/CT can inform staging or restaging of patients with gastric cancer. Clinical guidelines include PET/CT to inform management decisions that may offer clinical benefit. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who are asymptomatic after completing gastric cancer treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes meta-analyses. Relevant outcome is test validity. Pooled analyses have shown low sensitivities and specificities. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Head and Neck Cancer

For individuals who have suspected or diagnosed head and neck cancer in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes a TEC Assessment and several meta-analyses. Relevant outcome is test validity. In patients with head and neck cancers, PET and PET/CT are better able to detect local and metastatic disease compared with other imaging techniques. Evidence has also shown that FDG-PET/CT may be useful in predicting response to therapy. Two meta-analyses calculated the ability of FDG-PET or PET/CT to detect the residual or recurrent disease during various stages of treatment and another meta-analysis calculated the ability of positive PET or PET/CT results to predict overall survival and event-free survival. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who are asymptomatic after completing head and neck cancer treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, there is no evidence. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer

For individuals who have suspected non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) and inconclusive results from other imaging techniques or who have diagnosed NSCLC and in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes several meta-analyses. Relevant outcome is test validity. Pooled analyses have shown that PET and PET/CT have better

diagnostic performance than conventional imaging techniques. Clinical guidelines include PET/CT to inform management decisions that may offer clinical benefit. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have suspected NSCLC or who are asymptomatic after completing non-small-cell lung cancer treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, there is no evidence. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Small-Cell Lung Cancer

For individuals with diagnosed small-cell lung cancer (SCLC) and in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes a systematic review and a meta-analysis. Relevant outcome is test validity. While the quality of the studies was considered low, PET and PET/CT can be considered for staging or restaging in patients with SCLC if a limited stage is suspected. Clinical guidelines include PET/CT to inform management decisions that may offer clinical benefit. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have suspected SCLC or who are asymptomatic after completing SCLC treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, there is no evidence. Relevant outcomes are test accuracy and test validity. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Hodgkin and Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma

For individuals who have suspected or diagnosed Hodgkin and non-Hodgkin lymphoma in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes a TEC Assessment, several meta-analyses, and an RCT. Relevant outcome is test validity. Both PET and PET/CT have been found to provide useful information in the management of Hodgkin and non-Hodgkin lymphoma. The Deauville 5-point scale was developed based on PET results and can be used for staging and treatment response for patients with lymphoma. Clinical guidelines include PET/CT to inform management decisions that may offer clinical benefit. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who are asymptomatic after completing Hodgkin lymphoma treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, there is no evidence. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who are asymptomatic after completing non-Hodgkin lymphoma treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, there is no evidence. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Melanoma

For individuals who have suspected or diagnosed stage I or II melanoma and in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes a TEC Assessment. Relevant outcome is test validity. Evidence has shown PET and PET/CT are not as beneficial as the reference standard (sentinel node biopsy) for assessing regional lymph nodes. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have diagnosed advanced melanoma (stage III or IV) and in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes a TEC Assessment and a meta-analysis. Relevant outcome is test validity. Evidence has shown PET and PET/CT can detect systemic metastases in patients with advanced melanoma. Clinical guidelines include PET/CT for staging or restaging stage III or IV disease and for surveillance. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who are asymptomatic after completing melanoma treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes retrospective and observational studies. Relevant outcome is test validity. At the discretion of the physician, imaging surveillance can be considered every 3 to 12 months. Because recurrences usually occur within 3 years, screening asymptomatic patients beyond 3 to 5 years is not recommended. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

## Multiple Myeloma

For individuals who have suspected or diagnosed multiple myeloma in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes 2 systematic reviews, 1 of which conducted a meta-analysis. Relevant outcome is test validity. The meta-analysis reported high sensitivity in detecting extramedullary lesions in patients with multiple myeloma. The other systematic review compared FDG-PET with whole-body x-ray and reported that FDG-PET was more sensitive in detecting myeloma bone lesions. Clinical guidelines include PET/CT on the list of imaging techniques that may be useful for initial workup, as well as follow-up and surveillance as indicated. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who are asymptomatic after completing multiple myeloma treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, there is no evidence. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Neuroendocrine Tumors

For individuals who have suspected or diagnosed neuroendocrine tumors and in need of staging or restaging information or who are asymptomatic after completing neuroendocrine tumor treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes 2 meta-analyses. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence did not compare PET or PET/CT with other modalities and, therefore, did not provide comparative effectiveness information. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have suspected or diagnosed neuroendocrine tumors and in need of staging or restaging information who receive gallium 68 ( $^{68}\text{Ga}$ ) PET or  $^{68}\text{Ga}$ -PET/CT, the evidence includes several systematic reviews with meta-analyses. Relevant outcome is test validity. The meta-analyses showed relatively high sensitivities and specificities compared with other imaging techniques in the diagnosis and staging of neuroendocrine tumors. Clinical guidelines support the use of the  $^{68}\text{Ga}$  radiotracer in the diagnosis and staging of neuroendocrine tumors. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who are asymptomatic after completing neuroendocrine tumor treatment who receive  $^{68}\text{Ga}$ -PET or  $^{68}\text{Ga}$ -PET/CT, there is no evidence. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Ovarian Cancer

For individuals who have diagnosed ovarian cancer and in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes an AHRQ systematic review and several meta-analyses. Relevant outcome is test validity. Pooled sensitivities and specificities have supported the use of PET and PET/CT for the detection of recurrent ovarian cancer. Clinical guidelines include PET/CT to inform management decisions that may offer clinical benefit. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have suspected ovarian cancer or who are asymptomatic after completing ovarian cancer treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, there is no evidence. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Pancreatic Cancer

For individuals who have suspected or diagnosed pancreatic cancer and with inconclusive results from other imaging techniques who receive adjunctive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT for staging or restaging, the evidence includes a TEC Assessment and a systematic review. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence has shown that PET and PET/CT do not have a high enough negative predictive value to surpass current standard decision thresholds. Therefore, PET or PET/CT should only be considered if the results from standard staging methods are inconclusive. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have suspected or diagnosed pancreatic cancer and in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes an AHRQ systematic review, a TEC Assessment, and a meta-analysis published after the review and assessment. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence has shown that PET and PET/CT do not have a high enough negative predictive value to surpass current standard decision thresholds. Therefore, PET or PET/CT should only be considered if the results from standard staging methods are inconclusive. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who are asymptomatic after completing pancreatic cancer treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, there is no evidence. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Penile Cancer

For individuals who have suspected or diagnosed penile cancer and in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes a systematic review and a meta-analysis. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence has shown that PET had a low sensitivity, and no comparisons were made with other modalities. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who are asymptomatic after completing penile cancer treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, there is no evidence. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Prostate Cancer

For individuals who have suspected or diagnosed prostate cancer and in need of staging or restaging information who receive  $^{11}\text{C}$ -choline PET,  $^{11}\text{C}$ -choline PET/CT,  $^{18}\text{F}$ -fluciclovine PET, or  $^{18}\text{F}$ -fluciclovine PET/CT, the evidence includes several meta-analyses. Relevant outcome is test validity. Meta-analyses have reported that the choice of radiotracer affects the sensitivity and specificity of the scans, with most evidence showing that the use of  $^{11}\text{C}$ -choline or  $^{18}\text{F}$ -fluciclovine results in the highest sensitivities and specificities compared with FDG-PET and  $^{11}\text{C}$ -acetate. Of interest is a single-study that investigated the use of PET/CT results to inform patient decisions on radiotherapy treatment plans. The study reported that 40% of the patients altered the extent of the treatment planned based on the PET/CT results. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who are asymptomatic after completing prostate cancer treatment who receive  $^{11}\text{C}$ -choline PET,  $^{11}\text{C}$ -choline PET/CT,  $^{18}\text{F}$ -fluciclovine PET, or  $^{18}\text{F}$ -fluciclovine PET/CT, there is no evidence. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have suspected or diagnosed prostate cancer and in need of staging or restaging information who receive  $^{68}\text{Ga}$ -PET or  $^{68}\text{Ga}$ -PET/CT, the evidence includes a meta-analysis of small single-institution studies. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence is limited, resulting in estimates with large confidence intervals. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Renal Cell Carcinoma

For individuals who are diagnosed with renal cell carcinoma and in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes a systematic review and meta-analysis. Relevant outcome is test validity. The review concluded that PET has the potential to detect metastatic or recurrent lesions in patients with renal cell cancer but that additional prospective studies are needed. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Soft Tissue Sarcoma

