



BlueCross BlueShield
of Alabama

Name of Policy:

Use of Common Genetic Variants (SNPs) to Predict Risk of Nonfamilial Breast Cancer

Policy #: 422
Category: Laboratory

Latest Review Date: April 2014
Policy Grade: C

Background/Definitions:

As a general rule, benefits are payable under Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alabama health plans only in cases of medical necessity and only if services or supplies are not investigational, provided the customer group contracts have such coverage.

The following Association Technology Evaluation Criteria must be met for a service/supply to be considered for coverage:

- 1. The technology must have final approval from the appropriate government regulatory bodies;*
- 2. The scientific evidence must permit conclusions concerning the effect of the technology on health outcomes;*
- 3. The technology must improve the net health outcome;*
- 4. The technology must be as beneficial as any established alternatives;*
- 5. The improvement must be attainable outside the investigational setting.*

Medical Necessity means that health care services (e.g., procedures, treatments, supplies, devices, equipment, facilities or drugs) that a physician, exercising prudent clinical judgment, would provide to a patient for the purpose of preventing, evaluating, diagnosing or treating an illness, injury or disease or its symptoms, and that are:

- 1. In accordance with generally accepted standards of medical practice; and*
- 2. Clinically appropriate in terms of type, frequency, extent, site and duration and considered effective for the patient's illness, injury or disease; and*
- 3. Not primarily for the convenience of the patient, physician or other health care provider; and*
- 4. Not more costly than an alternative service or sequence of services at least as likely to produce equivalent therapeutic or diagnostic results as to the diagnosis or treatment of that patient's illness, injury or disease.*

Description of Procedure or Service:

Several single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), which are single base-pair variations in the DNA sequence of the genome, have been found to be associated with breast cancer and are common in the population, but confer only small increases in risk. Commercially-available assays test for several SNPs to predict an individual's risk of breast cancer relative to the general population. Some of these incorporate clinical information into risk prediction algorithms. The intent of both types of test is to identify individuals at increased risk who may benefit from more intensive surveillance.

Rare, single gene variants conferring a high risk of breast cancer have been linked to hereditary breast cancer syndromes. Examples are mutations in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2*. These, and a few others, account for less than 25% of inherited breast cancer. Moderate risk alleles, such as variants in the *CHEK2* gene, are also relatively rare and apparently explain very little of the genetic risk.

In contrast, several common SNPs associated with breast cancer have been identified primarily through genome-wide association studies of very large case-control populations. These alleles occur with high frequency in the general population, although the increased breast cancer risk associated with each is very small relative to the general population risk. Some have suggested that these common-risk SNPs could be combined for individualized risk prediction either alone or in combination with traditional predictors; personalized screening programs could then vary by starting age and intensity according to risk. Along these lines, the American Cancer Society recommends that women at high risk (greater than 20% lifetime risk) should undergo breast magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and a mammogram every year, and those at moderately increased risk (15% to 20% lifetime risk) should talk with their doctors about the benefits and limitations of adding MRI screening to their yearly mammogram.

SNP Panel Tests

Several companies offer testing for breast cancer risk profiles using SNPs. Most companies offer testing direct-to-consumers (DTCs). Algorithms or risk models for these tests are proprietary. When reported on company websites, panels range in number from 6 to 15 SNPs.

Clinical-Genetic Tests

Two companies currently offer risk assessment based on SNP panel testing and clinical information. Neither is provided as a direct-to-consumer test. Both are listed in the Genetic Testing Registry of the National Center for Biotechnology Information.

OncoVue®

The OncoVue® Breast Cancer Risk Test (InterGenetics™, Inc., Oklahoma City, OK) is a proprietary test that evaluates multiple, low-risk SNPs associated with breast cancer. Results are combined with personal history measures to determine breast cancer risk at different times during adulthood. The test does not detect known high-risk genetic factors such as *BRCA* mutations (associated with hereditary breast and ovarian cancer, see policy #513- Genetic Testing for Hereditary Breast and/or Ovarian Cancer). OncoVue® synthesizes various genetic and medical history risk measures into a personalized single-risk estimate for premenopause, perimenopause, and postmenopause for each patient, with comparison to the average population

risk at each of these life stages. The test is stated to be “an aid in the qualitative assessment of breast cancer risk...not intended as a stand-alone test for the determination of breast cancer risk in women.”

