Capital ✚

MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	GENE EXPRESSION PROFILING FOR CUTANEOUS MELANOMA
POLICY NUMBER	MP 2.396

CLINICAL BENEFIT	☐ MINIMIZE SAFETY RISK OR CONCERN.
	☒ MINIMIZE HARMFUL OR INEFFECTIVE INTERVENTIONS.
	☐ ASSURE APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF CARE.
	☐ ASSURE APPROPRIATE DURATION OF SERVICE FOR INTERVENTIONS.
	☐ ASSURE THAT RECOMMENDED MEDICAL PREREQUISITES HAVE BEEN MET.
	☐ ASSURE APPROPRIATE SITE OF TREATMENT OR SERVICE.
Effective Date:	**9/1/2025**

POLICY
RATIONALE
CODING INFORMATION

PRODUCT VARIATIONS
DEFINITIONS
REFERENCES

DESCRIPTION/BACKGROUND
DISCLAIMER
POLICY HISTORY

I. POLICY

Gene Expression Profiling for Cutaneous Melanoma

Gene expression testing, including but not limited to the Pigmented Lesion Assay, in the evaluation of patients with suspicious pigmented lesions is considered **investigational**.

Gene expression testing, including but not limited to the myPath Melanoma test, in the evaluation of patients with melanocytic lesions with indeterminate histopathologic features is considered **investigational**.

Gene expression testing, including but not limited to DecisionDx-Melanoma, in the evaluation of patients with cutaneous melanoma is considered **investigational** for all indications. There is insufficient evidence to support a general conclusion concerning the health outcomes or benefits associated with these procedures.

Policy Guidelines

Genetic Counseling
Experts recommend formal genetic counseling for patients who are at risk for inherited disorders and who wish to undergo genetic testing. Interpreting the results of genetic tests and understanding risk factors can be difficult for some patients; genetic counseling helps individuals understand the impact of genetic testing, including the possible effects the test results could have on the individual or their family members. It should be noted that genetic counseling may alter the utilization of genetic testing substantially and may reduce inappropriate testing; further, genetic counseling should be performed by an individual with experience and expertise in genetic medicine and genetic testing methods.

> ***Cross-References:***
> **MP 2.246 Genetic Testing for Familial Cutaneous Malignant Melanoma**
> **MP 2.277 Miscellaneous Genetic and Molecular Diagnostic Tests**

II. PRODUCT VARIATIONS   TOP

This policy is only applicable to certain programs and products administered by Capital Blue Cross and subject to benefit variations as discussed in Section VI. Please see additional information below.

FEP PPO - Refer to FEP Medical Policy Manual. The FEP Medical Policy manual can be found at: https://www.fepblue.org/benefit-plans/medical-policies-and-utilization-management-guidelines/medical-policies.

III. DESCRIPTION/BACKGROUND   TOP

Cutaneous Melanoma
Cutaneous melanoma accounts for more than 90% of cases of melanoma. For many decades, melanoma incidence was rapidly increasing in the United States. However, recent estimates have suggested the rise may be slowing. In 2018, more than 90,000 new cases of melanoma are expected to be diagnosed, and more than nine thousand people are expected to die of melanoma.

Risk Factors
Exposure to solar ultraviolet radiation is a major risk factor for melanoma. Most melanomas occur on the sun-exposed skin, particularly those areas most susceptible to sunburn. Likewise, features that are associated with an individual's sensitivity to sunlight, such as light skin pigmentation, red or blond hair, blue or green eyes, freckling tendency, and poor tanning ability are well-known risk factors for melanoma. There is also a strong association between high total body nevus counts and melanoma.

Several genes appear to contribute to melanoma predisposition such as tumor suppressor gene *CDKN2A*, melanocortin-1 receptor (*MC1R*) gene, and *BAP1* variants. Individuals with either familial or sporadic melanoma have a 2 to 3 times increased risk of developing a subsequent primary melanoma. Several occupational exposures and lifestyle factors, such as body mass index and smoking, have been evaluated as possible risk factors for melanoma.

Gene Expression Profiling
Gene expression profiling (GEP) measures the activity of thousands of genes simultaneously and creates a snapshot of cellular function. Data for GEP are generated by several molecular technologies including DNA microarrays that measures activity relative to previously identified genes and RNA-Seq that directly sequences and quantifies RNA molecules. Clinical applications of GEP include disease diagnosis, disease classification, prediction of drug response, and prognosis.