For individuals who have diagnosed soft tissue sarcoma and in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes an AHRQ review and a systematic review using PET for assessing response to imatinib. Relevant outcome is test validity. The review reported that PET had low diagnostic accuracy and there was a lack of studies comparing PET with alternative diagnostic modalities. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals with diagnosed soft tissue sarcoma and in need of rapid reading of response to imatinib treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes a systematic review. Relevant outcome is test validity. The review concluded that PET/CT can be used to monitor treatment response to imatinib, which can lead to individually adapted treatment strategies. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have suspected soft tissue sarcoma or who are asymptomatic after completing soft tissue sarcoma treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes a systematic review. Relevant outcome is test validity. The review concluded that there was insufficient evidence on the use of PET for the detection of locoregional recurrence. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Testicular Cancer

For individuals with diagnosed testicular cancer in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes an AHRQ systematic review and assessment. Relevant outcome is test validity. Results have shown that PET or PET/CT can evaluate residual masses following chemotherapy for seminoma. Clinical guidelines include PET/CT to inform management decisions that may offer clinical benefit. There is no evidence supporting the use of PET or PET/CT in nonseminoma patients. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have suspected testicular cancer or who are asymptomatic after completing testicular cancer treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, there is no evidence. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Thyroid Cancer

For individuals with diagnosed thyroid cancer and in need of staging or restaging information who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Relevant outcome is test validity. Pooled analyses have shown that PET or PET/CT can effectively detect recurrent differentiated thyroid cancer. Clinical guidelines include PET/CT to inform management decisions that may offer clinical benefit. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have suspected thyroid cancer or who are asymptomatic after completing thyroid cancer treatment who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, there is no evidence. Relevant outcome is test validity. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.



## Cancer of Unknown Primary and Single-Site Metastatic Disease

For individuals with cancer of unknown primary and single-site metastatic disease who receive FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT, the evidence includes a TEC Assessment. Relevant outcome is test validity. Studies reviewed in the assessment showed that PET identified previously undetected metastases confirmed by biopsy. Additionally, PET can contribute to the management of patients with cancer of unknown primary. Clinical guidelines include PET/CT to inform management decisions that may offer clinical benefit. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

## SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

### Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

#### Bladder Cancer

##### American College of Radiology

In 2018, the American College of Radiology (ACR) issued an Appropriateness Criteria for pretreatment staging of muscle-invasive bladder cancer.<sup>5</sup> The ACR stated that FDG-PET/CT "may be appropriate" for the pretreatment staging of muscle-invasive bladder cancer. However, the ACR cited CT, MRI, and chest radiographs as the most appropriate imaging techniques for pretreatment staging.

In 2019, the ACR issued an Appropriateness Criteria for post-treatment surveillance of bladder cancer. For muscle-invasive bladder cancer, FDG-PET/CT may be appropriate for surveillance; however, the ACR states that chest radiograph, CT, and MRI are usually appropriate procedures.<sup>6</sup>

##### National Comprehensive Cancer Network

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) guidelines for bladder cancer (v. 5.2020) state that FDG-PET/CT "may be beneficial in selected patients with T2 (muscle-invasive disease) and in patients with  $\geq$ T3 disease (category 2B)."<sup>7</sup> According to the guidelines, FDG-PET/CT may also be considered if metastasis is suspected in high-risk patients (category 2B). However, the guidelines note that "PET/CT should not be used to delineate the anatomy of the upper urinary tract" or in patients with nonmuscle invasive bladder cancer.

#### Bone Sarcoma

Current NCCN guidelines for bone cancer (v.1.2020) state that PET/CT may be considered for<sup>11</sup>:

- Workup of patients with chordoma, Ewing sarcoma, or osteosarcoma,
- Restaging in patients with Ewing sarcoma or osteosarcoma, and

- Surveillance of patients with Ewing sarcoma or osteosarcoma, every 3 months for 2 years, every 4 months during year 3 , every 6 months during years 4 and 5 , then once annually (category 2B).

## Brain Tumors

NCCN guidelines for brain cancer (v. 2.2020) include these statements:[16](#).

- PET can assess metabolism within the tumor and normal tissue by using radio-labeled tracers, which may be useful in differentiating tumor from radiation necrosis, may correlate with tumor grade, or provide an optimal area for biopsy.
- Limitations include the accuracy of interpretations and availability of equipment and isotopes.
- Close follow-up imaging, MR perfusion, MR spectroscopy, PET/CT imaging, and repeat surgery may be necessary if clinically indicated. Educate patients on the uncertainty of imaging as a whole, and the potential need for corollary testing to interpret scans.

## Breast Cancer

### American College of Radiology

In 2017, the ACR issued an Appropriateness Criteria for the initial workup and surveillance for local recurrence and distant metastases in asymptomatic women with stage I breast cancer.[32](#) The ACR noted that FDG-PET/CT is usually not appropriate during initial workup or surveillance of these patients to rule out metastases.

### National Comprehensive Cancer Network

NCCN guidelines on breast cancer (v. 5.2020) include a category 2B recommendation for FDG-PET/CT as an optional test in the workup of stage IIIA breast cancer.[33](#)

The NCCN recommends against FDG-PET/CT for lower stage breast cancer (I, II, or operable III) due to high false-negative rates in detecting low-grade lesions or lesions less than 1 cm , low sensitivity in detecting axillary node metastasis , the low prior probability of detectable metastases in these patients , and high false-positive rates. The NCCN considers PET or PET/CT most helpful when "standard staging studies are equivocal or suspicious, especially in the setting of locally advanced or metastatic disease."

The NCCN guidelines do not recommend routine use of PET in asymptomatic patients for surveillance and follow-up after breast cancer treatment. When monitoring the metastatic disease, the guidelines note that PET is "challenging because of the absence of a reproducible, validated, and widely accepted set of standards for disease activity assessment."

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

## Cervical Cancer

NCCN guidelines on cervical cancer (v. 1.2020) state that PET/CT may be considered under the following conditions.<sup>38</sup>

- Part of the initial non-fertility and fertility-sparing workup for patients with stage I cervical cancer.
- Part of the initial staging workup for detection of stage II, III, or IV metastatic disease.
- Follow-up/surveillance for stage I (only nonfertility sparing) through stage IV at 3 to 6 months after completion of therapy or if there is suspected recurrence or metastases. For stage II-IV, whole-body PET/CT is preferred.

## Colorectal Cancer

### American College of Radiology

In 2017, the ACR issued Appropriateness Criteria for the pretreatment staging of CRC.<sup>53</sup> In the evaluation of distant metastases, the criteria stated that "routine use of PET/CT is likely not indicated; however, it may provide guidance in cases of advanced, bilobar liver disease to exclude extrahepatic metastases prior to surgical intent to cure."

### National Comprehensive Cancer Network

NCCN guidelines for colon cancer (v.4.2020) "strongly discourages the routine use of PET/CT scanning for staging, baseline imaging, or routine follow-up" and "recommend consideration of a preoperative PET/CT scan at baseline only if prior anatomic imaging indicates the presence of potentially surgically curable M1 disease."<sup>54</sup> For initial workup of nonmetastatic patients, the guidelines state "PET/CT does not supplant a contrast-enhanced diagnostic CT or MR scan and should only be used to evaluate an equivocal finding on a contrast-enhanced CT scan or MR scan or in patients with strong contraindications to IV [intravenous] contrast." For workup of proven metastatic synchronous adenocarcinoma, the guidelines state that PET/CT may be considered; however, it is generally discouraged in most cases. Use of PET/CT is not recommended for surveillance. The NCCN has noted that PET/CT should not be used to assess response to chemotherapy. The NCCN was divided on the appropriateness of PET/CT when carcinoembryonic antigen level is rising; PET/CT might be considered when imaging study results (eg, a good quality CT scan) are normal.

NCCN guidelines for rectal cancer (v.6.2020) state that PET/CT is "not routinely indicated" and "should only be used to evaluate an equivocal finding on a contrast-enhanced CT or MR scan or in patients with strong contraindications to IV contrast." For certain patients with potential surgically-curable M1 disease, a PET/CT may be considered. Use of PET/CT is not recommended for restaging or for surveillance. Use of PET/CT can be considered if serial carcinoembryonic antigen elevation occurs or if there is documented metachronous metastases.

## Endometrial Cancer

NCCN guidelines for endometrial cancer (v.1.2020) state that whole-body PET/CT can be considered in the initial workup, in both non-fertility and fertility-sparing management, if metastases are suspected in select patients (based on clinical symptoms, physical findings, or abnormal laboratory findings). PET/CT may also be considered for patients with suspected recurrence or metastases as clinically indicated. Following treatment, PET/CT can be considered in select patients for surveillance, if clarification is needed and metastasis is suspected.