For women without a strong family history of breast cancer and at average risk before testing, OncoVue® purports to estimate a woman’s individual risk and place her in standard-, moderate-, or high-risk groups. The results are intended to help a woman and her physician decide if more frequent exams and/or more sophisticated surveillance techniques are indicated. For women already known to be at high risk based on a family history consistent with hereditary breast cancer, the test is represented as having added value by indicating greater or lesser risk at different life stages.

OncoVue® is available only through the Breast Cancer Risk Testing Network (BCRTN), described as a network of Breast Care Centers engaged in frontline genetic identification of breast cancer risk levels in their patients. BCRTN member centers will provide genetic breast cancer risk testing for their patients using OncoVue® as part of a comprehensive education program to help OncoVue® “at-risk” women understand their risk level and intervention strategies. BCRTN members will be selected for the network based on a number of criteria, including quality standards of care, level of breast cancer surveillance technology, and the capacity to provide patient education on genetic testing and future risk management protocols. As of March 2014, 32 participating centers (36 locations), located in 20 states, were listed on the company website.

BREVAGen™

BREVAGen™ (Phenogen Sciences, Charlotte, NC) evaluates seven breast cancer-associated SNPs identified in genome-wide association studies (GWAS). Risk is calculated by multiplying the product of the individual SNP risks by the Gail model risk. BREVAGen has been evaluated for use in Caucasian women of European descent age 35 years and older. Like OncoVue®, BREVAGen does not detect known high-risk mutations, e.g., in *BRCA*. According to the BREVAGen website, “suitable candidates” for testing include women with a Gail lifetime risk of 15% or greater; with high lifetime estrogen exposure (e.g., early menarche and late menopause); or with relatives diagnosed with breast cancer. BREVAGen is not suitable for women with previous diagnoses of lobular carcinoma in situ, ductal carcinoma in situ, or breast cancer, since the Gail model cannot calculate breast cancer risk accurately for such women, or for women with an extensive family history of breast and ovarian cancer.

Phenogen Sciences maintains on its website a list of physicians who have been trained to use BREVAGen. As of March 2014, more than 100 participating centers in 19 states were listed on the company website.

Policy:

Testing for one or more single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) to predict an individual’s risk of breast cancer does not meet Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alabama’s medical criteria for coverage and is considered *investigational*.

The OncoVue® and BREVA Gen™ breast cancer risk tests do not meet Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alabama’s medical criteria for coverage and are considered **investigational** for all indications, including but not limited to use as a method of estimating individual patient risk for developing breast cancer.

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alabama does not approve or deny procedures, services, testing, or equipment for our members. Our decisions concern coverage only. The decision of whether or not to have a certain test, treatment or procedure is one made between the physician and his/her patient. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alabama administers benefits based on the member’s contract and corporate medical policies. Physicians should always exercise their best medical judgment in providing the care they feel is most appropriate for their patients. Needed care should not be delayed or refused because of a coverage determination.

Key Points:

Genome-wide association studies (GWAS) examine the entire genome of each of thousands of individuals for single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), single base-pair variations in the DNA sequence at semi-regular intervals, and attempt to associate variant SNP alleles with particular diseases. Several case-control GWAS have been carried out, primarily in white women, to investigate common risk markers of breast cancer. In recent years, a number of SNPs associated with breast cancer have been reported at a high level of statistical significance and validated in two or more large, independent studies. Recently SNPs associated with breast cancer risk in Asian women have been the subject of more than a half-dozen articles, although these appear exploratory. GWAS have also identified SNPs in specific genes associated with the onset or severity of chemotherapy-induced toxicity.