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. The Pigmented Lesion Assay, myPath Melanoma, and

DecisionDx-Melanoma tests are available 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.

IV. RATIONALE   TOP

Cutaneous Melanoma

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

For individuals with suspicious pigmented lesions (based on ABCDE and/or ugly duckling criteria) being considered for biopsy who receive gene expression profiling (GEP) with the DermTech Pigmented Lesion Assay to determine which lesions should proceed to biopsy, the evidence includes observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, validity, and resource utilization. The Pigmented Lesion Assay has one clinical validity study with many methodologic and reporting limitations. Therefore, performance characteristics are not well-characterized. Also, the test has not been compared with dermoscopy, another tool frequently used to make biopsy decisions. No direct evidence of clinical utility was identified. Given that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have melanocytic lesions with indeterminate histopathologic features who receive GEP with the myPath Melanoma test added to histopathology to aid in the diagnosis of melanoma, the evidence includes observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test validity, change in disease status, and treatment-related morbidity. The myPath test has two clinical validity studies including long-term follow-up for metastasis as the reference standard. In one study, it is not clear whether the study population included lesions that were indeterminate following histopathology. The second study focused on indeterminate lesions but had limitations including a retrospective design and less than 5-year follow-up in 31% of cases. Therefore, performance characteristics are not well-characterized. No direct evidence of clinical utility was identified. Given that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) stage I to III cutaneous melanoma who receive GEP with the DecisionDx-Melanoma test to inform management decisions regarding surveillance, the evidence includes retrospective and perspective observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test validity, change in disease status, resource utilization and treatment-related morbidity. The DecisionDx-Melanoma test has three independent clinical validity studies that have reported five-year recurrence-free survival (RFS) in AJCC stage I or II patients. Gerami et al (2015) reported RFS rates of 37 % in DecisionDx class 2 (high-risk) in patients in AJCC stage I and II patients combined. Zager et al (2018) reported RFS rates of 85% (95% confidence interval, 74% to 97%) for DecisionDx class 2 patients with AJCC stage I and 55% (95% confidence interval, 44% to

69%) for DecisionDx class 2 in AJCC stage II disease. RFS does not appear to be well characterized as evidenced by the variation in estimates across studies. This indication is to 'rule-in' patients for enhanced surveillance; therefore, specificity and positive predictive value (PPV) are key performance characteristics. Zager et al (2018) and Greenhaw et al (2018) the specificities were 71% and 87% respectively while the PPV were 48% and 24%, respectively. The PPV suggests that the majority of patients identified as high-risk by the DecisionDx test would not develop metastasis and would be unnecessarily subjected to additional surveillance. Greenhaw et al (2018) also reported that in 219 AJCC stage I patients, 201 had DecisionDx class 1 (low risk) scores and 18 had DecisionDx class 2 (high-risk) scores. The only metastasis in stage I patients occurred in a patient with a DecisionDx class 1 score. Therefore, none of their stage 1 patients benefited from DecisionDx testing but 18 (8%) were incorrectly identified as high-risk for metastasis and could have received unnecessary surveillance. Five-year RFS data are not available for the subgroup of patients for whom a 'rule-out' test would be relevant (class IIB through III). There is no evidence that changes to the frequency and methods for surveillance improve outcomes. Given that, the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance and there is no evidence that changes in surveillance improve outcomes, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with AJCC stage I or II cutaneous melanoma who receive GEP with the DecisionDx-Melanoma test to inform management decisions regarding adjuvant therapy, the evidence includes retrospective and prospective observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test validity, change in disease status, resource utilization and treatment-related morbidity. The DecisionDx-Melanoma test has three independent clinical validity studies that have reported 5-year RFS in AJCC stage I or II patients. Gerami et al (2015) reported RFS rates of 37% for DecisionDx class 2 (high-risk) in patients in AJCC stage I and II patients combined. Zager et al (2018) reported RFS rates of 85% (95% confidence interval, 74% to 97%) for DecisionDx class 2 patients in AJCC stage 1 and 55% (95% confidence interval, 44% to 69%) for DecisionDx class 2 in AJCC stage II disease. RFS does not appear to be well-characterized as evidenced by the variation in estimates across studies. This indication is to 'rule-in' patients for adjuvant therapy; therefore, specificity and PPV are key performance characteristics. In Zager et al (2018) and Greenhaw et al (2018) the specificities were 71% and 87% respectively while the PPV were 48% and 24%, respectively. The PPV suggests that the majority of patients identified as high-risk by the DecisionDx test would not develop metastasis and would be unnecessarily subjected to additional treatment. Greenhaw et al (2018) also reported that in 219 AJCC stage I patients, 201 had DecisionDx class 1 (low risk) scores and 18 had DecisionDx class 2 (high-risk) scores. The only metastasis in stage I patients occurred in a patient with a DecisionDx class 1 score. Therefore, none of their stage 1 patients benefited from DecisionDx testing but 18 (8%) were incorrectly identified as high-risk for metastasis and could have received unnecessary treatment. There is no evidence that adjuvant therapy improves outcomes in these patients. Given that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance and there is no evidence that adjuvant therapy improves outcomes, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