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

## Esophageal Cancer

For initial diagnosis, PET is generally not considered for detecting primary esophageal tumors, and evidence is lacking in its ability to differentiate between esophageal cancer and benign conditions.

NCCN guidelines for esophageal cancer (v.3.2020 ) indicate that PET/CT can be considered under the following conditions<sup>60</sup>.

- Part of the initial workup if there is no evidence of M1 disease.
- To assess response to preoperative or definitive chemoradiation.
- For staging purposes, prior to surgery to obtain nodal distribution information

The guidelines note that PET/CT for these indications is preferable to PET alone.

## Gastric Cancer

NCCN guidelines for gastric cancer (v.2.2020 ) indicate that FDG-PET/CT (but not PET alone) can be used as part of an initial workup if there is no evidence of metastatic disease.<sup>64</sup> The guidelines note that the sensitivity of FDG-PET/CT is lower than for CT alone due to low tracer accumulation in diffuse and mucinous tumor types but specificity is higher. Use of FDG-PET/CT adds value to the diagnostic workup with higher accuracy in staging (identifying tumor and pertinent nodal groups). The NCCN guidelines also indicate that FDG-PET/CT can be used to evaluate response to treatment, in cases of renal insufficiency or allergy to CT contrast. For surveillance in patients with stage II or III disease, FDG-PET/CT can be considered as clinically indicated but CT scan with oral and IV contrast is preferred.

## Head and Neck Cancer

NCCN guidelines on head and neck cancer (v. 2.2020) indicate that PET/CT can be appropriate for disease evaluation, for detection of metastases or recurrence, and for evaluation of response to treatment (at a minimum of 12 weeks posttreatment to reduce false-positive rate).<sup>77</sup> There is no discussion on the use of PET/CT for surveillance.

## Lung Cancer

### Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer

NCCN guidelines for NSCLC ( v.6. 2020) indicate that PET/CT can be used in the staging of the disease, detection of metastases, treatment planning, and detection of disease recurrence.<sup>85</sup> The guidelines note that PET is "best performed before a diagnostic biopsy site is chosen in cases of high clinical suspicion for aggressive, advanced-stage tumors." However, PET is not recommended for detection of brain metastasis from lung cancers. While PET/CT is not routinely recommended for surveillance after completion of definitive therapy, it may be considered to differentiate between true malignancies and benign conditions (eg, atelectasis, consolidation, and radiation fibrosis), which may have been detected by CT imaging. If PET/CT detects recurrent disease, biopsy confirmation is necessary prior to initiating additional treatment because FDG remains avid up to 2 years.

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

In 2013 the American College of Chest Physicians issued guidelines for the diagnosis and management of NSCLC.<sup>86</sup> The guidelines stated that RCTs support the use of PET or PET/CT scanning as a component of lung cancer treatment and recommended PET or PET/CT for staging, detection of metastases, and avoidance of noncurative surgical resections.

## Small-Cell Lung Cancer

NCCN guidelines for SCLC (v.4.2020 ) indicate PET/CT can be used in the staging of the disease if limited stage is suspected or if needed to clarify stage. If extensive-stage is established, brain imaging, MRI (preferred), or CT with contrast is recommended. Use of PET/CT "is not recommended for routine follow-up."<sup>90</sup>

## Lymphoma, Including Hodgkin Disease

NCCN guidelines for Hodgkin lymphoma (v.2.2020 )<sup>100</sup> and non-Hodgkin lymphoma (chronic lymphocytic leukemia/small lymphocytic lymphoma [v.4.2020 ], b-cell lymphomas [v.2.2020 ],<sup>101</sup> hairy cell leukemia [v.1.2020 ],<sup>102</sup> primary cutaneous lymphomas [v.2.2020 ], and t-cell lymphomas [v.1.2020 ]) indicate that PET/CT may be used in the diagnostic workup, staging, restaging, and evaluating treatment response.<sup>103</sup> The guidelines recommend using the internationally recognized Deauville 5-point PET scale for initial staging and assessment of treatment response. The following PET/CT results are assigned the corresponding scores: 1=no uptake; 2=uptake ≤ mediastinum; 3=uptake > mediastinum but ≤ liver; 4=uptake moderately higher than liver; and 5=uptake markedly higher than liver and/or new lesions. The Deauville PET scores can be used to determine the course of treatment. The guidelines note that if PET/CT detects 3 or more skeletal lesions, the marrow may be assumed to be involved and marrow biopsies are no longer indicated. The guidelines also note "Surveillance PET should not be done routinely due to risks for false-positives. Management decisions should not be based on PET scan alone; clinical or pathologic correlation is needed."<sup>104</sup>

## Melanoma

NCCN guidelines for cutaneous melanoma (v.3.2020 ) indicate that PET/CT can be used for staging and restaging more advanced disease ( ie, stage III and IV) in the presence of specific signs and symptoms. Use of PET/CT is not recommended for stage I or II diseases. Also, PET/CT is listed as an option for surveillance screening for recurrence every 3 to 12 months (category 2B) at the physician's discretion. Because most recurrences occur within the first 3 years, routine screening for asymptomatic recurrence is not recommended beyond 3 to 5 years. The guidelines note that the safety of PET/CT is of concern due to cumulative radiation exposure.

## Multiple Myeloma

NCCN guidelines for multiple myeloma (v. 4.2020) recommend PET/CT as an imaging technique option for initial workup. The NCCN recommends using PET/CT for follow-up and surveillance as indicated, if utilized for initial workup. Use of PET/CT is considered first choice during initial work up of solitary extraosseous plasmacytoma. PET/CT may also be considered to detect disease progression.

## Neuroendocrine Tumors

NCCN guidelines for neuroendocrine tumors (v. 1.2020) have recommended somatostatin receptor-based imaging with PET/CT or PET/MRI, using <sup>68</sup>Ga-dotatate as the radioactive tracer.<sup>113</sup> The NCCN recommends <sup>68</sup>Ga-PET/CT or PET/MRI for diagnosis, staging, and restaging. Use of FDG-PET may be considered in poorly differentiated carcinomas only in biopsy-proven neuroendocrine tumors of unknown primary. Neither <sup>68</sup>Ga-PET/CT nor FDG-PET are recommended for surveillance. Use of <sup>18</sup>F-DOPA PET/CT is not discussed in the guidelines.

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

## Ovarian Cancer

### American College of Radiology

In 2018, the ACR published Appropriateness Criteria (2018) on staging and follow-up of ovarian cancer stating that PET/CT and MRI may be appropriate when lesions are indeterminate with contrast-enhanced CT.<sup>117</sup>

### National Comprehensive Cancer Network

NCCN guidelines for ovarian cancer (v.1.2020) indicate that PET/CT can be appropriate "for indeterminate lesions if results will alter management."<sup>118</sup> Use of PET/CT may be considered for monitoring patients with stage II through IV ovarian cancer receiving primary chemotherapy if clinically indicated. PET/CT also can be considered if clinically indicated after complete remission, for follow-up and for monitoring for recurrence if cancer antigen 125 is rising or clinical relapse is suspected.

## Pancreatic Cancer

NCCN guidelines for pancreatic cancer (v. 1.2020) state "the role of PET/CT (without iodinated intravenous contrast) remains unclear... [PET/CT] may be considered after formal pancreatic CT protocol in high-risk patients to detect extrapancreatic metastasis. It is not a substitute for high-quality, contrast-enhanced CT."

## Penile Cancer

NCCN guidelines for penile cancer (v. 1.2020) state that PET/CT may be considered in patients with penile cancer for the evaluation of enlarged pelvic lymph nodes.<sup>125</sup>

## Prostate Cancer

### American College of Radiology

In 2018, the ACR published an Appropriateness Criteria on the posttreatment follow-up of patients with prostate cancer stating that PET and PET/CT using <sup>11</sup>C-choline or <sup>18</sup>F-fluciclovine radiotracers is usually appropriate for patients with a clinical concern for residual or recurrent disease following radical prostatectomy, nonsurgical treatments, or systemic therapy.<sup>139</sup>

### National Comprehensive Cancer Network

NCCN guidelines for prostate cancer (v. 2.2020) indicate that <sup>11</sup>C-choline PET or PET/MRI may be considered for evaluating biochemical failure after primary treatment (ie, radiotherapy or radical prostatectomy).<sup>140</sup> To evaluate progression, <sup>11</sup>C-choline PET/CT or PET/MRI, or <sup>18</sup>F-fluciclovine PET/CT or PET/MRI may be considered for soft tissue and bone assessment and <sup>18</sup>F-sodium fluoride PET/CT or PET/MRI may be considered for further bone assessment. The guidelines note that <sup>18</sup>F-sodium fluoride PET/CT or

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

PET/MRI has greater sensitivity but lower specificity than standard bone scan imaging. Use of FDG-PET should not be used routinely for initial assessment or in other settings, due to limited evidence of clinical utility.