SNP Panel Tests

As noted in the Background section, estimates of breast cancer risk based on SNPs derived from large GWAS and/or from SNPs in other genes known to be associated with breast cancer are available as laboratory-developed test services from different companies. The literature on these associations is growing, although information about the risk models is proprietary. Independent determination of clinical validity in an intended-use population to demonstrate clinical validity has not been performed. There are also no studies to suggest that use of SNP-based risk assessment has any impact on health care outcomes. No peer-reviewed reports have been published in which commercially-available breast cancer risk estimators have been compared with each other to determine if they report similar results on the same individuals, specifically for breast cancer.

Meta-Analyses

Several meta-analyses have investigated the association between breast cancer and various SNPs. Meta-analyses of case-control studies have indicated that specific SNPs are associated with increased or decreased breast cancer risk (see Table 1). Other meta-analyses have revealed the interaction between environment (e.g., obesity, age at menarche) or ethnicity and breast cancer risk conferred by certain SNPs. Zhou et al (2013) found that a specific polymorphism in the vitamin D receptor gene increased breast cancer risk in African but not Caucasian women. Breast cancer risk associated with SNPs in microRNAs is commonly modified by ethnicity. Meta-

analyses of GWAS have identified SNPs at new breast cancer susceptibility loci. All of these markers are considered to be in an investigational phase of development.

In 2014, the Breast Cancer Association Consortium published a mega-analysis of 46,450 case patients and 42,461 controls from 38 international meta-analytic studies. The authors assessed two-way interactions among 3277 breast cancer-associated SNPs. Of 2.5 billion possible 2-SNP combinations, none were statistically significantly associated with breast cancer risk. The study suggests that risk models may be simplified by eliminating interaction terms. Nonetheless, the authors cautioned that despite the large sample size, the study may have been underpowered to detect very small interaction effects, which tend to be smaller than main effects.

Table 1: Results of Meta-Analyses of SNPs and Associations with Breast Cancer

SNP	Association			Study
	Positive	None	Protective	
2q35 [rs13387042]	•			Gu 2013
8q24 [G-allele of rs13281615]	•			Gong 2013
8q24 [homozygous A-alleles of rs13281615]			•	
ATR-CHEK1 checkpoint pathway genes ^a		•		Lin 2013
Chemotactic cytokines ^b		•		Bodelon 2013
COMT [V158M]			•	He 2012
COX11 [rs6504950]			•	Tang 2012
CYP1A1 [T3801C]	•			He 2013
CYP1A2 1F [A-allele of rs762551]	•			Tian 2013
CYP19 [rs10046]		•		Pineda 2013
Fibroblast growth factor receptor genes ^c		•		kConFab Investigators 2014
IL-10 [rs1800871]		•		Yu 2013
IRS1 [rs1801278]	•			Zhang 2013
MAP3K1 [C-allele of rs889312 and G-allele of rs16886165]	•			Zheng 2014
MDR1 [C3435T]	•			Wang 2013
MTR [A2756G]	•	•		Zhong 2013
PON1 [L55M]	•			Saadat 2012
STK15 [F31I]	•			Qin 2013
STK15 [V571I]		•		
XRCC2 [R188H]		•		He 2014
XRCC3 [A17893G]			•	He 2012
XRCC3 [T241M]	•			
TCF7L2 [rs7903146]	•			Chen 2013
VDR [rs731236]	•			Perna 2013

^a 40 ATR and 50 CHEK1 SNPs genotyped.

^b 34 SNPs and groups of SNPs genotyped in 8 chemokine candidate genes: CCL3, CCL4, CCL5, CCL20, CCR5, CCR6, CXCL12, and CXCR4.

^c 384 SNPs genotyped in FGFR1, FGFR3, FGFR4, and FGFR1L.

Primary studies

Because there are no published studies of commercial SNP-based breast cancer risk predictors, published studies of the clinical usefulness of other similar SNP combinations as risk predictors will be considered here.

