MEDICAL POLICY

POLICY TITLE	MULTIMARKER SERUM TESTING RELATED TO OVARIAN CANCER
POLICY NUMBER	MP 2.270

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:	**1/1/2025**

I. POLICY

All uses of the OVA1®, Overa®, OvaWatch℠, and ROMA™ tests are **investigational,** including but not limited to:

- Preoperative evaluation of adnexal masses to triage for malignancy; or
- Screening for ovarian cancer; or
- Selecting individuals for surgery for an adnexal mass; or
- Evaluation of individuals with clinical or radiologic evidence of malignancy; or
- Evaluation of individuals with nonspecific signs or symptoms suggesting possible malignancy; or
- Postoperative testing and monitoring to assess surgical outcome and/or to detect recurrent malignant disease following treatment.

There is insufficient evidence to support a general conclusion concerning the health outcomes or benefits associated with this procedure for these indications.

Policy Guidelines

OVA1®, Overa®, OvaWatch℠, and ROMA™ tests are combinations of several separate lab tests and involve a proprietary algorithm for determining risk (i.e., what the American Medical Association's CPT calls multianalyte assays with algorithmic analyses [MAAAs]).

Cross-reference:
MP 2.269 Serum Biomarkers for Human Epididymis Protein 4 (HE4)

II. PRODUCT VARIATIONS

TOP

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

Epithelial Ovarian Cancer

The term *epithelial ovarian cancer* collectively includes high-grade serous epithelial ovarian, fallopian tubal, and peritoneal carcinomas due to their shared pathogenesis, clinical presentation, and treatment. We use epithelial ovarian cancer to refer to this group of malignancies in the discussion that follows. There is currently no serum biomarker that can distinguish between these types of carcinomas. An estimated 19,710 women in the United States were estimated to be diagnosed with ovarian cancer in 2023, and approximately 13,270 were expected to die of the disease. The mortality rate depends on 3 variables: (1) patient characteristics; (2) tumor biology (grade, stage, type); and (3) treatment quality (nature of staging, surgery, and chemotherapy used). In particular, comprehensive staging and completeness of tumor resection appear to have a positive impact on patient outcome. Racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic disparities in management and outcomes are prominent in patients with ovarian cancer. Compared to non-Hispanic White and Asian patients, Hispanic and non-Hispanic Black patients are more likely to be diagnosed with advanced disease and are less likely to undergo optimal primary surgery and adjuvant chemotherapy. Patients with ovarian cancer from racial and ethnic minorities are also less likely to be enrolled in clinical trials. These are among the contributing factors to worsened overall survival among these racial and ethnic groups. Patients with impediments to access healthcare (e.g., those living in underserved areas, with low household income, and/or who are underinsured or uninsured), which frequently intersect with racial and ethnic determinants, also experience longer time to diagnosis, suboptimal treatment, and worse outcomes.

Adult women presenting with an adnexal mass have an estimated 68% likelihood of having a benign lesion. About 6% of women with masses have borderline tumors; 22% possess invasive malignant lesions, and 3% have metastatic disease. Surgery is the only way to diagnose ovarian cancer; this is because biopsy of an ovary with suspected ovarian cancer is usually not performed due to the risk of spreading cancer cells. Most clinicians agree that women with masses that have a high likelihood of malignancy should undergo surgical staging by a gynecologic oncologist. However, women with clearly benign masses do *not* require a referral to see a specialist. Therefore, criteria and tests that help differentiate benign from malignant pelvic masses are desirable.

In 2016, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists updated a practice bulletin that addressed criteria for referring women with adnexal masses to gynecologic oncologists.

Separate criteria were developed for premenopausal and postmenopausal women because the specificity and positive predictive value of cancer antigen 125 (CA 125) are higher in postmenopausal women. Prior guidance, which was based on expert opinion, recommended a CA 125 >200 U/mL for referring premenopausal women with an adnexal mass to a gynecologic oncologist. The current guidance advises using very elevated CA 125 levels with other clinical factors such as ultrasound findings, ascites, a nodular or fixed pelvic mass, or evidence of abdominal or distant metastasis for referral. The referral criteria for postmenopausal women are similar, except that a lower threshold for an elevated CA 125 test is used (35 U/mL). The practice bulletin states that serum biomarker panels are alternatives to CA 125 levels when deciding about a gynecologic oncologist referral.