## Renal Cell Carcinoma

NCCN guidelines for kidney cancer (v. 1.2021) state that "The value of PET in RCC remains to be determined. Currently, PET alone is not a tool that is standardly used to diagnose kidney cancer or follow for evidence of relapse after nephrectomy."<sup>144</sup>.

## Soft Tissue Sarcoma

NCCN guidelines for soft tissue sarcoma (v. 2.2020) state that PET/CT may be useful in staging, prognostication, grading, and determining response to chemotherapy.<sup>147</sup> The guidelines also state that PET can provide information on imatinib activity after 2 to 4 weeks of therapy when rapid reading of activity is considered necessary; however, long-term PET follow-up is rarely indicated. The guidelines also indicate that PET can be used to assess the progression of the disease if results from other imaging techniques (CT or MRI) are inconclusive.

## Testicular Cancer

NCCN guidelines for testicular cancer (v.3.2020 ) support the use of PET to evaluate residual masses that are greater than 3 cm following primary treatment with chemotherapy (at ≥6 weeks posttreatment).<sup>149</sup> If a PET scan is negative, surveillance is recommended. If a PET scan is positive, resection or biopsy of the residual mass is recommended. The guidelines warn that there is "limited predictive value for PET/CT scan for residual masses." Use of PET is not recommended for nonseminoma patients.

## Thyroid Cancer

### Differentiated

NCCN guidelines for thyroid carcinoma (v.2.2020) continue to support the use of FDG-PET/CT in thyroid cancer evaluations, such as when iodine-131 imaging is negative and stimulated thyroglobulin is greater than 2 to 5 ng/mL.<sup>153</sup>

### Medullary

NCCN guidelines for medullary thyroid cancer (v. 2.2020) state that Ga-68 DOTATATE PET/CT may be considered as part of the diagnostic workup, and recommend contrast-enhanced CT with or without PET at 2 to 3 months postoperative surveillance.<sup>153</sup> Additionally, PET/CT may be considered if the recurrent disease is suspected.

## Cancer Surveillance

Clinical utility of PET scanning in surveillance (ie, in performing follow-up PET scans in asymptomatic patients to detect early disease recurrence) is not well-studied. (For this evidence review, a scan is considered a surveillance scan if performed more than 6 months after therapy [but 12 months for lymphoma].) The NCCN report by Podoloff et al (2009) stated that "PET as a surveillance tool should only be used in clinical trials."<sup>37</sup> Additionally, NCCN guidelines for various malignancies often note that PET scans are not

recommended in asymptomatic patients. For example, current NCCN guidelines for breast cancer comment that PET scans (as well as many other imaging modalities) provide no advantage in survival or ability to palliate recurrent disease and are not recommended. [33](#).

## U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations

Not applicable.

## Medicare National Coverage

The Medicare coverage policy on positron emission tomography scans, which was updated in 2013, is summarized in Table 2. [157](#).

**Table 2: Effective for claims with dates of service on and after June 11, 2013, the chart below summarizes national FDG PET coverage for oncologic conditions:**

FDG PET for Cancers by Tumor Type	Initial Treatment Strategy (formerly "diagnosis" & "staging")	Subsequent Treatment Strategy (formerly "restaging" & "monitoring response to treatment")
Colorectal	Cover	Cover
Esophagus	Cover	Cover
Head and Neck (not thyroid, CNS)	Cover	Cover
Lymphoma	Cover	Cover
Non-small cell lung	Cover	Cover
Ovary	Cover	Cover
Brain	Cover	Cover
Cervix	Cover with exceptions *	Cover
Small cell lung	Cover	Cover
Soft tissue sarcoma	Cover	Cover
Pancreas	Cover	Cover
Testes	Cover	Cover
Prostate	<b>Non-cover</b>	Cover
Thyroid	Cover	Cover
Breast (male and female)	Cover with exceptions *	Cover
Melanoma	Cover with exceptions *	Cover
All other solid tumors	Cover	Cover
Myeloma	Cover	Cover
All other cancers not listed	Cover	Cover

\*Cervix: Nationally non-covered for the initial diagnosis of cervical cancer related to initial anti-tumor treatment strategy. All other indications for initial anti-tumor treatment strategy for cervical cancer are nationally covered.

\*Breast: Nationally non-covered for initial diagnosis and/or staging of axillary lymph nodes. Nationally covered for initial staging of metastatic disease. All other indications for initial anti-tumor treatment strategy for breast cancer are nationally covered.

\*Melanoma: Nationally non-covered for initial staging of regional lymph nodes. All other indications for initial anti-tumor treatment strategy for melanoma are nationally covered.

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.



## REFERENCES

1. Food and Drug Administration. Positron Emission Tomography (PET). 2016; <http://www.fda.gov/Drugs/DevelopmentApprovalProcess/Manufacturing/ucm085783.htm>. Accessed July 20, 2020.
2. Riberich R. FDA-Approved PET Radiopharmaceuticals. <http://www.radiopharmaceuticals.info/pet-radiopharmaceuticals.html>. Accessed July 15, 2020.
3. Zionexa. Zionexa USA and PETNET Solutions announce FDA approval of Cerianna (Fluoroestradiol F18). Accessed July 15, 2020. <https://www.zionexa.com/2020/05/27/zionexa-usa-and-petnet-solutions-announce-fda-approval-of-cerianna-fluoroestradiol-f18/>
4. Zhang H, Xing W, Kang Q, et al. Diagnostic value of [18F] FDG-PET and PET/CT in urinary bladder cancer: a meta-analysis. *Tumour Biol.* May 2015; 36(5): 3209-14. PMID 25809703
5. van der Pol CB, Sahni VA, Eberhardt SC, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria (R) Pretreatment Staging of Muscle-Invasive Bladder Cancer. *J Am Coll Radiol.* May 2018; 15(5S): S150-S159. PMID 29724418
6. Allen BC, Oto A, Akin O, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria(R) Post-Treatment Surveillance of Bladder Cancer. *J Am Coll Radiol.* Nov 2019; 16(11S): S417-S427. PMID 31685109
7. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Bladder Cancer. Version 5.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/bladder.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/bladder.pdf). Accessed July 16, 2020.
8. Zhang Q, Xi Y, Li D, et al. The utility of 18 F-FDG PET and PET/CT in the diagnosis and staging of chondrosarcoma: a meta-analysis. *J Orthop Surg Res.* Jun 22 2020; 15(1): 229. PMID 32571371
9. Liu F, Zhang Q, Zhu D, et al. Performance of Positron Emission Tomography and Positron Emission Tomography/Computed Tomography Using Fluorine-18-Fluorodeoxyglucose for the Diagnosis, Staging, and Recurrence Assessment of Bone Sarcoma: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore).* Sep 2015; 94(36): e1462. PMID 26356700
10. Treglia G, Salsano M, Stefanelli A, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of F-FDG-PET and PET/CT in patients with Ewing sarcoma family tumours: a systematic review and a meta-analysis. *Skeletal Radiol.* Mar 2012; 41(3): 249-56. PMID 22072239
11. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Uterine Neoplasms. Version 1.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/uterine.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/uterine.pdf). Accessed July 24, 2020.
12. Dunet V, Pomoni A, Hottinger A, et al. Performance of 18F-FET versus 18F-FDG-PET for the diagnosis and grading of brain tumors: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neuro-oncology.* Mar 2016; 18(3): 426-34. PMID 26243791
13. Dunet V, Rossier C, Buck A, et al. Performance of 18F-fluoro-ethyl-tyrosine (18F-FET) PET for the differential diagnosis of primary brain tumor: a systematic review and Metaanalysis. *J Nucl Med.* Feb 2012; 53(2): 207-14. PMID 22302961
14. Zhao C, Zhang Y, Wang J. A meta-analysis on the diagnostic performance of (18)F-FDG and (11)C-methionine PET for differentiating brain tumors. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol.* Jun 2014; 35(6): 1058-65. PMID 24029389
15. Deng SM, Zhang B, Wu YW, et al. Detection of glioma recurrence by C-methionine positron emission tomography and dynamic susceptibility contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging: a meta-analysis. *Nucl Med Commun.* Aug 2013; 34(8): 758-66. PMID 23670103
16. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Central Nervous System Cancers. Version 2.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/cns.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/cns.pdf). Accessed July 16, 2020.