POLICY TITLE	GENE EXPRESSION PROFILING FOR CUTANEOUS MELANOMA
POLICY NUMBER	MP 2.396

For individuals with stage, I or II cutaneous melanoma with clinically negative sentinel node basins who are being considered for sentinel lymph node (SLN) biopsy who receive GEP with the DecisionDx-Melanoma test to determine whether to perform SLN biopsy, the evidence includes retrospective observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test validity, change in disease status, resource utilization and treatment-related morbidity. The DecisionDx-Melanoma test has three independent clinical validity studies that have reported 5-year RFS in AJCC stage I or II patients. Gerami et al (2015) reported RFS rates of 98% in DecisionDx class 1 (low risk) without confidence intervals, in AJCC stage I or II patients. Zager et al (2017) reported RFS rates of 96% (95% confidence interval, 94% to 99%) for DecisionDx class 1 in patients with AJCC stage I disease; they also reported RFS rates of 74% (95% confidence interval, 60% to 91%) for DecisionDx class 1 in patients with AJCC stage II disease. Although confidence intervals were not available for the first study, RFS does not appear to be well-characterized as evidenced by the variation in estimates across studies. Zager et al (2017) also reported that in fifty-six patients who were DecisionDx class 1 (low-risk) but SLN biopay-positive, twenty-two recurrences (39%) occurred over 5 years. If the DecisionDx test were used as a triage for SLN biopsy, these patients would not undergo SLN biopsy and would likely not receive adjuvant therapy, which has shown to be effective at prolonging time to recurrence in node-positive patients. Data on 5-year RFS is not available for the target population (Class 1A patients ≤55 years old who have tumors less than 2 mm deep [T1-T2]) outside of the retrospective cohort that was used to identify the target population. No direct evidence of clinical utility was identified. Given that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

V. DEFINITIONS   **TOP**

NA

VI. DISCLAIMER   **TOP**

Capital Blue Cross' medical policies are used to determine coverage for specific medical technologies, procedures, equipment, and services. These medical policies do not constitute medical advice and are subject to change as required by law or applicable clinical evidence from independent treatment guidelines. Treating providers are solely responsible for medical advice and treatment of members. These polices are not a guarantee of coverage or payment. Payment of claims is subject to a determination regarding the member's benefit program and eligibility on the date of service, and a determination that the services are medically necessary and appropriate. Final processing of a claim is based upon the terms of contract that applies to the members' benefit program, including benefit limitations and exclusions. If a provider or a member has a question concerning this medical policy, please contact Capital Blue Cross' Provider Services or Member Services.

VII. **CODING INFORMATION** **TOP**

Note: This list of codes may not be all-inclusive, and codes are subject to change at any time. The identification of a code in this section does not denote coverage as coverage is determined by the terms of member benefit information. In addition, not all covered services are eligible for separate reimbursement.

Investigational, therefore not covered for CUTANEOUS melanoma:

Procedure Codes							
0089U	0090U	0314U	0490U	81529			

VIII. **REFERENCES** **TOP**

1. Chang AE, Karnell LH, Menck HR. The National Cancer Data Base report on cutaneous and noncutaneous melanoma: a summary of 84,836 cases from the past decade. The American College of Surgeons Commission on Cancer and the American Cancer Society. Cancer. Oct 15 1998; 83(8): 1664-78. PMID 9781962
2. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2018. CA Cancer J Clin. Jan 2018; 68(1): 7-30. PMID 29313949
3. Gilchrest BA, Eller MS, Geller AC, et al. The pathogenesis of melanoma induced by ultraviolet radiation. N Engl J Med. Apr 29 1999; 340(17): 1341-8. PMID 10219070
4. Gandini S, Sera F, Cattaruzza MS, et al. Meta-analysis of risk factors for cutaneous melanoma: III. Family history, actinic damage and phenotypic factors. Eur J Cancer. Sep 2005; 41(14): 2040-59. PMID 16125929
5. Caini S, Gandini S, Sera F, et al. Meta-analysis of risk factors for cutaneous melanoma according to anatomical site and clinico-pathological variant. Eur J Cancer. Nov 2009; 45(17): 3054-63. PMID 19545997
6. Goldstein AM, Chan M, Harland M, et al. Features associated with germline CDKN2A mutations: a GenoMEL study of melanoma-prone families from three continents. J Med Genet. Feb 2007; 44(2): 99-106. PMID 16905682
7. Wendt J, Rauscher S, Burgstaller-Muehlbacher S, et al. Human Determinants and the Role of Melanocortin-1 Receptor Variants in Melanoma Risk Independent of UV Radiation Exposure. JAMA Dermatol. Jul 01 2016; 152(7): 776-82. PMID 27050141
8. Wiesner T, Obenauf AC, Murali R, et al. Germline mutations in BAP1 predispose to melanocytic tumors. Nat Genet. Aug 28 2011; 43(10): 1018-21. PMID 21874003
9. Chen T, Fallah M, Försti A, et al. Risk of Next Melanoma in Patients With Familial and Sporadic Melanoma by Number of Previous Melanomas. JAMA Dermatol. Jun 2015; 151(6): 607-15. PMID 25671687
10. Jiang AJ, Rambhatla PV, Eide MJ. Socioeconomic and lifestyle factors and melanoma: a systematic review. Br J Dermatol. Apr 2015; 172(4): 885-915. PMID 25354495
11. Abbasi NR, Shaw HM, Rigel DS, et al. Early diagnosis of cutaneous melanoma: revisiting the ABCD criteria. JAMA. Dec 08 2004; 292(22): 2771-6. PMID 15585738
12. Grob JJ, Bonerandi JJ. The 'ugly duckling' sign: identification of the common characteristics of nevi in an individual as a basis for melanoma screening. Arch Dermatol. Jan 1998; 134(1): 103-4. PMID 9449921

13. *Wilson RL, Yentzer BA, Isom SP, et al. How good are US dermatologists at discriminating skin cancers? A number-needed-to-treat analysis. J Dermatolog Treat. Feb 2012; 23(1): 65-9. PMID 21756146*

14. *National Center for Biotechnology Information. PRAME preferentially expressed antigen in melanoma. 2021; https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/gene/23532. Accessed March 21, 2024.*

15. *DermTech. Pigmented Lesion Assay: Non-invasive gene expression analysis of pigmented skin lesions. Performance and Development Notes. 2015*

16. *Wachsman W, Morhenn V, Palmer T, et al. Noninvasive genomic detection of melanoma. Br J Dermatol. Apr 2011; 164(4): 797-806. PMID 21294715*

17. *Gerami P, Alsobrook JP, Palmer TJ, et al. Development of a novel noninvasive adhesive patch test for the evaluation of pigmented lesions of the skin. J Am Acad Dermatol. Aug 2014; 71(2): 237-44. PMID 24906614*

18. *Gerami P, Yao Z, Polsky D, et al. Development and validation of a noninvasive 2-gene molecular assay for cutaneous melanoma. J Am Acad Dermatol. Jan 2017; 76(1): 114-120.e2. PMID 27707590*

19. *Vestergaard ME, Macaskill P, Holt PE, et al. Dermoscopy compared with naked eye examination for the diagnosis of primary melanoma: a meta-analysis of studies performed in a clinical setting. Br J Dermatol. Sep 2008; 159(3): 669-76. PMID 18616769*

20. *Murzaku EC, Hayan S, Rao BK. Methods and rates of dermoscopy usage: a cross-sectional survey of US dermatologists stratified by years in practice. J Am Acad Dermatol. Aug 2014; 71(2): 393-5. PMID 25037790*

21. *Engasser HC, Warshaw EM. Dermatoscopy use by US dermatologists: a cross-sectional survey. J Am Acad Dermatol. Sep 2010; 63(3): 412-9, 419.e1-2. PMID 20619490*

22. *Bossuyt PM, Irwig L, Craig J, et al. Comparative accuracy: assessing new tests against existing diagnostic pathways. BMJ. May 06 2006; 332(7549): 1089-92. PMID 16675820*