Aston et al (2005) evaluated more than 14,000 oligogenotypes, defined by two or more SNPs in 10 breast cancer-associated genes. The association with breast cancer was considered statistically significant for 37 oligogenotypes. The authors observed that oligogenic combinations of 2 to 10 SNPs were strongly associated with wide variation in breast cancer risk; that for many combinations, genes affected breast cancer risk in a manner not predictable from single-gene effects; and that compared with individual SNPs, these combinations stratified risk over a broader range.

In 2008, Pharoah et al considered a combination of 7 well-validated SNPs associated with breast cancer, five of which are included in the deCODE BreastCancer™ test. A model that simply multiplies the individual risks of the seven common SNPs was assumed, and would explain approximately 5% of the total genetic risk of non-familial breast cancer. Applying the model to the population of women in the U.K., the risk profile provided by the seven SNPs did not provide sufficient discrimination between those who would and would not experience future breast cancer to enable individualized preventive treatment such as tamoxifen. However, the authors suggested that a population screening program could be personalized with results of SNP panel testing. They concluded that no women would be included in the high-risk category (defined as 20% risk within the next 10 years at age 40–49 years, according to the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence), and therefore none would warrant the addition of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) screening or consideration of more aggressive intervention.

Reeves et al (2010) evaluated the performance of a panel of 7 SNPs associated with breast cancer in 10,306 women with breast cancer and 10,383 without cancer in the U.K. The risk panel also contained five SNPs included in the deCODE BreastCancer™ test and used a similar multiplicative approach. Sensitivity studies were performed using only four SNPs and using 10 SNPs, both demonstrating no significant change in performance. Although the risk score showed marked differences in risk between the upper quintile of patients (8.8% cumulative risk to age 70 years) and the lower quintile of patients (4.4%), these changes were not viewed as clinically useful when compared with patients with an estimated overall background risk of 6.3%. Of note, simple information on patient histories; for example, presence of one or two first-degree relatives with breast cancer, provided equivalent or superior risk discrimination (9.1% and 15.4%, respectively).

It is assumed that many more genetic risk markers remain to be discovered because substantial unexplained heritability remains. Researchers from the Collaborative Oncological Gene-Environment Study (COGS) group, a mega-consortium established to follow-up previous GWAS and candidate gene association studies, estimate that “more than 1,000 additional loci are involved in breast cancer susceptibility.” One reason more genetic associations have not been found is that even large GWAS are underpowered to detect uncommon genetic variants.

Two approaches have recently been described to help address this problem. Braun and Buetow (2011) described a technique for multi-SNP analysis of GWAS data based on the study of patient cases selected using their association with known pathways related to disease risk. The authors coined the term Pathways of Distinction Analysis (PoDA) to describe this methodology and demonstrated that using this approach facilitated the identification of disease-related SNPs by creating clusters of similar variants within disease groups that stood out when compared with control groups.

In 2012, Silva et al reported on the use of DNA pooling methods to aid in detection of genetic polymorphisms. They combined DNA from many individuals (up to 200 patients or controls) into a single sample in an effort to pre-select SNPs of interest in different populations. They concluded that test accuracy was sufficiently robust to allow use of pooling to estimate allelic distributions in populations of interest.

Although there are no guidelines regarding the clinical use of SNP panels for estimating breast cancer risk, the published literature is in general agreement that their use in clinical or screening settings is premature due to a lack of a more complete set of explanatory gene variants and to insufficient discriminatory power at this time. Whether or not additional SNP studies are likely to be informative is under debate, as the study size to detect more and more rare variants becomes prohibitively large. As the cost of whole genome sequencing continues to decrease, some predict that this will become the preferred avenue for researching risk variants. Challenges to sorting through the growing literature on this diagnostic approach include nonstandardization and nontransparency of studies. Janssens et al (2011) published a methods paper providing a road map for optimal reporting and an accompanying detailed article describing good reporting practices.