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

17. Liang X, Yu J, Wen B, et al. MRI and FDG-PET/CT based assessment of axillary lymph node metastasis in early breast cancer: a meta-analysis. *Clin Radiol*. Apr 2017; 72(4): 295-301. PMID 28139203
18. Caldarella C, Treglia G, Giordano A. Diagnostic performance of dedicated positron emission mammography using fluorine-18-fluorodeoxyglucose in women with suspicious breast lesions: a meta-analysis. *Clin Breast Cancer*. Aug 2014; 14(4): 241-8. PMID 24472718
19. Sloka JS, Hollett PD, Mathews M. A quantitative review of the use of FDG-PET in the axillary staging of breast cancer. *Med Sci Monit*. Mar 2007; 13(3): RA37-46. PMID 17325645
20. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Positron Emission Tomography in Breast Cancer. *Technol Eval Cent Assess*. 2001;16(5).
21. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). FDG Positron Emission Tomography for Evaluating Breast Cancer. *Technol Eval Cent Assess*. 2003;18(14).
22. Hong S, Li J, Wang S. 18FDG PET-CT for diagnosis of distant metastases in breast cancer patients. A meta-analysis. *Surg Oncol*. Jun 2013; 22(2): 139-43. PMID 23566435
23. Rong J, Wang S, Ding Q, et al. Comparison of 18 FDG PET-CT and bone scintigraphy for detection of bone metastases in breast cancer patients. A meta-analysis. *Surg Oncol*. Jun 2013; 22(2): 86-91. PMID 23726506
24. Isasi CR, Moadel RM, Blafox MD. A meta-analysis of FDG-PET for the evaluation of breast cancer recurrence and metastases. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. Mar 2005; 90(2): 105-12. PMID 15803356
25. Xiao Y, Wang L, Jiang X, et al. Diagnostic efficacy of 18F-FDG-PET or PET/CT in breast cancer with suspected recurrence: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Nucl Med Commun*. Nov 2016; 37(11): 1180-8. PMID 27428888
26. Liu Q, Wang C, Li P, et al. The Role of (18)F-FDG PET/CT and MRI in Assessing Pathological Complete Response to Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy in Patients with Breast Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Biomed Res Int*. 2016; 2016: 3746232. PMID 26981529
27. Sheikhabaei S, Trahan TJ, Xiao J, et al. FDG-PET/CT and MRI for Evaluation of Pathologic Response to Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy in Patients With Breast Cancer: A Meta-Analysis of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies. *Oncologist*. Aug 2016; 21(8): 931-9. PMID 27401897
28. Li H, Yao L, Jin P, et al. MRI and PET/CT for evaluation of the pathological response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Breast*. Aug 2018; 40: 106-115. PMID 29758503
29. Cheng X, Li Y, Liu B, et al. 18F-FDG PET/CT and PET for evaluation of pathological response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer: a meta-analysis. *Acta Radiol*. Jul 2012; 53(6): 615-27. PMID 22734080
30. Wang Y, Zhang C, Liu J, et al. Is 18F-FDG PET accurate to predict neoadjuvant therapy response in breast cancer? A meta-analysis. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. Jan 2012; 131(2): 357-69. PMID 21960111
31. Podoloff DA, Advani RH, Allred C, et al. NCCN task force report: positron emission tomography (PET)/computed tomography (CT) scanning in cancer. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw*. May 2007; 5 Suppl 1: S1-22; quiz S23-2. PMID 17509259
32. Moy L, Bailey L, D'Orsi C, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria (R) Stage I Breast Cancer: Initial Workup and Surveillance for Local Recurrence and Distant Metastases in Asymptomatic Women. *J Am Coll Radiol*. May 2017; 14(5S): S282-S292. PMID 28473085
33. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Breast Cancer. Version 5.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/breast.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/breast.pdf). Accessed July 16, 2020.

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

34. Chu Y, Zheng A, Wang F, et al. Diagnostic value of 18F-FDG-PET or PET-CT in recurrent cervical cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Nucl Med Commun*. Feb 2014; 35(2): 144-50. PMID 24177043
35. Ospina MB, Horton J, Seida J, et al. Technology Assessment Report : Positron emission tomography for nine cancers (bladder, brain, cervical, kidney, ovarian, pancreatic, prostate, small cell lung, testicular). Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2008.
36. Yen TC, See LC, Chang TC, et al. Defining the priority of using 18F-FDG PET for recurrent cervical cancer. *J Nucl Med*. Oct 2004; 45(10): 1632-9. PMID 15471826
37. Podoloff DA, Ball DW, Ben-Josef E, et al. NCCN task force: clinical utility of PET in a variety of tumor types. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw*. Jun 2009; 7 Suppl 2: S1-26. PMID 19555588
38. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Rectal Cancer. Version 6.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/rectal.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/rectal.pdf). Accessed July 24, 2020.
39. Mahmud A, Poon R, Jonker D. PET imaging in anal canal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Radiol*. Dec 2017; 90(1080): 20170370. PMID 28972796
40. Jones M, Hruby G, Solomon M, et al. The Role of FDG-PET in the Initial Staging and Response Assessment of Anal Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Ann Surg Oncol*. Oct 2015; 22(11): 3574-81. PMID 25652048
41. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). FDG Positron Emission Tomography in Colorectal Cancer. *Technol Eval Cent Assess*. 1999;14(25).
42. Albertsson P, Alverbratt C, Liljegren A, et al. Positron emission tomography and computed tomographic (PET/CT) imaging for radiation therapy planning in anal cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol*. Jun 2018; 126: 6-12. PMID 29759568
43. Ye Y, Liu T, Lu L, et al. Pre-operative TNM staging of primary colorectal cancer by (18)F-FDG PET-CT or PET: a meta-analysis including 2283 patients. *Int J Clin Exp Med*. 2015; 8(11): 21773-85. PMID 26885142
44. Li C, Lan X, Yuan H, et al. 18F-FDG PET predicts pathological response to preoperative chemoradiotherapy in patients with primary rectal cancer: a meta-analysis. *Ann Nucl Med*. Jun 2014; 28(5): 436-46. PMID 24623152
45. Maffione AM, Chondrogiannis S, Capirci C, et al. Early prediction of response by F-FDG PET/CT during preoperative therapy in locally advanced rectal cancer: a systematic review. *Eur J Surg Oncol*. Oct 2014; 40(10): 1186-94. PMID 25060221
46. Memon S, Lynch AC, Akhurst T, et al. Systematic review of FDG-PET prediction of complete pathological response and survival in rectal cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol*. Oct 2014; 21(11): 3598-607. PMID 24802909
47. Gwynne S, Mukherjee S, Webster R, et al. Imaging for target volume delineation in rectal cancer radiotherapy--a systematic review. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)*. Feb 2012; 24(1): 52-63. PMID 22035634
48. Rymer B, Curtis NJ, Siddiqui MR, et al. FDG PET/CT Can Assess the Response of Locally Advanced Rectal Cancer to Neoadjuvant Chemoradiotherapy: Evidence From Meta-analysis and Systematic Review. *Clin Nucl Med*. May 2016; 41(5): 371-5. PMID 26914561
49. Yu T, Meng N, Chi D, et al. Diagnostic Value of (18)F-FDG PET/CT in Detecting Local Recurrent Colorectal Cancer: A Pooled Analysis of 26 Individual Studies. *Cell Biochem Biophys*. Jun 2015; 72(2): 443-51. PMID 25737131
50. Maffione AM, Marzola MC, Capirci C, et al. Value of (18)F-FDG PET for Predicting Response to Neoadjuvant Therapy in Rectal Cancer: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. Jun 2015; 204(6): 1261-8. PMID 26001237

