



---

## FEP Medical Policy Manual

---

### FEP 6.01.29 Magnetic Resonance Imaging for Detection and Diagnosis of Breast Cancer

---

**Effective Policy Date: January 1, 2020**

**Related Policies:**

None

**Original Policy Date: December 2011**

---

## Magnetic Resonance Imaging for Detection and Diagnosis of Breast Cancer

### Description

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the breast is performed using scanners and intravenous imaging contrast agents in combination with specialized breast coils. This evidence review only addresses the use of breast MRI for clinical indications related to the detection or diagnosis of breast cancer.

### OBJECTIVE

The objective of this evidence review is to determine whether magnetic resonance imaging of the breast improves the net health outcome for individuals undergoing breast cancer screening, breast cancer detection, and/or evaluation for breast cancer before and/or after 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.

---

## POLICY STATEMENT

All policy statements below refer to performing magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the breast with contrast agents and a breast coil. MRI of the breast without a breast coil, regardless of the clinical indication, is considered **investigational**. See additional comments in the Policy Guidelines section about the breast imaging team and the need for breast MRI centers to perform MRI-guided biopsy and localization.

### Screening Uses

MRI of the breast may be considered **medically necessary** for breast cancer screening patients with high risk of breast cancer. (For definitions on each of the risk levels, see the Policy Guidelines section.)

MRI of the breast is considered **investigational** as a screening technique in average-risk patients.

MRI of the breast is considered **investigational** as a screening technique for the detection of breast cancer when the sensitivity of mammography (ie, mammography using low-dose x-rays for imaging) is limited (ie, dense breasts, breast implants, scarring after breast cancer treatment).

### Detection Uses

MRI of the breast may be considered **medically necessary** for detection of a suspected occult breast primary tumor in patients with axillary nodal adenocarcinoma (ie, negative mammography and physical exam).

MRI of the breast may be considered **medically necessary** in patients with a new diagnosis of breast cancer to evaluate the contralateral breast when clinical and mammographic findings are normal.

MRI of the breast is considered **investigational** for diagnosis of low-suspicion findings on conventional testing not indicated for immediate biopsy and referred for short-interval follow-up.

MRI of the breast is considered **investigational** for the diagnosis of a suspicious breast lesion in order to avoid biopsy.

### Treatment-Related Uses

MRI of the breast may be considered **medically necessary** for preoperative tumor mapping of the involved (ipsilateral) breast to evaluate the presence of multicentric disease in patients with clinically localized breast cancer who are candidates for breast conservation therapy (see the Policy Guidelines section).

MRI of the breast may be considered **medically necessary** for presurgical planning in patients with locally advanced breast cancer (before and after completion of neoadjuvant chemotherapy) to permit tumor localization and characterization.

MRI of the breast may be considered **medically necessary** to determine the presence of pectoralis major muscle/chest wall invasion in patients with posteriorly located tumors.

MRI of the breast may be considered **medically necessary** to evaluate a documented abnormality of the breast before obtaining an MRI-guided biopsy when there is documentation that other methods, such as palpation or ultrasound, are not able to localize the lesion for biopsy.

MRI of the breast is considered **investigational** to determine response during neoadjuvant chemotherapy in patients with locally advanced breast cancer.

MRI of the breast is considered **investigational** for evaluation of residual tumor in patients with positive margins after initial lumpectomy or breast conservation surgery.

---

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 GUIDELINES

### High-risk Considerations

There is no standardized method for determining a woman's risk of breast cancer that incorporates all possible risk factors. Clinical practice guidelines offer guidance on factors known to individually indicate a high risk of breast cancer (see the Supplemental Information section).

A number of factors may increase the risk of breast cancer but do not by themselves indicate high risk. It is possible that combinations of factors may be indicative of high risk, but it is not possible to quantitate estimates of risk. As a result, it may be necessary to individualize the estimate of risk, whereby one would need to take into account the numerous risk factors. A number of risk factors, not individually indicating high risk, are included in the National Cancer Institute Breast Cancer Risk Assessment Tool (also called the Gail model). Risk factors in the model can be accessed online (<http://www.cancer.gov/bcrisktool/Default.aspx>).

### Considerations for Performing Magnetic Resonance Imaging

Breast magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) exams should be performed and interpreted by an expert breast imaging team working with the multidisciplinary oncology treatment team.

As noted, breast MRI exams require a dedicated breast coil and the use of contrast agents by radiologists familiar with the optimal timing sequences and other technical aspects of image interpretation. The breast MRI center also should have the ability to perform MRI-guided biopsy and/or wire localization of findings detected by MRI.

### Considerations for Preoperative MRI

Preoperative MRI in patients with localized disease results in higher rates of mastectomy and lower rates of breast-conserving therapy. There is uncertainty from the available evidence on whether outcomes are improved by changing to a more extensive operation. If biopsies are performed on all MRI-identified lesions, and if shared patient decision making is used for altering the surgical approach, then the probability of improved outcomes is increased.