In 2011, Bloss et al reported on the psychological, behavioral, and clinical effects of risk scanning in 3639 patients followed for a short time (mean [SD], 5.6 [2.4] months). The investigators evaluated anxiety, intake of dietary fat, and exercise based on information from genomic testing. There were no significant changes before and after testing and no increase in the number of screening tests obtained in enrolled patients. Although more than half of patients participating in the study indicated intent to undergo screening in the future, during the course of the study itself, no actual increase was observed.

Section Summary: Common, single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) have been shown in primary studies and meta-analyses to be significantly associated with breast cancer risk; some SNPs convey slightly elevated risk of compared with the general population risk. Panels of SNPs are commercially available, with results synthesized into breast cancer risk estimates. These have not been clinically validated and clinical utility has not been demonstrated. Most of these tests are commercially available as DTC tests. Use of such risk panels for individual patient care or for population screening programs is premature because performance of these panels in the intended-use populations is uncertain, and most genetic breast cancer risk has yet to be explained by undiscovered gene variants and SNPs. Long-term prospective studies with large sample sizes are needed to determine the clinical validity and utility of SNP-based models for use in predicting breast cancer risk. The discrimination offered by the limited genetic factors currently known is insufficient to inform clinical practice.

Clinical-Genetic Tests

OncoVue®

The OncoVue® test was developed by evaluating samples from a large case-control study for 117 common, functional polymorphisms, mostly single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), in candidate genes likely to influence breast carcinogenesis. A model using weighted combinations of 22 SNPs in 19 genes together with several Gail Model (personal and family history characteristics) risk factors was subsequently identified by multiple linear regression analysis. OncoVue improved individual sample risk estimation, compared to the Gail Model alone ($p < 0.0001$), by correctly placing more cases and fewer controls at elevated risk. In the same study, the model was validated on an independent sample set with similarly significant results. To date, this study has only been published in a meeting abstract; no details of the study or its results are available. Note that the Gail model has been shown to accurately estimate the proportion of women (without a strong family history) who will develop cancer in large groups but is a poor discriminator of risk among individuals.

Using the same case-control validation data, OncoVue was also compared to risk estimation determined by seven SNPs reported in other GWAS; the GWAS risk scores were unable to stratify individuals by risk for breast cancer, whereas OncoVue significantly stratified patients by risk. This study has not been published. Independently, SNPs derived from GWAS are known to result in only low-level estimates of risk at best; in one example, a 14-SNP polygenic risk score yielded an odds ratio of only 1.3 for estrogen receptor (ER)-positive breast cancer and 1.05 for ER-negative breast cancer.

An additional analysis of the same case-control data was reported at the 2010 San Antonio Breast Cancer Symposium. The OncoVue risk score was calculated in the same discovery set (4,768 Caucasian women, 1,592 cases and 3,176 controls) and two independent validation sets (1,137 Caucasian women, 376 cases and 761 controls; 494 African American women, 149 cases and 345 controls). For both OncoVue and Gail Model risk scores, positive likelihood ratios (proportion of patients with breast cancer with an elevated risk estimate [$\geq 20\%$] divided by the proportion of disease-free individuals with an elevated risk estimate) were calculated. OncoVue exhibited a 1.6- to 1.8-fold improvement compared to the Gail Model in more accurately assigning elevated risk estimates to breast cancer cases rather than controls. At higher risk thresholds, the fold improvement increased and exceeded 2.5 in some sample sets.

Does OncoVue testing improve the accuracy of breast cancer risk prediction beyond standard risk prediction measures?

The performance of OncoVue was studied in women from the Marin County, CA, breast cancer adolescent risk factor study. A retrospective case-control study was developed within the cohort, and samples were evaluated with OncoVue testing. OncoVue assigned high-risk status (defined as $\geq 12\%$ lifetime risk of developing breast cancer) to 19 more women who had had breast cancer (of 169 cases) than did the Gail model, which represented an approximately 50% improvement. OncoVue was also more effective at stratifying risk in the high-risk Marin County population than seven SNPs reported in other GWAS. These studies have not yet been published in a peer-reviewed journal.