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

51. Lu YY, Chen JH, Chien CR, et al. Use of FDG-PET or PET/CT to detect recurrent colorectal cancer in patients with elevated CEA: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Colorectal Dis.* Aug 2013; 28(8): 1039-47. PMID 23407908
52. Sobhani I, Itti E, Luciani A, et al. Colorectal cancer (CRC) monitoring by 6-monthly 18FDG-PET/CT: an open-label multicentre randomised trial. *Ann Oncol.* Apr 01 2018; 29(4): 931-937. PMID 29365058
53. Fowler KJ, Kaur H, Cash BD, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria (R) Pretreatment Staging of Colorectal Cancer. *J Am Coll Radiol.* May 2017; 14(5S): S234-S244. PMID 28473079
54. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Colon Cancer. Version 4.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/colon.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/colon.pdf). Accessed July 16, 2020.
55. Bollineni VR, Ytre-Hauge S, Bollineni-Balabay O, et al. High Diagnostic Value of 18F-FDG PET/CT in Endometrial Cancer: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Literature. *J Nucl Med.* Jun 2016; 57(6): 879-85. PMID 26823564
56. Kroese TE, Goense L, van Hillegersberg R, et al. Detection of distant interval metastases after neoadjuvant therapy for esophageal cancer with 18F-FDG PET/(CT): a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Dis Esophagus.* Dec 01 2018; 31(12). PMID 29917073
57. Cong L, Wang S, Gao T, et al. The predictive value of 18F-FDG PET for pathological response of primary tumor in patients with esophageal cancer during or after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy: a meta-analysis. *Jpn J Clin Oncol.* Dec 2016; 46(12): 1118-1126. PMID 27702836
58. Goense L, van Rossum PS, Reitsma JB, et al. Diagnostic Performance of F-FDG PET and PET/CT for the Detection of Recurrent Esophageal Cancer After Treatment with Curative Intent: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Nucl Med.* Jul 2015; 56(7): 995-1002. PMID 25952733
59. Shi W, Wang W, Wang J, et al. Meta-analysis of 18FDG PET-CT for nodal staging in patients with esophageal cancer. *Surg Oncol.* Jun 2013; 22(2): 112-6. PMID 23478047
60. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Esophageal and Esophagogastric Cancer. Version 3.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/esophageal.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/esophageal.pdf). Accessed August 5, 2020.
61. Li P, Liu Q, Wang C, et al. Fluorine-18-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography to evaluate recurrent gastric cancer after surgical resection: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Nucl Med.* Apr 2016; 30(3): 179-87. PMID 26830546
62. Zou H, Zhao Y. 18FDG PET-CT for detecting gastric cancer recurrence after surgical resection: a meta-analysis. *Surg Oncol.* Sep 2013; 22(3): 162-6. PMID 23747134
63. Wu LM, Hu JN, Hua J, et al. 18 F-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography to evaluate recurrent gastric cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol.* Mar 2012; 27(3): 472-80. PMID 21916986
64. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Gastric Cancer. Version 2.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/gastric.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/gastric.pdf). Accessed July 4, 2020.
65. Chen WS, Li JJ, Hong L, et al. Comparison of MRI, CT and 18F-FDG PET/CT in the diagnosis of local and metastatic of nasopharyngeal carcinomas: an updated meta analysis of clinical studies. *Am J Transl Res.* 2016; 8(11): 4532-4547. PMID 27904660
66. Wei J, Pei S, Zhu X. Comparison of 18F-FDG PET/CT, MRI and SPECT in the diagnosis of local residual/recurrent nasopharyngeal carcinoma: A meta-analysis. *Oral Oncol.* Jan 2016; 52: 11-7. PMID 26547126

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

67. Cheung PK, Chin RY, Eslick GD. Detecting Residual/Recurrent Head Neck Squamous Cell Carcinomas Using PET or PET/CT: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Mar 2016; 154(3): 421-32. PMID 26715675
68. Sheikhabaehi S, Taghipour M, Ahmad R, et al. Diagnostic Accuracy of Follow-Up FDG PET or PET/CT in Patients With Head and Neck Cancer After Definitive Treatment: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* Sep 2015; 205(3): 629-39. PMID 26295652
69. Sheikhabaehi S, Ahn SJ, Moriarty E, et al. Intratherapy or Posttherapy FDG PET or FDG PET/CT for Patients With Head and Neck Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Prognostic Studies. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* Nov 2015; 205(5): 1102-13. PMID 26496559
70. Rohde M, Dyrvig AK, Johansen J, et al. 18F-fluoro-deoxy-glucose-positron emission tomography/computed tomography in diagnosis of head and neck squamous cell carcinoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Cancer.* Sep 2014; 50(13): 2271-9. PMID 25011659
71. Yi X, Fan M, Liu Y, et al. 18 FDG PET and PET-CT for the detection of bone metastases in patients with head and neck cancer. A meta-analysis. *J Med Imaging Radiat Oncol.* Dec 2013; 57(6): 674-9. PMID 24283555
72. Gao S, Li S, Yang X, et al. 18FDG PET-CT for distant metastases in patients with recurrent head and neck cancer after definitive treatment. A meta-analysis. *Oral Oncol.* Mar 2014; 50(3): 163-7. PMID 24368204
73. Helsen N, Van den Wyngaert T, Carp L, et al. FDG-PET/CT for treatment response assessment in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis of diagnostic performance. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* Jun 2018; 45(6): 1063-1071. PMID 29478080
74. Li Q, Zhang J, Cheng W, et al. Prognostic value of maximum standard uptake value, metabolic tumor volume, and total lesion glycolysis of positron emission tomography/computed tomography in patients with nasopharyngeal carcinoma: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore).* Sep 2017; 96(37): e8084. PMID 28906411
75. Lin J, Xie G, Liao G, et al. Prognostic value of 18F-FDG-PET/CT in patients with nasopharyngeal carcinoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Oncotarget.* May 16 2017; 8(20): 33884-33896. PMID 27980228
76. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). FDG Positron Emission Tomography in Head and Neck Cancer. *Technol Eval Cent Assess.* 2000;15(4).
77. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Head and Neck Cancers. Version 2.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/head-and-neck.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/head-and-neck.pdf). Accessed July 17, 2020.
78. Barger RL, Nandalur KR. Diagnostic performance of dual-time 18F-FDG PET in the diagnosis of pulmonary nodules: a meta-analysis. *Acad Radiol.* Feb 2012; 19(2): 153-8. PMID 22104289
79. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). FDG Positron Emission Tomography for Non-CNS Cancers. *Technol Eval Cent Assess.* 1997;12(3).
80. Brea TP, Ravina AR, Villamor JMC, et al. Use of Magnetic Resonance Imaging for N-Staging in Patients with Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer. A Systematic Review. *Arch Bronconeumol.* Jan 2019; 55(1): 9-16. PMID 29803524
81. Ruilong Z, Daohai X, Li G, et al. Diagnostic value of 18F-FDG-PET/CT for the evaluation of solitary pulmonary nodules: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Nucl Med Commun.* Jan 2017; 38(1): 67-75. PMID 27741214
82. Li Y, Jin G, Su D. Comparison of Gadolinium-enhanced MRI and 18FDG PET/PET-CT for the diagnosis of brain metastases in lung cancer patients: A meta-analysis of 5 prospective studies. *Oncotarget.* May 30 2017; 8(22): 35743-35749. PMID 28415747

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

83. He YQ, Gong HL, Deng YF, et al. Diagnostic efficacy of PET and PET/CT for recurrent lung cancer: a meta-analysis. *Acta Radiol.* Apr 2014; 55(3): 309-17. PMID 24081215
84. Li J, Xu W, Kong F, et al. Meta-analysis: accuracy of 18FDG PET-CT for distant metastasis staging in lung cancer patients. *Surg Oncol.* Sep 2013; 22(3): 151-5. PMID 23664848
85. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer. Version 6.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/nscl.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/nscl.pdf). Accessed July 7, 2020.
86. Silvestri GA, Gonzalez AV, Jantz MA, et al. Methods for staging non-small cell lung cancer: Diagnosis and management of lung cancer, 3rd ed: American College of Chest Physicians evidence-based clinical practice guidelines. *Chest.* May 2013; 143(5 Suppl): e211S-e250S. PMID 23649440
87. Lu YY, Chen JH, Liang JA, et al. 18F-FDG PET or PET/CT for detecting extensive disease in small-cell lung cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Nucl Med Commun.* Jul 2014; 35(7): 697-703. PMID 24694775
88. Ruben JD, Ball DL. The efficacy of PET staging for small-cell lung cancer: a systematic review and cost analysis in the Australian setting. *J Thorac Oncol.* Jun 2012; 7(6): 1015-20. PMID 22534816
89. Seidenfeld J, Samson DJ, Bonnell CJ, et al. Management of small cell lung cancer. *Evid Rep Technol Assess (Full Rep).* Jul 2006(143):1-154.
90. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Small Cell Lung Cancer. Version 4.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/sclc.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/sclc.pdf). Accessed July 6, 2020.
91. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). FDG Positron Emission Tomography in Lymphoma. *Technol Eval Cent Assess.* 1999;14(26).
92. Adams HJ, Kwee TC, de Keizer B, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis on the diagnostic performance of FDG-PET/CT in detecting bone marrow involvement in newly diagnosed Hodgkin lymphoma: is bone marrow biopsy still necessary?. *Ann Oncol.* May 2014; 25(5): 921-7. PMID 24351400
93. Adams HJ, Kwee TC, de Keizer B, et al. FDG PET/CT for the detection of bone marrow involvement in diffuse large B-cell lymphoma: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* Mar 2014; 41(3): 565-74. PMID 24281821
94. Adams HJA, Kwee TC. Proportion of false-positive lesions at interim and end-of-treatment FDG-PET in lymphoma as determined by histology: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Radiol.* Nov 2016; 85(11): 1963-1970. PMID 27776647
95. Adams HJ, Nievelstein RA, Kwee TC. Outcome of Hodgkin Lymphoma Patients With a Posttreatment 18F-Fluoro-2-Deoxy-d-Glucose Positron Emission Tomography (FDG-PET)-Negative Residual Mass: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Pediatr Hematol Oncol.* 2015; 32(8): 515-24. PMID 26561044
96. Adams HJ, Kwee TC. Pretransplant FDG-PET in aggressive non-Hodgkin lymphoma: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Haematol.* Apr 2017; 98(4): 337-347. PMID 27943422
97. Adams HJ, Kwee TC. Prognostic value of pretransplant FDG-PET in refractory/relapsed Hodgkin lymphoma treated with autologous stem cell transplantation: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Hematol.* Apr 2016; 95(5): 695-706. PMID 26931115
98. Zhu D, Xu XL, Fang C, et al. Prognostic value of interim (18)F-FDG-PET in diffuse large B cell lymphoma treated with rituximab-based immune-chemotherapy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Clin Exp Med.* 2015; 8(9): 15340-50. PMID 26629023