## BENEFIT APPLICATION

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

## FDA REGULATORY STATUS

MRI of the breast can be performed using commercially available magnetic resonance scanners and intravenous magnetic resonance contrast agents. Specialized breast coils such as the Access Breast Coil 4/SMS (Confirma) and magnetic resonance-compatible equipment for performing biopsy have been developed and cleared for marketing by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration through the 510(k) process. The Food and Drug Administration determined that these devices are substantially equivalent to predicate devices for use "in conjunction with a magnetic resonance imager (MRI) to produce diagnostic and interventional images of the breast, chest wall and axillary tissues that can be interpreted by a trained physician."<sup>1</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.

## RATIONALE

### Summary of Evidence

#### Screening Uses

For individuals who are asymptomatic with high-risk of breast cancer who receive magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) as an adjunct to screening for breast cancer, the evidence includes systematic reviews (including a TEC Assessment) and diagnostic accuracy studies. The relevant outcomes are overall survival (OS), disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, and resource utilization. Studies have found that MRI is more sensitive than mammography or ultrasonography in detecting malignancy. Because of the high likelihood of malignancy among women at high-risk for breast cancer, the benefits of detecting cancer earlier with MRI outweigh the disadvantages of incurring unnecessary workups and biopsies due to false-positive 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 with average-risk of breast cancer who receive MRI as an adjunct to screening for breast cancer, the evidence includes systematic reviews and clinical validity studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, and resource utilization. The systematic reviews did not identify any randomized controlled trials (RCTs) or nonrandomized comparative studies evaluating MRI for screening average-risk women. One comparative observational study has been published since the systematic reviews. The diagnostic accuracy of screening tests would likely be lower in this lower prevalence population, and there would be higher false-positive rates, morbidity, and anxiety. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals with characteristics limiting the accuracy of mammography (eg, dense breasts) who receive MRI as an adjunct to screening for breast cancer, the evidence includes a systematic review (TEC Assessment) and diagnostic accuracy studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, and resource utilization. There are limited data on the diagnostic accuracy of MRI vs mammography in patients who have had breast-conserving therapy or who have dense breasts. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

#### Detection Uses

For individuals who have suspected occult breast primary tumor with axillary nodal adenocarcinoma with negative mammography who receive MRI as an adjunct to detect breast cancer eligible for breast-conserving therapy (BCT), the evidence includes a systematic review (TEC Assessment) and meta-analysis. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, and resource utilization. The studies found that adjunctive use of breast MRI to guide BCS rather than preemptive mastectomy allowed a substantial portion of patients to avoid the morbidity of mastectomy. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have breast cancer who receive adjunctive MRI of the contralateral breast, the evidence includes cohort studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, and resource utilization. A study of nearly 1000 patients found that MRI could detect contralateral breast cancer with a high degree of accuracy. Although long-term outcomes of these contralateral breast cancers are not fully known, important changes in management will occur (eg, simultaneous treatment of synchronous cancers) as a result of these findings, which should lead to improved outcomes. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have low-suspicion findings on conventional mammography who receive MRI as an adjunct to detect breast cancer, the evidence includes a systematic review (TEC Assessment). The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, and resource utilization. The TEC Assessment concluded that, although the available studies suggested reasonably high diagnostic accuracy, none of the studies used prospective methods in appropriate study populations or appropriate comparison interventions such as short-interval mammographic follow-up. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have suspicious breast lesions who receive MRI as an adjunct to further characterize lesions, the evidence includes systematic reviews (including a TEC Assessment) and cohort studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, and resource utilization. Studies have found that MRI for evaluation of suspicious breast lesions has relatively

high sensitivity and a moderately high specificity. However, it has not yet been established that the negative predictive value (NPV) is sufficient to preclude the need for biopsy. Although 2 recent studies have reported NPVs greater than 90% in certain types of breast lesions, these were non-U.S., single-institution studies that require replication in larger, multicenter trials. Therefore, the use of MRI to further characterize suspicious lesions is currently unlikely to alter clinical management. In addition, the moderately high rate of false-positives will lead to substantial numbers of unnecessary biopsies. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## Treatment-Related Uses