Three multimarker serum-based tests specific to ovarian cancer have been cleared by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) with the intended use of triaging patients with adnexal masses (see Regulatory Status section). The proposed use of the tests is to identify women with a substantial likelihood of malignant disease who may benefit from referral to a gynecologic oncology specialist. Patients with positive results may be considered candidates for referral to a gynecologic oncologist for treatment. The tests have been developed and evaluated only in patients with adnexal masses and planned surgeries. Other potential uses, such as selecting patients to have surgery, screening asymptomatic patients, and monitoring treatment, have not been investigated. Furthermore, the tests are not intended to be used as stand-alone tests, but in conjunction with clinical assessment.

Regulatory Status

In July 2009, the OVA1® test (Aspira Labs [Austin, TX]) was cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process. OVA1® was designed as a tool to further assess the likelihood that malignancy is present when the physician's independent clinical and radiologic evaluation does not indicate malignancy.

In September 2011, the Risk of Ovarian Malignancy Algorithm (ROMA™ test; Fujirebio Diagnostics [Sequin, TX]) was cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process. The intended use of ROMA™ is as an aid, in conjunction with clinical assessment, in assessing whether a premenopausal or postmenopausal woman who presents with an ovarian adnexal mass is at high or low likelihood of finding malignancy on surgery.

In March 2016, a second-generation test called Overa™ (also referred as next-generation OVA1®), in which 2 of the 5 biomarkers in OVA1® are replaced with human epididymis secretory protein 4 and follicle stimulating hormone, was cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process. Similar to OVA1®, Overa™ generates a low or high risk of malignancy on a scale from 0 to 10.

In December 2022, Aspira Women's Health introduced OvaWatch℠. This test is intended for use in assessing the risk of ovarian cancer for women with adnexal masses that have been considered indeterminate or benign in initial clinical assessment. The OvaWatch℠ test has not been FDA approved.

Black Box Warning

In December 2011, the FDA amended its regulation for classifying ovarian adnexal mass assessment score test systems. The change required that off-label risks be highlighted using a black box warning. The warning is intended to mitigate the risk to health associated with off-label use as a screening test, stand-alone diagnostic test, or as a test to determine whether to proceed with surgery. Considering the history and currently unmet medical needs for ovarian cancer testing, the FDA concluded that there is a risk of off-label use of this device. To address this risk, the FDA requires that manufacturers provide notice concerning the risks of off-label uses in the labeling, advertising, and promotional material of ovarian adnexal mass assessment score test systems. Manufacturers must address the following risks:

- Women without adnexal pelvic masses (i.e., for cancer "screening") are not part of the intended use population for the ovarian adnexal mass assessment score test systems. Public health risks associated with false-positive results for ovarian cancer screening tests are well described in the medical literature and include morbidity or mortality associated with unneeded testing and surgery. The risk from false-negative screening results also includes morbidity and mortality due to failure to detect and treat ovarian malignancy.
- Analogous risks, adjusted for prevalence and types of disease, arise if test results are used to determine the need for surgery in patients who are known to have ovarian adnexal masses.
- If used outside the "OR" rule that is described in this special control guidance, results from ovarian adnexal mass assessment score test systems pose a risk for morbidity and mortality due to nonreferral for oncologic evaluation and treatment.

IV. RATIONALE

TOP

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

For individuals who have adnexal mass(es) undergoing surgery for possible ovarian cancer who receive multimarker serum testing with clinical assessment preoperatively to assess ovarian cancer risk, the evidence includes studies assessing the technical performance and diagnostic accuracy. Relevant outcomes are overall survival and test accuracy. OVA1 and Overa are intended for use in patients for whom clinical assessment does not indicate cancer. When used in this manner, sensitivity for ovarian malignancy was 92% and specificity was 42% with OVA1; with Overa, sensitivity was 94% and specificity was 65%. ROMA is intended for use with clinical assessment, but no specific method has been defined. One study, which used clinical assessment and ROMA results, showed a sensitivity of 90% and specificity of 67%. However, the National Comprehensive Cancer Network guidelines recommend (category 1) that all patients undergoing surgery should undergo surgery by an experienced gynecologic oncologist. Given the National Comprehensive Cancer Network recommendation, direct evidence will be required to demonstrate that the use of U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) cleared multimarker serum testing to inform decisions regarding referral to a gynecologic oncology specialist for surgery has clinical usefulness. Direct evidence of clinical usefulness is provided by studies that have compared health outcomes for patients managed with and without the FDA cleared multimarker serum testing. Because these are intervention studies, the preferred

evidence would be from randomized controlled trials. No trials were identified that have evaluated whether referral based on FDA cleared multimarker serum testing improves health outcomes. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