23. *Ferris LK, Gerami P, Skelsey MK, et al. Real-world performance and utility of a noninvasive gene expression assay to evaluate melanoma risk in pigmented lesions. Melanoma Res. Oct 2018; 28(5): 478-482. PMID 30004988*

24. *Ferris LK, Jansen B, Ho J, et al. Utility of a Noninvasive 2-Gene Molecular Assay for Cutaneous Melanoma and Effect on the Decision to Biopsy. JAMA Dermatol. Jul 01 2017; 153(7): 675-680. PMID 28445578*

25. *Bass J, Hill H, Jaworsky C. Significant discordance in DermTech test results when paired with histopathology: Caveat emptor. J Am Acad Dermatol. Nov 2023; 89(5): 1039-1041. PMID 37549792*

26. *Clarke LE, Warf MB, Flake DD, et al. Clinical validation of a gene expression signature that differentiates benign nevi from malignant melanoma. J Cutan Pathol. Apr 2015; 42(4): 244-52. PMID 25727210*

27. *Clarke LE, Flake DD, Busam K, et al. An independent validation of a gene expression signature to differentiate malignant melanoma from benign melanocytic nevi. Cancer. Feb 15 2017; 123(4): 617-628. PMID 27768230*

28. *Reimann JDR, Salim S, Velazquez EF, et al. Comparison of melanoma gene expression score with histopathology, fluorescence in situ hybridization, and SNP array for the classification of melanocytic neoplasms. Mod Pathol. Nov 2018; 31(11): 1733-1743. PMID 29955141*

29. *Gaiser T, Kutzner H, Palmedo G, et al. Classifying ambiguous melanocytic lesions with FISH and correlation with clinical long-term follow up. Mod Pathol. Mar 2010; 23(3): 413-9. PMID 20081813*

30. *Vergier B, Prochazkova-Carlotti M, de la Fouchardière A, et al. Fluorescence in situ hybridization, a diagnostic aid in ambiguous melanocytic tumors: European study of 113 cases. Mod Pathol. May 2011; 24(5): 613-23. PMID 21151100*

31. *Ko JS, Clarke LE, Minca EC, et al. Correlation of melanoma gene expression score with clinical outcomes on a series of melanocytic lesions. Hum Pathol. Apr 2019; 86: 213-221. PMID 30566894*

32. *Clarke LE, Pimentel JD, Zalaznick H, et al. Gene expression signature as an ancillary method in the diagnosis of desmoplastic melanoma. Hum Pathol. Dec 2017; 70: 113-120. PMID 29079183*

33. *Minca EC, Al-Rohil RN, Wang M, et al. Comparison between melanoma gene expression score and fluorescence in situ hybridization for the classification of melanocytic lesions. Mod Pathol. Aug 2016; 29(8): 832-43. PMID 27174586*

34. *Boothby-Shoemaker W, Guan L, Jones B, et al. Real world validation of an adjunctive gene expression-profiling assay for melanoma diagnosis and correlation with clinical outcomes at an academic center. Hum Pathol. Sep 2023; 139: 73-79. PMID 37423481*

35. *Ko JS, Matharoo-Ball B, Billings SD, et al. Diagnostic Distinction of Malignant Melanoma and Benign Nevi by a Gene Expression Signature and Correlation to Clinical Outcomes. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. Jul 2017; 26(7): 1107-1113. PMID 28377414*

36. *Clarke LE, Mabey B, Flake Ii DD, et al. Clinical validity of a gene expression signature in diagnostically uncertain neoplasms. Per Med. Sep 2020; 17(5): 361-371. PMID 32915688*

37. *Cockerell C, Tschen J, Billings SD, et al. The influence of a gene-expression signature on the treatment of diagnostically challenging melanocytic lesions. Per Med. Mar 2017; 14(2): 123-130. PMID 28757886*

38. *Cockerell CJ, Tschen J, Evans B, et al. The influence of a gene expression signature on the diagnosis and recommended treatment of melanocytic tumors by dermatopathologists. Medicine (Baltimore). Oct 2016; 95(40): e4887. PMID 27749545*

39. *Gershenwald JES, R.A.; Hess, K.R.; et al. Melanoma of the Skin. Chicago, IL: American Joint Committee on Cancer; 2017.*