For individuals who have clinically localized breast cancer who receive MRI for preoperative mapping to identify multicentric disease, the evidence includes RCTs, systematic reviews, and prospective cohort studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, and resource utilization. Studies have found that, for patients with clinically localized breast cancer, MRI can detect additional areas of disease in the ipsilateral or contralateral breast beyond that detected by standard imaging; further, MRI is associated with a higher rate of mastectomy. Follow-up studies have reported mixed results including no significant reduction in reoperations rates after MRI while other studies have reported lower odds of reoperation in patients with invasive lobular carcinoma. No significant differences in ipsilateral local or distant recurrence-free survival after MRI-guided treatment were found in meta-analyses. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have locally advanced breast cancer undergoing neoadjuvant chemotherapy who receive an MRI to guide surgical decisions after neoadjuvant chemotherapy, the evidence includes diagnostic accuracy studies and systematic reviews. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, and resource utilization. Both a 2004 TEC Assessment and a 2015 systematic review found that MRI results were well-correlated with pathologic assessment for measuring residual tumor size after neoadjuvant chemotherapy. The 2015 systematic review also found that MRI performed better than conventional methods. Using breast MRI instead of conventional methods to guide surgical decisions on BCT vs mastectomy after neoadjuvant chemotherapy would be at least as beneficial and may lead to appropriate surgical treatment more often. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have posteriorly located breast tumors who receive an MRI to diagnose chest wall involvement, the evidence includes cohort studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, and resource utilization. Only a few small studies were identified but MRI was 100% accurate in identifying chest wall involvement compared with the criterion standard. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have a suspicious breast lesion recommended for biopsy but not localizable by mammography or ultrasonography who receive MRI to evaluate and localize the lesion prior to biopsy, the evidence includes a cohort study. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, and resource utilization. A small cohort study from Brazil identified malignant tumors in 60% of patients with MRI-detected occult lesions using contrast-enhanced MRI. Although there is little published evidence supporting this indication, improved health outcomes are expected by enabling earlier diagnosis of breast cancer for suspicious lesions where other good options are not available. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have locally advanced breast cancer undergoing neoadjuvant chemotherapy who receive an MRI to evaluate response to chemotherapy, the evidence includes diagnostic accuracy studies and systematic reviews. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, and resource utilization. Studies, including systematic reviews, have not found that there is sufficient evidence to determine whether breast MRI can reliably predict lack of response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy. There is a large amount of variability in reported performance characteristics of MRI in published studies, leaving uncertainty about the true accuracy of MRI for this purpose. Furthermore, evidence would need to show that any resulting change in patient management (eg, discontinuation of chemotherapy, change to a different regimen) would improve outcomes. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have positive surgical margins after lumpectomy or BCS who receive MRI to evaluate residual tumor, the evidence includes cohort studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test accuracy and validity, and resource utilization. The studies, most of which were retrospective and published before 2005, generally reported moderate sensitivity and specificity with MRI for detection of residual disease compared with the criterion standard. Two retrospective studies published since 2015 have an uncertain or high-risk of bias and therefore performance characteristics are unknown. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

---

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.

## SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

### Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

#### National Comprehensive Cancer Network

Current NCCN guidelines on breast cancer (v.1.2019),<sup>61</sup> breast cancer screening and diagnosis (v.2.2019),<sup>62</sup> and genetic assessment of those at high-risk of breast and/or ovarian cancer (v.3.2019)<sup>63</sup> list the following indications for breast magnetic resonance imaging (MRI).

Screening (as an adjunct to mammography):

"Recommend Annual MRI Screening (Based on Evidence)

- First-degree relative of *BRCA* carrier, but untested: commence at age 25-29 y
- Lifetime risk 20% or greater, as defined by models that are largely dependent on family history .Encourage genetic testing for first-degree relatives. If testing declined, recommend MRI.

Recommend Annual MRI Screening (Based on Expert Consensus Opinion):

- Radiation to chest between 10 and 30 years

Consider MRI screening for LCIS [lobular carcinoma in situ] and ALH [atypical lobular hyperplasia]/ADH [atypical ductal hyperplasia] based on emerging evidence if lifetime risk  $\geq 20\%$

Insufficient evidence to Recommend for or Against MRI Screening:

- Lifetime risk 15%-20%, as defined by models that are largely dependent on family history
- Heterogeneously or extremely dense breast on mammography
- Women with a personal history of breast cancer, including ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS)

Recommend Against MRI Screening (Based on Expert Consensus Opinion):

- Women at <15% lifetime risk"<sup>61</sup>.

The NCCN guidelines state that women at "increased risk" of breast cancer include the following groups:

- "women with a prior history of breast cancer;
- women  $\geq 35$  years of age with a 5-year risk of invasive breast cancer  $\geq 1.7\%$  (per Gail Model);
- women who have a lifetime risk  $>20\%$  based on history of LCIS or ADH/ALH;
- women who have a lifetime risk  $>20\%$  as defined by models that are largely dependent on family history;
- women between the ages of 10 and 30 years with prior thoracic RT [radiotherapy]

<sup>61</sup>.

The NCCN guidelines for genetic or familial high-risk assessment for breast cancer recommend MRI screening with contrast for patients with *BRCA* pathogenic or likely pathogenic variants starting at age 25-29 years or individualized if the family had breast cancer diagnosis before age 30. The guidelines further state that MRI with contrast can be considered for patients with the following genetic variants:

---

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.

- *ATM*, *CHEK2*, and *NBN*, starting at age 40
- *CDH1* and *PALB2*, starting at age 30
- *NF1*, from ages 30 to 50. [62](#).

The NCCN guidelines also state there is insufficient evidence for any recommendations for use of breast MRI for patients with the following genetic variants: *BARD1*, *BRIP1*, *MLH1*, *MSH2*, *MSH6*, *PMS2*, *EPCAM*, *RAD51C*, *RAD51D*, *STK11*, *TP53*, *PTEN*, *FANCC*, *MRE11A*, *MUTYH heterozygotes*, *RECQL4*, *RAD50*, *RINT1*, *SLX4*, *SMARCA*, or *XRCC2*.