V. DEFINITIONS

TOP

N/A

VI. BENEFIT VARIATIONS

TOP

The existence of this medical policy does not mean that this service is a covered benefit under the member's health benefit plan. Benefit determinations should be based in all cases on the applicable health benefit plan language. Medical policies do not constitute a description of benefits. A member's health benefit plan governs which services are covered, which are excluded, which are subject to benefit limits, and which require preauthorization. There are different benefit plan designs in each product administered by Capital Blue Cross. Members and providers should consult the member's health benefit plan for information or contact Capital Blue Cross for benefit information.

VII. DISCLAIMER

TOP

Capital Blue Cross' medical policies are developed to assist in administering a member's benefits, do not constitute medical advice and are subject to change. Treating providers are solely responsible for medical advice and treatment of members. Members should discuss any medical policy related to their coverage or condition with their provider and consult their benefit information to determine if the service is covered. If there is a discrepancy between this medical policy and a member's benefit information, the benefit information will govern. If a provider or a member has a question concerning the application of this medical policy to a specific member's plan of benefits, please contact Capital Blue Cross' Provider Services or Member Services. Capital Blue Cross considers the information contained in this medical policy to be proprietary and it may only be disseminated as permitted by law.

VIII. 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:

Procedure Codes								
81500	81503	0003U	0375U	0507U				

IX. REFERENCES

TOP

1. *Surveillance Epidemology and End Results (SEER) Program. SEER Stat Fact Sheets: Ovarian Cancer. n.d.; https://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/ovary.html. Accessed October 31, 2023.*
2. *du Bois A, Rochon J, Pfisterer J, et al. Variations in institutional infrastructure, physician specialization and experience, and outcome in ovarian cancer: a systematic review. Gynecol Oncol. Feb 2009; 112(2): 422-36. PMID 18990435*
3. *Matthews BJ, Qureshi MM, Fiascone SJ, et al. Racial disparities in non-recommendation of adjuvant chemotherapy in stage II-III ovarian cancer. Gynecol Oncol. Jan 2022; 164(1): 27-33. PMID 34785030*
4. *Zhang C, Zhang C, Wang Q, et al. Differences in Stage of Cancer at Diagnosis, Treatment, and Survival by Race and Ethnicity Among Leading Cancer Types. JAMA Netw Open. Apr 01 2020; 3(4): e202950. PMID 32267515*
5. *Joslin CE, Brewer KC, Davis FG, et al. The effect of neighborhood-level socioeconomic status on racial differences in ovarian cancer treatment in a population-based analysis in Chicago. Gynecol Oncol. Nov 2014; 135(2): 285-91. PMID 25173584*
6. *Mattei LH, Robb L, Banning K, et al. Enrollment of Individuals From Racial and Ethnic Minority Groups in Gynecologic Cancer Precision Oncology Trials. Obstet Gynecol. Oct 01 2022; 140(4): 654-661. PMID 36075065*
7. *Zhong P, Yang B, Pan F, et al. Temporal trends in Black-White disparities in cancer surgery and cancer-specific survival in the United States between 2007 and 2015. Cancer Med. Feb 2023; 12(3): 3509-3519. PMID 35968573*
8. *Ellis L, Canchola AJ, Spiegel D, et al. Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Cancer Survival: The Contribution of Tumor, Sociodemographic, Institutional, and Neighborhood Characteristics. J Clin Oncol. Jan 01 2018; 36(1): 25-33. PMID 29035642*
9. *Albright BB, Nasioudis D, Craig S, et al. Impact of Medicaid expansion on women with gynecologic cancer: a difference-in-difference analysis. Am J Obstet Gynecol. Feb 2021; 224(2): 195.e1-195.e17. PMID 32777264*
10. *Bodurtha Smith AJ, Applebaum J, Fader AN. Association of the Affordable Care Act's Medicaid Expansion With 1-Year Survival Among Patients With Ovarian Cancer. Obstet Gynecol. Jun 01 2022; 139(6): 1123-1129. PMID 35675609*
11. *Smick AH, Holbert M, Neff R. Association of Physician Densities and Gynecologic Cancer Outcomes in the United States. Obstet Gynecol. Nov 01 2022; 140(5): 751-757. PMID 36201771*
12. *Van Holsbeke C, Van Belle V, Leone FP, et al. Prospective external validation of the 'ovarian crescent sign' as a single ultrasound parameter to distinguish between benign and malignant adnexal pathology. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. Jul 2010; 36(1): 81-7. PMID 20217895*
13. *Eskander R, Berman M, Keder L. Practice Bulletin No. 174: Evaluation and Management of Adnexal Masses. Obstet Gynecol. Nov 2016; 128(5): e210-e226. PMID 27776072*
14. *Simmons AR, Clarke CH, Badgwell DB, et al. Validation of a Biomarker Panel and Longitudinal Biomarker Performance for Early Detection of Ovarian Cancer. Int J Gynecol Cancer. Jul 2016; 26(6): 1070-7. PMID 27206285*