40. *Eggermont AM, Chiarion-Sileni V, Grob JJ, et al. Prolonged Survival in Stage III Melanoma with Ipilimumab Adjuvant Therapy. N Engl J Med. Nov 10 2016; 375(19): 1845-1855. PMID 27717298*

41. *Weber J, Mandala M, Del Vecchio M, et al. Adjuvant Nivolumab versus Ipilimumab in Resected Stage III or IV Melanoma. N Engl J Med. Nov 09 2017; 377(19): 1824-1835. PMID 28891423*

42. *Long GV, Hauschild A, Santinami M, et al. Adjuvant Dabrafenib plus Trametinib in Stage III BRAF-Mutated Melanoma. N Engl J Med. Nov 09 2017; 377(19): 1813-1823. PMID 28891408*

43. *Gerami P, Cook RW, Wilkinson J, et al. Development of a prognostic genetic signature to predict the metastatic risk associated with cutaneous melanoma. Clin Cancer Res. Jan 01 2015; 21(1): 175-83. PMID 25564571*

44. *Zager JS, Gastman BR, Leachman S, et al. Performance of a prognostic 31-gene expression profile in an independent cohort of 523 cutaneous melanoma patients. BMC Cancer. Feb 05 2018; 18(1): 130. PMID 29402264*

45. *Wrightson WR, Wong SL, Edwards MJ, et al. Complications associated with sentinel lymph node biopsy for melanoma. Ann Surg Oncol. Jul 2003; 10(6): 676-80. PMID 12839853*

46. *Soong SJ, Ding S, Coit DG, et al. AJCC: Individualized melanoma patient outcome prediction tools. n.d*

47. *Callender GG, Gershenwald JE, Egger ME, et al. A novel and accurate computer model of melanoma prognosis for patients staged by sentinel lymph node biopsy: comparison with the American Joint Committee on Cancer model. J Am Coll Surg. Apr 2012; 214(4): 608-17; discussion 617-9. PMID 22342785*

48. *Dicker TJ, Kavanagh GM, Herd RM, et al. A rational approach to melanoma follow-up in patients with primary cutaneous melanoma. Scottish Melanoma Group. Br J Dermatol. Feb 1999; 140(2): 249-54. PMID 10233217*

49. *Garbe C, Paul A, Kohler-Späth H, et al. Prospective evaluation of a follow-up schedule in cutaneous melanoma patients: recommendations for an effective follow-up strategy. J Clin Oncol. Feb 01 2003; 21(3): 520-9. PMID 12560444*

50. *Faries MB, Steen S, Ye X, et al. Late recurrence in melanoma: clinical implications of lost dormancy. J Am Coll Surg. Jul 2013; 217(1): 27-34; discussion 34-6. PMID 23643694*

51. *Hsueh EC, DeBloom JR, Lee J, et al. Interim analysis of survival in a prospective, multi-center registry cohort of cutaneous melanoma tested with a prognostic 31-gene expression profile test. J Hematol Oncol. Aug 29 2017; 10(1): 152. PMID 28851416*

52. *Podlipnik S, Carrera C, Boada A, et al. Early outcome of a 31-gene expression profile test in 86 AJCC stage IB-II melanoma patients. A prospective multicentre cohort study. J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol. May 2019; 33(5): 857-862. PMID 30702163*

53. *Hsueh EC, DeBloom JR, Lee JH, et al. Long-Term Outcomes in a Multicenter, Prospective Cohort Evaluating the Prognostic 31-Gene Expression Profile for Cutaneous Melanoma. JCO Precis Oncol. 2021; 5. PMID 34036233*

54. *Bailey CN, Martin BJ, Petkov VI, et al. 31-Gene Expression Profile Testing in Cutaneous Melanoma and Survival Outcomes in a Population-Based Analysis: A SEER Collaboration. JCO Precis Oncol. Jun 2023; 7: e2300044. PMID 37384864*

55. *Gastman BR, Gerami P, Kurley SJ, et al. Identification of patients at risk of metastasis using a prognostic 31-gene expression profile in subpopulations of melanoma patients with favorable outcomes by standard criteria. J Am Acad Dermatol. Jan 2019; 80(1): 149-157.e4. PMID 30081113*

56. *Gastman BR, Zager JS, Messina JL, et al. Performance of a 31-gene expression profile test in cutaneous melanomas of the head and neck. Head Neck. Apr 2019; 41(4): 871-879. PMID 30694001*