Guidelines on breast cancer screening and diagnosis make the following recommendations on Diagnosis [61](#):

- Optional MRI for women with nipple discharge, no palpable mass and a BI-RADS rating of 1-3.
- Guideline discussion update in progress: "For patients with skin changes consistent with serious breast disease, consideration of breast MRI is included in the guidelines for those with benign biopsy of skin or nipple following BI-RADS category 1-2 assessment. Since a benign skin punch biopsy in a patient with clinical suspicion of inflammatory breast cancer (IBC) does not rule out malignancy, further evaluation is recommended...[and] MRI may facilitate diagnosis of IBC."

Guidelines on breast cancer make the following recommendations on pretreatment evaluation [61](#):

- "May be useful for identifying primary cancer in women with axillary nodal adenocarcinoma and occult (unidentified) primary cancer, or with Paget's disease, or with invasive lobular carcinoma poorly (or inadequately) defined on mammography, ultrasound, or physical examination."

Guidelines on breast cancer make the following recommendations on treatment [61](#).

- "May be helpful for breast cancer evaluation before and after preoperative systemic therapy to define extent of disease, response to treatment, and potential for breast-conserving therapy."
- "False-positive findings on breast MRI are common. Surgical decisions should not be based solely on MRI findings. Additional tissue sampling of areas of concern identified by breast MRI is recommended."

Guidelines on breast cancer make the following recommendations on surveillance [61](#).

- Utility of MRI in follow-up screening in women with prior breast cancer is undefined. Generally, it should only be considered for women with a greater than 20% lifetime risk of second primary breast cancer.

---

## American Cancer Society

The American Cancer Society (2017) guide on early detection of breast cancer has recommended the following on MRI [64](#):

"A breast MRI is mainly used for women who have been diagnosed with breast cancer, to help measure the size of the cancer, look for other tumors in the breast, and to check for tumors in the opposite breast. For certain women at high-risk for breast cancer, a screening MRI is recommended along with a yearly mammogram. MRI is not recommended as a screening tool by itself because it can miss some cancers that a mammogram would find.

Although MRI can find some cancers not seen on a mammogram, it's also more likely to find something that turns out not to be cancer (called a false positive). False-positive findings have to be checked out to know that cancer isn't present. This means more tests and/or biopsies. This is why MRI is not recommended as a screening test for women at average risk of breast cancer, because it would mean unneeded biopsies and other tests for many of these women."



## American College of Radiology

The American College of Radiology has appropriateness criteria for breast imaging, which were developed in 2012 and revised in 2017<sup>65</sup>; palpable breast masses, <sup>66</sup> revised in 2016; initial workup and surveillance for stage I breast cancer, reviewed in 2019<sup>67</sup>; and monitoring response to neoadjuvant therapy, 2017<sup>68</sup>. (see Table 1).

Table 1. MRI-Related to Criteria for Breast Cancer Screening, Diagnosis, and Monitoring Response

Specific Indications	MRI Rating
High-risk women: women with a <i>BRCA</i> gene variant and their untested first-degree relatives, women with a history of chest irradiation between the ages of 10 and 30 years, women with 20% or greater lifetime risk of breast cancer	Usually appropriate with and without contrast (with mammography)
Intermediate-risk women: women with personal history of breast cancer, lobular neoplasia, atypical ductal hyperplasia, or 15%-20% lifetime risk of breast cancer	May be appropriate with and without contrast (with mammography)
Average-risk women: women with <15% lifetime risk of breast cancer, breasts not dense	Usually not appropriate with and without contrast
Evaluating palpable breast mass. All indications reviewed	Usually not appropriate with and without contrast
Initial determination of tumor size and extent within the breast prior to neoadjuvant chemotherapy.	Usually appropriate without and with contrast
Imaging of the breast after initiation or completion of neoadjuvant chemotherapy [if a prechemotherapy MRI was performed].	Usually appropriate without and with contrast
Axillary evaluation prior to neoadjuvant chemotherapy.	May be appropriate without and with contrast
Known breast cancer. Axillary evaluation after completion of neoadjuvant chemotherapy, axilla not previously evaluated.	May be appropriate without and with contrast
Surveillance. Rule out local recurrence.	May be appropriate without and with contrast

MRI: magnetic resonance imaging.

The College (2018) issued recommendations for breast cancer screening in women at higher-than-average risk.<sup>69</sup> The recommendations for MRI are as follows:

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.



•"For women with genetics-based increased risk (and their untested first-degree relatives), history of chest radiation, calculated lifetime risk of 20% or more, breast MRI should be performed annually beginning at age 25 to 30."

•"For women with personal histories of breast cancer and dense breast tissue, or those diagnosed before age 50, annual surveillance with breast MRI is recommended."

•"For women with personal histories of breast cancer not included in the above, or with LCIS or atypia on prior biopsy, MRI should be considered, especially if other risk factors are present."