15. *Yanaranop M, Tiyayon J, Siricharoenthai S, et al. Rajavithi-ovarian cancer predictive score (R-OPS): A new scoring system for predicting ovarian malignancy in women presenting with a pelvic mass. Gynecol Oncol. Jun 2016; 141(3): 479-484. PMID 26996662*
16. *Guidance for Industry and FDA Staff - Class II Special Controls Guidance Document: Ovarian Adnexal Mass Assessment Score Test System.*
17. *Fung ET. A recipe for proteomics diagnostic test development: the OVA1 test, from biomarker discovery to FDA clearance. Clin Chem. Feb 2010; 56(2): 327-9. PMID 20110452*
18. *U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). 510(k) Substantial Equivalence Determination Decision Summary: OVA1TM Test (K081754) n.d.*
19. *Grenache DG, Heichman KA, Werner TL, et al. Clinical performance of two multi-marker blood tests for predicting malignancy in women with an adnexal mass. Clin Chim Acta. Jan 01 2015; 438: 358-63. PMID 25283731*
20. *Bristow RE, Smith A, Zhang Z, et al. Ovarian malignancy risk stratification of the adnexal mass using a multivariate index assay. Gynecol Oncol. Feb 2013; 128(2): 252-9. PMID 23178277*
21. *Moore RG, Brown AK, Miller MC, et al. The use of multiple novel tumor biomarkers for the detection of ovarian carcinoma in patients with a pelvic mass. Gynecol Oncol. Feb 2008; 108(2): 402-8. PMID 18061248*
22. *Moore RG, Miller MC, Disilvestro P, et al. Evaluation of the diagnostic accuracy of the risk of ovarian malignancy algorithm in women with a pelvic mass. Obstet Gynecol. Aug 2011; 118(2 Pt 1): 280-288. PMID 21775843*
23. *Suri A, Perumal V, Ammalli P, et al. Diagnostic measures comparison for ovarian malignancy risk in Epithelial ovarian cancer patients: a meta-analysis. Sci Rep. Aug 27 2021; 11(1): 17308. PMID 34453074*
24. *Dayyani F, Uhlig S, Colson B, et al. Diagnostic Performance of Risk of Ovarian Malignancy Algorithm Against CA125 and HE4 in Connection With Ovarian Cancer: A Meta-analysis. Int J Gynecol Cancer. Nov 2016; 26(9): 1586-1593. PMID 27540691*
25. *Wang J, Gao J, Yao H, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of serum HE4, CA125 and ROMA in patients with ovarian cancer: a meta-analysis. Tumour Biol. Jun 2014; 35(6): 6127-38. PMID 24627132*
26. *Al Musalhi K, Al Kindi M, Al Aisary F, et al. Evaluation of HE4, CA-125, Risk of Ovarian Malignancy Algorithm (ROMA) and Risk of Malignancy Index (RMI) in the Preoperative Assessment of Patients with Adnexal Mass. Oman Med J. Sep 2016; 31(5): 336-44. PMID 27602187*
27. *Cho HY, Park SH, Park YH, et al. Comparison of HE4, CA125, and Risk of Ovarian Malignancy Algorithm in the Prediction of Ovarian Cancer in Korean Women. J Korean Med Sci. Dec 2015; 30(12): 1777-83. PMID 26713052*
28. *Terlikowska KM, Dobrzycka B, Witkowska AM, et al. Preoperative HE4, CA125 and ROMA in the differential diagnosis of benign and malignant adnexal masses. J Ovarian Res. Jul 19 2016; 9(1): 43. PMID 27436085*
29. *Shen Y, Zhao L, Lu S. Diagnostic performance of HE4 and ROMA among Chinese women. Clin Chim Acta. Jan 2020; 500: 42-46. PMID 31626761*
30. *Shin KH, Kim HH, Kwon BS, et al. Clinical Usefulness of Cancer Antigen (CA) 125, Human Epididymis 4, and CA72-4 Levels and Risk of Ovarian Malignancy Algorithm Values for*