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

99. Borchmann P, Goergen H, Kobe C, et al. PET-guided treatment in patients with advanced-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma (HD18): final results of an open-label, international, randomised phase 3 trial by the German Hodgkin Study Group. *Lancet*. Dec 23 2018; 390(10114): 2790-2802. PMID 29061295
100. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Hodgkin Lymphoma. Version 2.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/hodgkins.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/hodgkins.pdf). Accessed July 8, 2020.
101. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: B-Cell Lymphomas. Version 2.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/b-cell.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/b-cell.pdf). Accessed July 1, 2020.
102. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Hairy Cell Leukemia. Version 1.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/hairy\\_cell.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/hairy_cell.pdf). Accessed July 2, 2020.
103. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: T-Cell Lymphomas. Version 1.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/t-cell.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/t-cell.pdf). Accessed August 2, 2020.
104. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia/Small Lymphocytic Lymphoma. Version 4.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/cll.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/cll.pdf). Accessed August July 31, 2020.
105. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). FDG Positron Emission Tomography in Melanoma. *Technol Eval Cent Assess*. 1999;14(27).
106. Rodriguez Rivera AM, Alabbas H, Ramjaun A, et al. Value of positron emission tomography scan in stage III cutaneous melanoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Surg Oncol*. Mar 2014; 23(1): 11-6. PMID 24556310
107. Lu YY, Chen JH, Lin WY, et al. FDG PET or PET/CT for detecting intramedullary and extramedullary lesions in multiple Myeloma: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Nucl Med*. Sep 2012; 37(9): 833-7. PMID 22889770
108. van Lammeren-Venema D, Regelink JC, Riphagen II, et al. F-fluoro-deoxyglucose positron emission tomography in assessment of myeloma-related bone disease: a systematic review. *Cancer*. Apr 15 2012; 118(8): 1971-81. PMID 21887677
109. Barrio M, Czernin J, Fanti S, et al. The Impact of Somatostatin Receptor-Directed PET/CT on the Management of Patients with Neuroendocrine Tumor: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Nucl Med*. May 2017; 58(5): 756-761. PMID 28082438
110. Deppen SA, Blume J, Bobbey AJ, et al. 68Ga-DOTATATE Compared with 111In-DTPA-Octreotide and Conventional Imaging for Pulmonary and Gastroenteropancreatic Neuroendocrine Tumors: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Nucl Med*. Jun 2016; 57(6): 872-8. PMID 26769864
111. Treglia G, Castaldi P, Rindi G, et al. Diagnostic performance of Gallium-68 somatostatin receptor PET and PET/CT in patients with thoracic and gastroenteropancreatic neuroendocrine tumours: a meta-analysis. *Endocrine*. Aug 2012; 42(1): 80-7. PMID 22350660
112. Treglia G, Cocciolillo F, de Waure C, et al. Diagnostic performance of 18F-dihydroxyphenylalanine positron emission tomography in patients with paraganglioma: a meta-analysis. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. Jul 2012; 39(7): 1144-53. PMID 22358431
113. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Neuroendocrine and Adrenal Tumors. Version 1.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/neuroendocrine.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/neuroendocrine.pdf). Accessed July 17, 2020.
114. Xu B, Ma J, Jiang G, et al. Diagnostic value of positron emission tomography (PET) and PET/computed tomography in recurrent/metastatic ovarian cancer: A meta-analysis. *J Obstet Gynaecol Res*. Feb 2017; 43(2): 378-386. PMID 28150407

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

115. Limei Z, Yong C, Yan X, et al. Accuracy of positron emission tomography/computed tomography in the diagnosis and restaging for recurrent ovarian cancer: a meta-analysis. *Int J Gynecol Cancer*. May 2013; 23(4): 598-607. PMID 23502451
116. Matchar DB, Kulasingam SL, Havrilesky L, et al. *Positron Emission Testing for Six Cancers (Brain, Cervical, Small Cell Lung, Ovarian, Pancreatic and Testicular)*. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2004.
117. Kang SK, Reinhold C, Atri M, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria (R) Staging and Follow-Up of Ovarian Cancer. *J Am Coll Radiol*. May 2018; 15(5S): S198-S207. PMID 29724422
118. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). *NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Ovarian Cancer*. Version 1.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/ovarian.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/ovarian.pdf). Accessed July 17, 2020.
119. Best LM, Rawji V, Pereira SP, et al. Imaging modalities for characterising focal pancreatic lesions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Apr 17 2017; 4: CD010213. PMID 28415140
120. Wang L, Dong P, Wang WG, et al. Positron emission tomography modalities prevent futile radical resection of pancreatic cancer: A meta-analysis. *Int J Surg*. Oct 2017; 46: 119-125. PMID 28890410
121. Rijkers AP, Valkema R, Duivenvoorden HJ, et al. Usefulness of F-18-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography to confirm suspected pancreatic cancer: a meta-analysis. *Eur J Surg Oncol*. Jul 2014; 40(7): 794-804. PMID 24755095
122. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). *FDG Positron Emission Tomography in Pancreatic Cancer*. *Technol Eval Cent Assess*. 1999;14(28).
123. Ghaneh P, Hanson R, Titman A, et al. PET-PANC: multicentre prospective diagnostic accuracy and health economic analysis study of the impact of combined modality 18fluorine-2-fluoro-2-deoxy-d-glucose positron emission tomography with computed tomography scanning in the diagnosis and management of pancreatic cancer. *Health Technol Assess*. Feb 2018; 22(7): 1-114. PMID 29402376
124. Sadeghi R, Gholami H, Zakavi SR, et al. Accuracy of 18F-FDG PET/CT for diagnosing inguinal lymph node involvement in penile squamous cell carcinoma: systematic review and meta-analysis of the literature. *Clin Nucl Med*. May 2012; 37(5): 436-41. PMID 22475891
125. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). *NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Penile Cancer*. Version 1.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/penile.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/penile.pdf). Accessed July 30, 2020.
126. Liu J, Chen Z, Wang T, et al. Influence of Four Radiotracers in PET/CT on Diagnostic Accuracy for Prostate Cancer: A Bivariate Random-Effects Meta-Analysis. *Cell Physiol Biochem*. 2016; 39(2): 467-80. PMID 27383216
127. Ouyang Q, Duan Z, Lei J, et al. Comparison of meta-analyses among elastosonography (ES) and positron emission tomography/computed tomography (PET/CT) imaging techniques in the application of prostate cancer diagnosis. *Tumour Biol*. Mar 2016; 37(3): 2999-3007. PMID 26415734
128. Fanti S, Minozzi S, Castellucci P, et al. PET/CT with (11)C-choline for evaluation of prostate cancer patients with biochemical recurrence: meta-analysis and critical review of available data. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. Jan 2016; 43(1): 55-69. PMID 26450693
129. von Eyben FE, Kairemo K. Meta-analysis of (11)C-choline and (18)F-choline PET/CT for management of patients with prostate cancer. *Nucl Med Commun*. Mar 2014; 35(3): 221-30. PMID 24240194
130. Umbehr MH, Muntener M, Hany T, et al. The role of 11C-choline and 18F-fluorocholine positron emission tomography (PET) and PET/CT in prostate cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Urol*. Jul 2013; 64(1): 106-17. PMID 23628493

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.