## American Society of Clinical Oncology

The American Society of Clinical Oncology (2006) has published guidelines for follow-up and management after primary treatment of breast cancer.<sup>70</sup> In 2013, the guidelines were updated with a systematic review of the literature through March 2012, and no revisions were made.<sup>71</sup> The guidelines recommended against the use of breast MRI "for routine follow-up in an otherwise asymptomatic patient with no specific findings on clinical examination."<sup>71</sup> Furthermore, "The decision to use breast MRI in high-risk patients should be made on an individual basis depending on the complexity of the clinical scenario."<sup>70</sup>

## International Late Effects of Childhood Cancer Guideline Harmonization Group

The International Late Effects of Childhood Cancer Guideline Harmonization Group from 9 countries (2013) published evidence-based recommendations for breast cancer surveillance in female survivors of childhood, adolescent, and young adult cancer who received chest irradiation before age 30 years and have no genetic predisposition to breast cancer.<sup>72</sup> The authors found concordance among previous guidelines to initiate annual breast MRI exams beginning at age 25 or 8 years after radiation. Based on a systematic review of the literature to August 2011 and expert consensus, the authors recommended mammography, breast MRI, or both for surveillance (strong recommendation based on high-quality evidence with a low degree of uncertainty). The authors acknowledged that "no prospective studies have assessed the use of MRI screening in this population." The recommendation was therefore based on extrapolation of evidence from patients with hereditary risk for breast cancer.

## U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations

The U.S. Preventive Services Task **Force** (2016) updated its recommendations on breast cancer screening. The Task Force concluded the following on breast MRI<sup>73</sup>:

"... the current evidence is insufficient to assess the balance of benefits and harms of adjunctive screening for breast cancer using breast ultrasonography, magnetic resonance imaging, DBT [digital breast tomosynthesis], or other methods in women identified to have dense breasts on an otherwise negative screening mammogram."

## 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.

## REFERENCES

1. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). 510(k) Summary of Safety and Effectiveness: Access Breast Coil 4/SMS. 2006; [https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh\\_docs/pdf6/K060547.pdf](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf6/K060547.pdf). Accessed August 21, 2018.
2. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Magnetic resonance imaging of the breast in screening women considered to be at high genetic risk of breast cancer. TEC Assessments 2003;Volume 18:Tab 15.

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.

3. Kuhl CK, Schmutzler RK, Leutner CC, et al. Breast MR imaging screening in 192 women proved or suspected to be carriers of a breast cancer susceptibility gene: preliminary results. *Radiology*. Apr 2000;215(1):267-279. PMID 10751498.
4. Warner E, Plewes DB, Shumak RS, et al. Comparison of breast magnetic resonance imaging, mammography, and ultrasound for surveillance of women at high risk for hereditary breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. Aug 1 2001;19(15):3524-3531. PMID 11481359.
5. Warner E, Messersmith H, Causer P, et al. Systematic review: using magnetic resonance imaging to screen women at high risk for breast cancer. *Ann Intern Med*. May 6 2008;148(9):671-679. PMID 18458280.
6. Phi XA, Houssami N, Obdeijn IM, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging improves breast screening sensitivity in BRCA mutation carriers age  $\geq$  50 years: evidence from an individual patient data meta-analysis. *J Clin Oncol*. Feb 1 2015;33(4):349-356. PMID 25534390.
7. Phi XA, Houssami N, Hooning MJ, et al. Accuracy of screening women at familial risk of breast cancer without a known gene mutation: Individual patient data meta-analysis. *Eur J Cancer*. Nov 2017;85:31-38. PMID 28886475.
8. Nelson HD, Fu R, Cantor A, et al. Effectiveness of breast cancer screening: systematic review and meta-analysis to update the 2009 U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation. *Ann Intern Med*. Feb 16 2016;164(4):244-255. PMID 26756588.
9. Health Quality Ontario. Magnetic resonance imaging as an adjunct to mammography for breast cancer screening in women at less than high risk for breast cancer: a health technology assessment. *Ont Health Technol Assess Ser*. Dec 2016;16(20):1-30. PMID 27990198.
10. Kuhl CK, Strobel K, Bieling H, et al. Supplemental Breast MR Imaging Screening of Women with Average Risk of Breast Cancer. *Radiology*. May 2017;283(2):361-370. PMID 28221097.
11. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Breast magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) for detection or diagnosis of primary or recurrent breast cancer TEC Assessments. 2004;Volume 19:Tab 1.
12. Berg WA, Zhang Z, Lehrer D, et al. Detection of breast cancer with addition of annual screening ultrasound or a single screening MRI to mammography in women with elevated breast cancer risk. *JAMA*. Apr 4 2012;307(13):1394-1404. PMID 22474203.
13. Cho N, Han W, Han BK, et al. Breast cancer screening with mammography plus ultrasonography or magnetic resonance imaging in women 50 years or younger at diagnosis and treated with breast conservation therapy. *JAMA Oncol*. Nov 1 2017;3(11):1495-1502. PMID 28655029.
14. Kim EJ, Kang BJ, Kim SH, et al. Diagnostic performance of and breast tissue changes at early breast MR imaging surveillance in women after breast conservation therapy. *Radiology*. Sep 2017;284(3):656-666. PMID 28419815.
15. de Bresser J, de Vos B, van der Ent F, et al. Breast MRI in clinically and mammographically occult breast cancer presenting with an axillary metastasis: a systematic review. *Eur J Surg Oncol*. Feb 2010;36(2):114-119. PMID 19822403.
16. Lehman CD, Gatsonis C, Kuhl CK, et al. MRI evaluation of the contralateral breast in women with recently diagnosed breast cancer. *N Engl J Med*. Mar 29 2007;356(13):1295-1303. PMID 17392300.
17. Liberman L, Morris EA, Kim CM, et al. MR imaging findings in the contralateral breast of women with recently diagnosed breast cancer. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. Feb 2003;180(2):333-341. PMID 12540428.
18. Lehman CD, Blume JD, Thickman D, et al. Added cancer yield of MRI in screening the contralateral breast of women recently diagnosed with breast cancer: results from the International Breast Magnetic Resonance Consortium (IBMC) trial. *J Surg Oncol*. Oct 1 2005;92(1):9-15; discussion 15-16. PMID 16180217.
19. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Magnetic resonance imaging of the breast: differential diagnosis of a breast lesion. TEC Assessments. 2000;Volume 15:Tab 10.
20. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Magnetic resonance imaging of the breast: differential diagnosis of a breast lesion to avoid biopsy. TEC Assessments. 2001;Volume 16:Tab 15.
21. Medeiros LR, Duarte CS, Rosa DD, et al. Accuracy of magnetic resonance in suspicious breast lesions: a systematic quantitative review and meta-analysis. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. Apr 2011;126(2):273-285. PMID 21221772.