Several supportive studies are listed on the InterGenetics, Inc. website; most are meeting abstracts. These address conceptual aspects of the OncoVue test but do not appear to report data using the final OncoVue test configuration. One fully published study characterizes SNPs that exhibit breast cancer risk associations that vary with age. This study stratified breast cancer cases and normal controls into three age groups, then determined breast cancer risk for SNP homozygotes and heterozygotes for each of 18 candidate SNPs within each age group. Of these, five SNP variants had statistically significant odds ratios for at least one age group. In a separate validation sample, only one had a statistically significant odds ratio but not in a pattern similar to that of the discovery set. The other four SNPs, although not significant, were judged to have patterns of results similar to that of the discovery set and were investigated further by a sliding 10-year window strategy; the results of which the authors suggest clarify age-specific breast cancer risk associations. The authors note the need for additional validation in other populations and nonwhite ethnicities.

Do results of OncoVue testing lead to changes in management that result in health outcome improvements?

The medical management implications of this test are unclear. The Gail Model was originally designed for use in clinical trials, not for individual patient care and management. Thus using the Gail Model as a baseline for comparison may not be sufficiently informative. In addition, no evidence of improved outcomes as a result of management changes in OncoVue-identified high-risk patients has been presented or published. The OncoVue sample report makes no recommendations regarding patient management. The InterGenetics, Inc. website makes this statement regarding test results: “A Moderate to High Risk result gives a woman several options: More comprehensive surveillance for breast cancer with mammograms, ultrasound and now Magnetic Resonance Imaging-MRI. Earlier detection means better long-term survival. Breast cancer prevention drugs like Tamoxifen can actually reduce breast cancer in high risk women.”

A pilot study using buccal samples from women in the Marin County, CA retrospective case-control study described above aimed to examine the genotypes of individuals determined to be high risk ($\geq 12\%$) by OncoVue®. Of 22 SNPs assessed by the OncoVue assay, one (rs7975232 in the vitamin D receptor gene) occurred significantly more often in high-risk cases than in the overall (all cases plus controls) sample (64% vs. 34%; $p < 0.001$); however, the incidence among all cases (29%) was less than that among controls (39%). The authors postulate a potential prevention strategy using vitamin D supplementation in women with this genotype. Although recent retrospective studies support an association between sunlight exposure, elevated serum levels of vitamin D (25[OH]D)/vitamin D supplementation, and reduced risk of breast cancer, prospective uncontrolled studies gave mixed results (positive or no association). Clinical trials demonstrating improved health outcomes in patients identified as high risk due to OncoVue detection of the rs7975232 SNP who were subsequently treated with vitamin D supplementation have not been reported.

BREVAGen™

In 2010, Mealiffe et al published a clinical validation study of the BREVAGen™ test. The authors evaluated a 7-SNP panel in a nested case-control cohort of 1664 case patients and 1636

controls. A model that multiplied the individual risks of the seven SNPs was assumed, and the resulting genetic risk score was assessed as a potential replacement for or add-on test to the Gail clinical risk model. The net reclassification improvement, or NRI, was used to evaluate performance. Combining seven validated SNPs with the Gail model resulted in a modest improvement in classification of breast cancer risks, but area under the curve (AUC) only increased from 0.557 to 0.594 (0.50 represents no discrimination, 1.0 perfect discrimination). The impact of reclassification on net health outcome was not evaluated. The authors suggested that best use of the test might be in patients who would benefit from enhanced or improved risk assessment, eg those classified as intermediate risk by the Gail model.