57. *Vetto JT, Hsueh EC, Gastman BR, et al. Guidance of sentinel lymph node biopsy decisions in patients with T1-T2 melanoma using gene expression profiling. Future Oncol. Apr 2019; 15(11): 1207-1217. PMID 30691297*

58. *Marks, Etan et al. Establishing an evidence-based decision point for clinical use of the 31-gene expression profile test in cutaneous melanoma. SKIN The Journal of Cutaneous Medicine, [S.l.], July 2019, v. 3, n. 4, p. 239-249.*

59. *Greenhaw BN, Zitelli JA, Brodland DG. Estimation of Prognosis in Invasive Cutaneous Melanoma: An Independent Study of the Accuracy of a Gene Expression Profile Test. Dermatol Surg. Dec 2018; 44(12): 1494-1500. PMID 29994951*

60. *Keller J, Schwartz TL, Lizalek JM, et al. Prospective validation of the prognostic 31-gene expression profiling test in primary cutaneous melanoma. Cancer Med. May 2019; 8(5): 2205-2212. PMID 30950242*

61. *Gerami P, Cook RW, Russell MC, et al. Gene expression profiling for molecular staging of cutaneous melanoma in patients undergoing sentinel lymph node biopsy. J Am Acad Dermatol. May 2015; 72(5): 780-5.e3. PMID 25748297*

62. *Ferris LK, Farberg AS, Middlebrook B, et al. Identification of high-risk cutaneous melanoma tumors is improved when combining the online American Joint Committee on Cancer Individualized Melanoma Patient Outcome Prediction Tool with a 31-gene expression profile-based classification. J Am Acad Dermatol. May 2017; 76(5): 818-825.e3. PMID 28110997*

63. *Berger AC, Davidson RS, Poitras JK, et al. Clinical impact of a 31-gene expression profile test for cutaneous melanoma in 156 prospectively and consecutively tested patients. Curr Med Res Opin. Sep 2016; 32(9): 1599-604. PMID 27210115*

64. *Farberg AS, Glazer AM, White R, et al. Impact of a 31-gene Expression Profiling Test for Cutaneous Melanoma on Dermatologists' Clinical Management Decisions. J Drugs Dermatol. May 01 2017; 16(5): 428-431. PMID 28628677*

65. *Schuitevoerder D, Heath M, Cook RW, et al. Impact of Gene Expression Profiling on Decision-Making in Clinically Node Negative Melanoma Patients after Surgical Staging. J Drugs Dermatol. Feb 01 2018; 17(2): 196-199. PMID 29462228*

66. *Dillon LD, Gadzia JE, Davidson RS, et al. Prospective, multicenter clinical impact evaluation of a 31-gene expression profile test for management of melanoma patients. Skin. 2018;2(2):111-121.*

67. *Hyams DM, Covington KR, Johnson CE, et al. Integrating the melanoma 31-gene expression profile test with surgical oncology practice within national guideline and staging recommendations. Future Oncol. Feb 2021; 17(5): 517-527. PMID 33021104*

68. *Dillon LD, McPhee M, Davidson RS, et al. Expanded evidence that the 31-gene expression profile test provides clinical utility for melanoma management in a multicenter study. Curr Med Res Opin. Aug 2022; 38(8): 1267-1274. PMID 35081854*

69. *Swetter SM, Tsao H, Bichakjian CK, et al. Guidelines of care for the management of primary cutaneous melanoma. J Am Acad Dermatol. Jan 2019; 80(1): 208-250. PMID 30392755*

70. *American Academy of Dermatology. Choosing Wisely.*

71. *National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Cutaneous Melanoma. Version 1.2024.*

72. *Berman, et.al. Appropriate Use Criteria for the Integration of Diagnostic and Prognostic Gene Expression Profile Assays into the Management of Cutaneous Malignant Melanoma: An Expert Panel Consensus-Based Modified Delphi Process Assessment. SKIN. 2019; 3(5):291-298.*

73. *Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Medical Policy Reference Manual. 2.04.146 Gene Expression Profiling for Cutaneous Melanoma. February 2025*

POLICY TITLE	GENE EXPRESSION PROFILING FOR CUTANEOUS MELANOMA
POLICY NUMBER	MP 2.396

IX. POLICY HISTORY

MP 2.396	**02/19/2025 New Policy**. Adopting BCBSA Policy. Gene expression profiling for cutaneous melanoma is investigational. Coding added. Previously on MP 2.360.
	06/30/2025 Administrative Update. Removed Benefit Variations Section and updated Disclaimer.