---

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.

22. Strobel K, Schrading S, Hansen NL, et al. Assessment of BI-RADS Category 4 lesions detected with screening mammography and screening US: utility of MR imaging. *Radiology*. Feb 2015;274(2):343-351. PMID 25271857.
23. Li E, Li J, Song Y, et al. A comparative study of the diagnostic value of contrast-enhanced breast MR imaging and mammography on patients with BI-RADS 3-5 microcalcifications. *PLoS One*. Nov 2014;9(11):e111217. PMID 25365327.
24. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Magnetic resonance imaging of the breast for preoperative evaluation in patients with localized breast cancer. *TEC Assessments*. 2004;Volume 19:Tab 8.
25. Houssami N, Ciatto S, Macaskill P, et al. Accuracy and surgical impact of magnetic resonance imaging in breast cancer staging: systematic review and meta-analysis in detection of multifocal and multicentric cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. Jul 1 2008;26(19):3248-3258. PMID 18474876.
26. Houssami N, Turner R, Morrow M. Preoperative magnetic resonance imaging in breast cancer: meta-analysis of surgical outcomes. *Ann Surg*. Feb 2013;257(2):249-255. PMID 23187751.
27. Houssami N, Turner RM, Morrow M. Meta-analysis of pre-operative magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and surgical treatment for breast cancer. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. Sep 2017;165(2):273-283. PMID 28589366.
28. Plana MN, Carreira C, Muriel A, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging in the preoperative assessment of patients with primary breast cancer: systematic review of diagnostic accuracy and meta-analysis. *Eur Radiol*. Jan 2012;22(1):26-38. PMID 21847541.
29. Houssami N, Turner R, Macaskill P, et al. An individual person data meta-analysis of preoperative magnetic resonance imaging and breast cancer recurrence. *J Clin Oncol*. Feb 10 2014;32(5):392-401. PMID 24395846.
30. Gonzalez V, Sandelin K, Karlsson A, et al. Preoperative MRI of the breast (POMB) influences primary treatment in breast cancer: a prospective, randomized, multicenter study. *World J Surg*. Jul 2014;38(7):1685-1693. PMID 24817517.
31. Peters NH, van Esser S, van den Bosch MA, et al. Preoperative MRI and surgical management in patients with nonpalpable breast cancer: the MONET - randomised controlled trial. *Eur J Cancer*. Apr 2011;47(6):879-886. PMID 21195605.
32. Turnbull L, Brown S, Harvey I, et al. Comparative effectiveness of MRI in breast cancer (COMICE) trial: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. Feb 13 2010;375(9714):563-571. PMID 20159292.
33. Bruck N, Koskivuo I, Bostrom P, et al. Preoperative magnetic resonance imaging in patients with stage I invasive ductal breast cancer: a prospective randomized study. *Scand J Surg*. Mar 2018;107(1):14-22. PMID 28401771.
34. Onega T, Zhu W, Weiss JE, et al. Preoperative breast MRI and mortality in older women with breast cancer. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. Jul 2018;170(1):149-157. PMID 29516372.
35. Fortune-Greeley AK, Wheeler SB, Meyer AM, et al. Preoperative breast MRI and surgical outcomes in elderly women with invasive ductal and lobular carcinoma: a population-based study. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. Jan 2014;143(1):203-212. PMID 24305978.
36. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Breast MRI for management of patients with locally advanced breast cancer who are being referred for neoadjuvant chemotherapy. *TEC Assessments*. 2004;Volume19:Tab 7.
37. Drew PJ, Kerin MJ, Mahapatra T, et al. Evaluation of response to neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for locally advanced breast cancer with dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI of the breast. *Eur J Surg Oncol*. Nov 2001;27(7):617-620. PMID 11669587.
38. Partridge SC, Gibbs JE, Lu Y, et al. Accuracy of MR imaging for revealing residual breast cancer in patients who have undergone neoadjuvant chemotherapy. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. Nov 2002;179(5):1193-1199. PMID 12388497.
39. Marinovich ML, Macaskill P, Irwig L, et al. Agreement between MRI and pathologic breast tumor size after neoadjuvant chemotherapy, and comparison with alternative tests: individual patient data meta-analysis. *BMC Cancer*. Oct 08 2015;15:662. PMID 26449630.
40. Lobbes MB, Prevos R, Smidt M, et al. The role of magnetic resonance imaging in assessing residual disease and pathologic complete response in breast cancer patients receiving neoadjuvant chemotherapy: a systematic review. *Insights Imaging*. Apr 2013;4(2):163-175. PMID 23359240.