Information about analytic validity of the BREVAGen™ test is provided in the published study, but is indeterminate. Genomic DNA samples were analyzed on custom oligonucleotide arrays (Affymetrix, Inc., Santa Clara, CA). Mean concordance across duplicate samples included for quality control was 99.8%; breast cancer loci had call rates (a measure of SNP detection) above 99%. For approximately 70% of samples with sufficient DNA available, whole genome amplification also was carried out using the Sequenom (San Diego, CA) MassARRAY platform. Across samples that had not been excluded for lack of DNA or poor quality data (proportion not reported), concordance between the two assays was 97%, and the resulting call rate was 96.8%. Genotype data for 121 samples that had one or more inconsistencies between the Sequenom analysis and the corresponding custom array genotype were excluded. Conflicting calls were not differentially distributed across case patients and controls. The authors acknowledged that the two assays performed “relatively poorly,” but asserted that consensus calls were nonetheless accurate.

In 2013, Dite et al published a similar case-control study of the same seven SNPs assuming the same multiplicative model (based on independent risks of each SNP). Predictive ability of the Gail model with and without the seven SNP panel was compared in 962 case patients and 463 controls, all 35 years of age or older (mean age, approximately 45 years). AUC of the Gail model was 0.58 (95% CI, 0.54 to 0.61); in combination with the 7-SNP panel, AUC increased to 0.61 (95% CI, 0.58 to 0.64; bootstrap resampling, p<0.001). In reclassification analysis, 12% of cases and controls were correctly reclassified and 9% of cases and controls were incorrectly reclassified when the 7-SNP panel was added to the Gail model. Risk classes were defined by five-year risk of developing breast cancer: <1.5%, ≥1.5% to <2.0%, and >2.0%. Although addition of the 7-SNP panel to the Gail model improved predictive accuracy, the magnitude of improvement is small, the overall accuracy is moderate, and the impact on health outcomes is uncertain.

Other Clinical-Genetic Tests

Other large studies have evaluated 8-18 common, candidate SNPs breast cancer cases and normal controls to determine whether breast cancer assessments based on clinical factors plus various SNP combinations were more accurate than risk assessments based on clinical factors alone.

- Zheng et al found that eight SNPs, combined with other clinical predictors, were significantly associated with breast cancer risk; the full model gave an area under the curve of 0.63.

- Campa et al evaluated 17 SNP breast cancer susceptibility loci for any interaction with established risk factors for breast cancer but found no evidence that the SNPs modified the associations between established risk factors and breast cancer. The results of these studies support the concept of OncoVue but do not represent direct evidence of its clinical validity or utility.
- Wacholder et al evaluated the performance of a panel of 10 SNPs associated with breast cancer that had, at the time of the study, been validated in at least three published GWAS. Cases (n=5,590) and controls (n=5,998) from the National Cancer Institute's Cancer Genetic Markers of Susceptibility GWAS of breast cancer were included in the study (women of primarily European ancestry). The SNP panel was examined as a risk predictor alone and in addition to readily available components of the Gail model (e.g., diagnosis of atypical hyperplasia was not included). Mammographic density also was not included. The authors found that adding the SNP panel to the Gail model resulted in slightly better stratification of a woman's risk than either the SNP panel or the Gail model alone but that this stratification was not adequate to inform clinical practice. For example, only 34% of the women who actually had breast cancer were assigned to the top 20% risk group. AUC for the combined SNP and Gail model was 62% (50% is random, 100% is perfect).
- Darabi et al investigated the performance of 18 breast cancer risk SNPs, together with mammographic percentage density (PD), body mass index (BMI), and clinical risk factors in predicting absolute risk of breast cancer, empirically, in a well-characterized case-control study of postmenopausal Swedish women. Performance of a risk prediction model based on an initial set of seven breast cancer risk SNPs was improved by including 11 more recently established breast cancer risk SNPs ($p=4.69 \times 10^{-4}$). Adding mammographic PD, BMI and all 18 SNPs to a modified Gail model improved the discriminatory accuracy (the AUC statistic) from 55% to 62%. The net reclassification improvement was used to assess improvement in classification of women into five year low-, intermediate-, and high-risk categories ($p=8.93 \times 10^{-9}$). It was estimated that using an individualized screening strategy based on risk models incorporating clinical risk factors, mammographic density, and SNPs, would capture 10% more cases. Impacts on net health outcomes from such a change are unknown.
- Armstrong et al examined the impact of pretest breast cancer risk prediction on the classification of women with an abnormal mammogram above or below the risk threshold for biopsy. Currently, one-year probability of breast cancer among women with Breast Imaging– Reporting and Data System (BI-RADS) Category 3 mammograms is 2%; these women undergo six-month follow-up rather than biopsy. In contrast, women with BI-RADS4 mammograms have a 6% (BI-RADS 4A) or greater (BI-RADS 4B and 4C) probability of developing breast cancer in one year; these women are referred for biopsy. Using the Gail model plus 12 SNPs for risk prediction and a 2% biopsy risk threshold, 8% of women with a BI-RADS3 mammogram were reclassified above the threshold for biopsy and 7% of women with BI-RADS4A mammograms were reclassified below the threshold. The greatest impact on reclassification was attributed to standard breast cancer risk factors. Net health outcomes were not compared between women who were reclassified and those who were not.