131. Mohsen B, Giorgio T, Rasoul ZS, et al. Application of C-11-acetate positron-emission tomography (PET) imaging in prostate cancer: systematic review and meta-analysis of the literature. *BJU Int.* Dec 2013; 112(8): 1062-72. PMID 23937453
132. Sandgren K, Westerlinck P, Jonsson JH, et al. Imaging for the Detection of Locoregional Recurrences in Biochemical Progression After Radical Prostatectomy-A Systematic Review. *Eur Urol Focus.* Jul 2019; 5(4): 550-560. PMID 29133278
133. Albisinni S, Aoun F, Marcellis Q, et al. Innovations in imaging modalities for recurrent and metastatic prostate cancer: a systematic review. *Minerva Urol Nefrol.* Aug 2018; 70(4): 347-360. PMID 29388415
134. Bach-Gansmo T, Nanni C, Nieh PT, et al. Multisite Experience of the Safety, Detection Rate and Diagnostic Performance of Fluciclovine ( <sup>18</sup>F) Positron Emission Tomography/Computerized Tomography Imaging in the Staging of Biochemically Recurrent Prostate Cancer. *J Urol.* Mar 2017; 197(3 Pt 1): 676-683. PMID 27746282
135. Andriole GL, Kostakoglu L, Chau A, et al. The Impact of Positron Emission Tomography with <sup>18</sup>F-Fluciclovine on the Treatment of Biochemical Recurrence of Prostate Cancer: Results from the LOCATE Trial. *J Urol.* Feb 2019; 201(2): 322-331. PMID 30179618
136. Akin-Akintayo OO, Jani AB, Odewole O, et al. Change in Salvage Radiotherapy Management Based on Guidance With FACBC (Fluciclovine) PET/CT in Postprostatectomy Recurrent Prostate Cancer. *Clin Nucl Med.* Jan 2017; 42(1): e22-e28. PMID 27749412
137. Heidenreich A, Bastian PJ, Bellmunt J, et al. EAU guidelines on prostate cancer. Part II: Treatment of advanced, relapsing, and castration-resistant prostate cancer. *Eur Urol.* Feb 2014; 65(2): 467-79. PMID 24321502
138. Treglia G, Ceriani L, Sadeghi R, et al. Relationship between prostate-specific antigen kinetics and detection rate of radiolabelled choline PET/CT in restaging prostate cancer patients: a meta-analysis. *Clin Chem Lab Med.* May 2014; 52(5): 725-33. PMID 24310773
139. Froemming AT, Verma S, Eberhardt SC, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria (R) Post-treatment Follow-up Prostate Cancer. *J Am Coll Radiol.* May 2018; 15(5S): S132-S149. PMID 29724417
140. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Prostate Cancer. Version 2.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/prostate.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/prostate.pdf). Accessed August 1, 2020.
141. Eissa A, Elsherbiny A, Coelho RF, et al. The role of <sup>68</sup>Ga-PSMA PET/CT scan in biochemical recurrence after primary treatment for prostate cancer: a systematic review of the literature. *Minerva Urol Nefrol.* Oct 2018; 70(5): 462-478. PMID 29664244
142. Perera M, Papa N, Christidis D, et al. Sensitivity, Specificity, and Predictors of Positive <sup>68</sup>Ga-Prostate-specific Membrane Antigen Positron Emission Tomography in Advanced Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Eur Urol.* Dec 2016; 70(6): 926-937. PMID 27363387
143. Ma H, Shen G, Liu B, et al. Diagnostic performance of <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET or PET/CT in restaging renal cell carcinoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Nucl Med Commun.* Feb 2017; 38(2): 156-163. PMID 27824726
144. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Kidney Cancer. Version 1.2021. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/kidney.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/kidney.pdf). Accessed July 20, 2020.
145. Treglia G, Mirk P, Stefanelli A, et al. <sup>18</sup>F-Fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography in evaluating treatment response to imatinib or other drugs in gastrointestinal stromal tumors: a systematic review. *Clin Imaging.* May-Jun 2012; 36(3): 167-75. PMID 22542374
146. Ioannidis JPA, Lau J. *FDG-PET for the Diagnosis and Management of Soft Tissue Sarcoma (Contract No. 290- 97-0019).* Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2002.

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

147. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Soft Tissue Sarcoma, Version 2.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/sarcoma.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/sarcoma.pdf). Accessed July 20, 2020.
148. Becherer A, De Santis M, Karanikas G, et al. FDG PET is superior to CT in the prediction of viable tumour in post-chemotherapy seminoma residuals. *Eur J Radiol*. May 2005; 54(2): 284-8. PMID 15837411
149. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Testicular Cancer. Version 3.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/testicular.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/testicular.pdf). Accessed July 20, 2020.
150. Schutz F, Lautenschlager C, Lorenz K, et al. Positron Emission Tomography (PET) and PET/CT in Thyroid Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Eur Thyroid J*. Jan 2018; 7(1): 13-20. PMID 29594049
151. Haslerud T, Brauckhoff K, Reisaeter L, et al. F18-FDG-PET for recurrent differentiated thyroid cancer: a systematic meta-analysis. *Acta Radiol*. Oct 2016; 57(10): 1193-200. PMID 26163534
152. Pace L, Klain M, Salvatore B, et al. Prognostic role of 18F-FDG PET/CT in the postoperative evaluation of differentiated thyroid cancer patients. *Clin Nucl Med*. Feb 2015; 40(2): 111-5. PMID 25546215
153. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Thyroid Carcinoma. Version 2.2020. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/thyroid.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/thyroid.pdf). Accessed July 20, 2020.
154. Cheng X, Bao L, Xu Z, et al. F-FDG-PET and F-FDG-PET/CT in the detection of recurrent or metastatic medullary thyroid carcinoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Med Imaging Radiat Oncol*. Apr 2012; 56(2): 136-42. PMID 22498184
155. Burglin SA, Hess S, Hoiland-Carlsen PF, et al. 18F-FDG PET/CT for detection of the primary tumor in adults with extracervical metastases from cancer of unknown primary: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. Apr 2017; 96(16): e6713. PMID 28422888
156. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). FDG Positron Emission Tomography to Manage Patients with an Occult Primary Carcinoma and Metastasis outside the Cervical Lymph Nodes. *Technol Eval Cent Assess*. 2002;17(14).
157. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). Pub 100-03 National Coverage Determination (NCD) for Positron Emission TOMOGRAPHY (FDG) for Oncologic Conditions (220.6.17); <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/ncd-details.aspx?NCDId=331&ncdver=4&NCAId=232&TAId=22&CoverageSelection=Both&ArticleType=All&PolicyType=Final&s=All&Keyword=tomography&KeywordLookUp=Title&KeywordSearchType=And&bc=gAAAAACAAAAAA&>. Accessed July 15, 2020.

---

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.

**POLICY HISTORY - THIS POLICY WAS APPROVED BY THE FEP® PHARMACY AND MEDICAL POLICY COMMITTEE ACCORDING TO THE HISTORY BELOW:**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>
June 2012	New policy	
June 2013	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review. References 22-35 added, Policy statements revised with NMN added to breast cancer, colorectal cancer, soft tissue sarcomas and thyroid cancer. Thyroid cancer revised to include both differentiated and poorly differentiated disease, Prostate cancer moved to section on Other Oncologic Applications, also added to this section, are diagnosis of brain tumors, restaging of gastric cancer, staging of multiple myeloma, evaluation of neuroendocrine tumors and staging of inguinal lymph nodes in patients with squamous cell carcinoma of the penis.
June 2014	Replace policy	Policy was revised with literature search adding references 37-40, 42-75. PET for gastric cancer as medically necessary for initial work up and staging and for evaluation of recurrent gastric cancer when other imaging modalities are inconclusive.
June 2015	Replace policy	Policy revised with literature review; references 1, 42-43, 46, 48-50, 58, 62, 72, 77, 84, and 87 added. Policy statements unchanged.
September 2017	Replace policy	Policy revised with literature review through March 23, 2017; references 37,41, 48-50, 59-63, 67, 69-70, 73, 76-80, 85, 94-98, 103, 109-110, 112, 115,119-120, and 126 added. Additional details added to policy statements. The following statements were changed to medically necessary: staging or restaging of brain cancer; evaluation of response to treatment in head and neck cancer; and testing with 11C-choline for evaluating response to primary treatment in prostate cancer. Two additional indications were added
December 2019	Replace policy	Policy revised with literature review through August 9, 2019; references on NCCN updated. Policy statements unchanged
December 2020	Replace policy	Policy revised with literature review through July 15, 2020; references added. Policy statements unchanged.

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.