---

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.

41. Morris EA, Schwartz LH, Drotman MB, et al. Evaluation of pectoralis major muscle in patients with posterior breast tumors on breast MR images: early experience. *Radiology*. Jan 2000;214(1):67-72. PMID 10644103.
42. Kerslake RW, Carleton PJ, Fox JN, et al. Dynamic gradient-echo and fat-suppressed spin-echo contrast-enhanced MRI of the breast. *Clin Radiol*. Jul 1995;50(7):440-454. PMID 7614789.
43. Rodenko GN, Harms SE, Pruneda JM, et al. MR imaging in the management before surgery of lobular carcinoma of the breast: correlation with pathology. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. Dec 1996;167(6):1415-1419. PMID 8956569.
44. de Lima Docema MF, Costa PA, de Andrade FE, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging-guided occult breast lesion localization and simultaneous sentinel lymph node mapping. *World J Surg Oncol*. Oct 23 2014;12:320. PMID 25341393.
45. Balu-Maestro C, Chapellier C, Bleuse A, et al. Imaging in evaluation of response to neoadjuvant breast cancer treatment benefits of MRI. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. Mar 2002;72(2):145-152. PMID 12038705.
46. Cheung YC, Chen SC, Su MY, et al. Monitoring the size and response of locally advanced breast cancers to neoadjuvant chemotherapy (weekly paclitaxel and epirubicin) with serial enhanced MRI. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. Mar 2003;78(1):51-58. PMID 12611457.
47. Rieber A, Brambs HJ, Gabelmann A, et al. Breast MRI for monitoring response of primary breast cancer to neo- adjuvant chemotherapy. *Eur Radiol*. Jul 2002;12(7):1711-1719. PMID 12111062.
48. Marinovich ML, Houssami N, Macaskill P, et al. Meta-analysis of magnetic resonance imaging in detecting residual breast cancer after neoadjuvant therapy. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. Mar 6 2013;105(5):321-333. PMID 23297042.
49. 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*. May 11 2018;40:106-115. PMID 29758503.
50. Nakatsukasa K, Ouchi Y, Sakaguchi K, et al. Dynamic Contrast-enhanced Magnetic Resonance Imaging for Patients with Breast Cancer Receiving First-line Bevacizumab and Paclitaxel. *Anticancer Res*. 2018 Sep;38(9):5459-5463. PMID: 30194203.
51. Hylton NM, Blume JD, Bernreuter WK, et al. Locally advanced breast cancer: MR imaging for prediction of response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy--results from ACRIN 6657/I-SPY Trial. *Radiology*. Jun 2012;263(3):663- 672. PMID 22623692.
52. Lee JM, Orel SG, Czerniecki BJ, et al. MRI before reexcision surgery in patients with breast cancer. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. Feb 2004;182(2):473-480. PMID 14736685.
53. Bedrosian I, Mick R, Orel SG, et al. Changes in the surgical management of patients with breast carcinoma based on preoperative magnetic resonance imaging. *Cancer*. Aug 1 2003;98(3):468-473. PMID 12879462.
54. Kawashima H, Tawara M, Suzuki M, et al. Effectiveness of dynamic MRI for diagnosing pericatricial minimal residual breast cancer following excisional biopsy. *Eur J Radiol*. Oct 2001;40(1):2-9. PMID 11673001.
55. Orel SG, Reynolds C, Schnall MD, et al. Breast carcinoma: MR imaging before re-excisional biopsy. *Radiology*. Nov 1997;205(2):429-436. PMID 9356624.
56. Weinstein SP, Orel SG, Heller R, et al. MR imaging of the breast in patients with invasive lobular carcinoma. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. Feb 2001;176(2):399-406. PMID 11159081.
57. Krammer J, Price ER, Jochelson MS, et al. Breast MR imaging for the assessment of residual disease following initial surgery for breast cancer with positive margins. *Eur Radiol*. May 31 2017;27(11):4812-4818. PMID 28567547.
58. Lee RK, Kim HJ, Lee J. Role of breast magnetic resonance imaging in predicting residual lobular carcinoma in situ after initial excision. *Asian J Surg*. May 2018;41(3):279-284. PMID 28286021.
59. Frei KA, Kinkel K, Bonel HM, et al. MR imaging of the breast in patients with positive margins after lumpectomy: influence of the time interval between lumpectomy and MR imaging. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. Dec 2000;175(6):1577-1584. PMID 11090379.

