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Molecular Testing for the Management of Pancreatic Cysts, Barrett Esophagus, and Solid Pancreaticobiliary Lesions

Description

Tests that integrate microscopic analysis with molecular tissue analysis are generally called topographic genotyping. Interpace Diagnostics offers 2 such tests that use the PathFinderTG platform (e.g. PancraGEN, BarreGEN). These molecular tests are intended to be used adjunctively when a definitive pathologic diagnosis cannot be made, because of the inadequate specimen or equivocal histologic or cytologic findings, to inform appropriate surveillance or surgical strategies.

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this evidence review is to determine whether testing using topographic genotyping in addition to standard diagnostic or prognostic practices improve the net health outcome in individuals with pancreatic cysts, Barrett esophagus, or solid pancreaticobiliary lesions.

POLICY STATEMENT

Molecular testing using the PathFinderTG system is considered investigational for all indications including the evaluation of pancreatic cyst fluid, Barrett esophagus, and solid pancreaticobiliary lesions.

POLICY GUIDELINES

None

BENEFIT APPLICATION

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

Screening (other than the preventive services listed in the brochure) is not covered. Please see Section 6 General exclusions.
Benefits are available for specialized diagnostic genetic testing when it is medically necessary to diagnose and/or manage a patient's existing medical condition. Benefits are not provided for genetic panels when some or all of the tests included in the panel are not covered, are experimental or investigational, or are not medically necessary.

**FDA REGULATORY STATUS**

There are no specific CPT codes for PathFinderTG analysis. However, these pathology tests are commercially available only at Interpace Diagnostics’ reference laboratories (Pittsburgh, PA, and New Haven, CT) so the tests can be identified in that way.

**FDA REGULATORY STATUS**

Clinical laboratories may develop and validate tests in-house and market them as a laboratory service; laboratory-developed tests must meet the general regulatory standards of the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments. Patented diagnostic test (e.g. PancraGEN) are available only through Interpace Diagnostics (formerly RedPath Integrated Pathology) under the auspices of the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments. Laboratories that offer laboratory-developed tests must be licensed by the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments for high-complexity testing. To date, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration has chosen not to require any regulatory review of this test.

**RATIONALE**

**Summary of Evidence**

For individuals who have pancreatic cysts who do not have a definitive diagnosis after first-line evaluation and who receive standard diagnostic and management practices plus topographic genotyping (PancraGEN molecular testing), the evidence includes retrospective studies of clinical validity and clinical utility. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test validity, change in disease status, morbid events, and quality of life. The best evidence regarding incremental clinical validity comes from the National Pancreatic Cyst Registry report that compared PancraGEN performance characteristics with current international consensus guidelines and provided preliminary but inconclusive evidence of a small incremental benefit for PancraGEN. The analyses from the registry study included only a small proportion of enrolled patients, relatively short follow-up time for observing malignant transformation, and limited data on cases where the PancraGEN results were discordant with international consensus guidelines. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have Barrett esophagus who receive standard prognostic techniques plus topographic genotyping (BarreGEN molecular testing), the evidence includes a systematic review. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test validity, change in disease status, morbid events, and quality of life. The systematic review identified no studies relevant to this evidence review. Two observational studies were excluded based on BCBSA selection criteria because it was unclear whether the test used was specifically BarreGEN or whether the BarreGEN prognostic algorithm was applied for classification. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have solid pancreaticobiliary lesions who do not have a definitive diagnosis after first-line evaluation and who receive standard diagnostic and management practices plus topographic genotyping (PancraGEN molecular testing), the evidence includes 3 observational studies of clinical validity. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test validity, change in disease status, morbid events, and quality of life. Two of the 3 studies had populations with biliary strictures and the other had a population of patients with solid pancreaticobiliary lesions. The studies reported higher sensitivities and specificities when PancraGEN testing was added to cytology results compared with cytology alone. However, the inclusion of patients in the analysis who may not have solid pancreaticobiliary lesions (those with biliary strictures not caused by solid pancreaticobiliary lesions) limits the interpretation of the results. While preliminary results...
showed a potential incremental benefit for PancreGEN, further research focusing on patients with solid pancreaticobiliary lesions is warranted. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

**Practice Guidelines and Position Statements**

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

**American Gastroenterological Association**

In 2015, the American Gastroenterological Association (AGA) published guidelines on the diagnosis and management of asymptomatic neoplastic pancreatic cysts, based on findings from a technical review. The technical review stated the following about molecular testing: "Case series have confirmed that malignant cysts have a greater number and quality of molecular alterations, but no study has been properly designed to identify how the test performs in predicting outcome with regard to need for surgery, surveillance, or predicting interventions leading to improved survival." The AGA guidelines also stated: "Molecular techniques to evaluate pancreatic cysts remain an emerging area of research, and the diagnostic utility of these tests is uncertain."

In 2011, AGA published a medical position statement on the management of Barrett esophagus. Based on findings from a technical review, AGA recommended: "against the use of molecular biomarkers to confirm the histological diagnosis of dysplasia or as a method of risk stratification for patients with Barrett's esophagus at this time (weak recommendation, low-quality evidence)."

**American College of Gastroenterology**

In 2015, the American College of Gastroenterology released guidelines on the diagnosis and management of Barrett esophagus. The guidelines stated: "Given the complexity and diversity of alterations observed to date in the progression sequence, a panel of biomarkers may be required for risk stratification. At the present time, no biomarkers or panels of biomarkers are ready for clinical practice. In order to become part of the clinical armamentarium, biomarkers will have to be validated in large prospective cohorts."

In 2018, the American College of Gastroenterology published guidelines on the diagnosis and management of pancreatic cysts. The guidelines stated that the evidence for the use of molecular biomarkers for identifying high-grade dysplasia or pancreatic cancer is insufficient to recommend their routine use. However, molecular markers may help identify intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasms and mucinous cystic neoplasms in cases with an unclear diagnosis and if results are likely to change the management (conditional recommendation; very low quality evidence).
National Comprehensive Cancer Network

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) guidelines for pancreatic adenocarcinoma were updated in 2019 and recommend that clinicians consider molecular tumor analysis in patients with metastatic disease.\textsuperscript{53}

NCCN guidelines esophageal and esophagogastric junction cancers (v.2. 2021)\textsuperscript{54}, do not include recommendations for molecular anatomic pathology or integrated molecular pathology.

U.S. Preventative Services Task Force Recommendations

Not applicable.

Medicare National Coverage

There is no national coverage determination. In the absence of a national coverage determination, coverage decisions are left to the discretion of local Medicare carriers. The local coverage determination by Novatis Solutions is:

"PathfinderTG will be considered medically reasonable and necessary when selectively used as an occasional second-line diagnostic supplement:

- only where there remains clinical uncertainty as to either the current malignancy or the possible malignant potential of the pancreatic cyst based upon a comprehensive first-line evaluation;
- AND
- a decision regarding treatment (e.g. surgery) has NOT already been made based on existing information."
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