Diagnosing Ovarian Tumors in Korean Patients With and Without Endometriosis. Ann Lab Med. Jan 2020; 40(1): 40-47. PMID 31432638

31. *Dunton C, Bullock RG, Fritsche H. Multivariate Index Assay Is Superior to CA125 and HE4 Testing in Detection of Ovarian Malignancy in African-American Women. Biomark Cancer. 2019; 11: 1179299X19853785. PMID 31236012*
32. *Han KH, Park NH, Kim JJ, et al. The power of the Risk of Ovarian Malignancy Algorithm considering menopausal status: a comparison with CA 125 and HE4. J Gynecol Oncol. Nov 2019; 30(6): e83. PMID 31576682*
33. *Carreras-Dieguez N, Glickman A, Munmany M, et al. Comparison of HE4, CA125, ROMA and CPH-I for Preoperative Assessment of Adnexal Tumors. Diagnostics (Basel). Jan 17 2022; 12(1). PMID 35054393*
34. *Chacón E, Dasí J, Caballero C, et al. Risk of Ovarian Malignancy Algorithm versus Risk Malignancy Index-I for Preoperative Assessment of Adnexal Masses: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Gynecol Obstet Invest. 2019; 84(6): 591-598. PMID 31311023*
35. *Davenport C, Rai N, Sharma P, et al. Menopausal status, ultrasound and biomarker tests in combination for the diagnosis of ovarian cancer in symptomatic women. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Jul 26 2022; 7(7): CD011964. PMID 35879201*
36. *Moore RG, Hawkins DM, Miller MC, et al. Combining clinical assessment and the Risk of Ovarian Malignancy Algorithm for the prediction of ovarian cancer. Gynecol Oncol. Dec 2014; 135(3): 547-51. PMID 25449569*
37. *Committee Opinion No. 716: The Role of the Obstetrician-Gynecologist in the Early Detection of Epithelial Ovarian Cancer in Women at Average Risk. Obstet Gynecol. Sep 2017; 130(3): e146-e149. PMID 28832487*
38. *National Center for Clinical Excellence (NICE). Ovarian cancer: recognition and initial management [CG122]. 2011*
39. *National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Ovarian Cancer Including Fallopian Tub Cancer and Primary Peritoneal Cancer. Version 2.2023*
40. *Grossman DC, Curry SJ, Owens DK, et al. Screening for Ovarian Cancer: US Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement. JAMA. Feb 13 2018; 319(6): 588-594. PMID 29450531*
41. *Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Medical Policy Reference Manual. 2.04.62, Multimarker Serum Testing Related to Ovarian Cancer. January 2024*

X. POLICY HISTORY

TOP

MP 2.270	**11/03/2020 Consensus Review.** No change to policy statement. Reference updated.
	05/11/2021 Consensus Review. Policy statement unchanged. Background, Rationale, and References updated.
	03/02/2022 Consensus Review. Added NCCN statement. Background, FEP, references updated.
	03/16/2023 Administrative Update. Added New code 0375U, effective 4/1/23.

POLICY TITLE	MULTIMARKER SERUM TESTING RELATED TO OVARIAN CANCER
POLICY NUMBER	MP 2.270

	04/10/2023 Minor Review. Added OvaWatch to statement. Updated background, coding table, and references.
	03/04/2024 Consensus Review. Updated FEP, background, and references. No changes to coding.
	09/18/2024 Administrative Update. New code 0507U added effective 10/1/2024.
	11/19/2024 Administrative Update. Removed NCCN statement.

Top