---

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.

60. Soderstrom CE, Harms SE, Farrell RS, Jr., et al. Detection with MR imaging of residual tumor in the breast soon after surgery. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* Feb 1997;168(2):485-488. PMID 9016232.
61. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology (NCCN guidelines): breast cancer. Version 2.2019. Updated July 2, 2019. Accessed July 10, 2019. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/breast.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/breast.pdf).
62. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology (NCCN guidelines): breast cancer screening and diagnosis. Version 1.2019. Updated May 17, 2019. Accessed July 10, 2019. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/breast-screening.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/breast-screening.pdf).
63. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology (NCCN guidelines): genetic/familial high-risk assessment: breast and ovarian. Version 3.2019. Updated January 18, 2019. Accessed July 10, 2019. [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/genetics\\_screening.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/genetics_screening.pdf).
64. American Cancer Society. Breast MRI Scans. 2017; <https://www.cancer.org/cancer/breast-cancer/screening-tests-and-early-detection/breast-mri-scans.html>. Accessed August 21, 2018.
65. American College of Radiology. Appropriateness criteria - breast cancer screening, revised 2017. <https://acsearch.acr.org/docs/70910/Narrative/>. Accessed July 11, 2018.
66. American College of Radiology. Appropriateness criteria - Palpable Breast Masses, revised 2016. <https://acsearch.acr.org/docs/69495/Narrative/>. Accessed July 11, 2018.
67. American College of Radiology. ACR Appropriateness Criteria - stage I breast cancer: initial workup and surveillance for local recurrence and distant metastases in asymptomatic women. Revised 2019. Accessed July 10, 2019. <https://acsearch.acr.org/docs/69496/Narrative/>.
68. American College of Radiology. Appropriateness criteria - Monitoring Response to Neoadjuvant Systemic Therapy for Breast Cancer, 2017. <https://acsearch.acr.org/docs/3099208/Narrative/>. Accessed July 11, 2018.
69. Monticciolo DL, Newell MS, Moy L, et al. Breast Cancer Screening in Women at Higher-Than-Average Risk: Recommendations From the ACR. *J Am Coll Radiol.* Mar 2018;15(3 Pt A):408-414. PMID 29371086.
70. Khatcheressian JL, Wolff AC, Smith TJ, et al. American Society of Clinical Oncology 2006 update of the breast cancer follow-up and management guidelines in the adjuvant setting. *J Clin Oncol.* Nov 1 2006;24(31):5091- 5097. PMID 17033037.
71. Khatcheressian JL, Hurley P, Bantug E, et al. Breast cancer follow-up and management after primary treatment: American Society of Clinical Oncology clinical practice guideline update. *J Clin Oncol.* Mar 1 2013;31(7):961-965. PMID 23129741.
72. Mulder RL, Kremer LC, Hudson MM, et al. Recommendations for breast cancer surveillance for female survivors of childhood, adolescent, and young adult cancer given chest radiation: a report from the International Late Effects of Childhood Cancer Guideline Harmonization Group. *Lancet Oncol.* Dec 2013;14(13):e621-629. PMID 24275135.
73. U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Final Recommendation Statement. Breast Cancer: Screening. 2016; <https://www.uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/Page/Document/RecommendationStatementFinal/breast-cancer-screening1>. Accessed July 21, 2018.

## **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>
December 2011	New policy	

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.

Date	Action	Description
June 2013	Replace policy	Rationale extensively written; References removed, references 8, 9, 18, 31, 44-46, 49 & 54 added. Policy statement amended to clarify that medically necessary statements refer to performing MRI of the breast with a breast coil and the use of contrast.
September 2014	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review; references 16, 21, 46-49, 56-57, 64-65, and 77-82 added; references 11, 13, and 26-27 updated. No change to policy statements.
September 2015	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through March 8, 2015; references 17, 33-34, 53, 70-74, 85-86, and 88-89 added. Policy statements unchanged.
March 2017	Archive policy	Policy updated with literature review through July 22, 2016. References 10, 15, 41, 49 and 81-82 added. For first policy statement, screening patients at high risk of breast cancer, risk level criteria moved to Policy Guidelines and updated with new NCCN criteria. Title changed to "Magnetic Resonance Imaging for Detection and Diagnosis of Breast Cancer". Policy archived.
December 2019	Reactivate policy	Policy updated with literature review through July 8, 2019; references added; references on NCCN updated. Policy statements unchanged. Policy reactivated for use with prior approval where applicable.

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.