Although results of these studies support the concept of clinical-genetic tests, they do not represent direct evidence of their clinical validity or utility.

Section Summary: There is a lack of published detail regarding OncoVue® and BREVAGen™ test validation, supportive data, and management implications. Available data suggest that OncoVue® and BREVAGen™ may add predictive accuracy to the Gail Model. However, the degree of improved risk prediction may be modest, and clinical implications are unclear. There is insufficient evidence to determine whether using breast cancer risk estimates from OncoVue® or BREVAGen™ in asymptomatic individuals changes management decisions and improves patient outcomes.

Summary

Clinical utility of SNP panel tests and clinical-genetic tests (OncoVue®, BREVAGen™, and others) is unknown. Information about analytic performance (reproducibility) of marketed tests is lacking. Most tests are in an investigational phase of development, having demonstrated associations between the SNPs tested and breast cancer risk. Clinical-genetic tests may improve predictive accuracy of currently-used clinical risk predictors. However, the magnitude of improvement is small and clinical significance is uncertain. Whether potential harms of these tests due to false negative and false positive results are outweighed by potential benefit associated with improved risk assessment is unknown. Use of these tests is therefore considered investigational.

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

National Comprehensive Cancer Network

Current guidelines from the National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) identify the following limitations of multigene cancer panels: unknown significance of some variants, uncertain level of risk associated with most variants, and unclear guidance on risk management for carriers of some variants. For breast cancer risk assessment, the Gail model or risk models for women with elevated risk based on family history (e.g., Claus et al or Tyrer-Cuzick et al) are recommended.

Key Words:

Single nucleotide polymorphisms, (SNPs), deCODE, BreastCancer™ test, 23and me, deCODEme, Cancer Scan, Navigenics, BREVAGen, OncoVue, easyDNA, GenePlanet, Matrix Genomics

Approved by Governing Bodies:

No SNP-based test to predict breast cancer risk has been approved or cleared by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). These tests are offered as laboratory-developed tests under the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA) licensed laboratories. Clinical laboratories may develop and validate tests in-house and market them as a laboratory service; laboratories offering such tests as a clinical service must meet general regulatory standards of the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act (CLIA) and must be licensed by CLIA for high-complexity testing.

FDA has not yet developed specific rules for direct-to-consumer (DTC) genetic testing. On November 22, 2013, FDA issued a warning letter to 23andMe ordering it to “immediately discontinue marketing the Saliva Collection Kit and Personal Genome Service (PGS) until such time as it receives FDA marketing authorization for the device.” Currently, the test is available on the company website with the alert, “At this time we do not offer health-related genetic reports.” Current and new customers receive “ancestry-related information and raw genetic data without 23andMe’s interpretation.”

Under current regulations, CLIA requires that laboratories demonstrate the analytical validity of the tests they offer. However, there is no requirement for a test to demonstrate either clinical validity or clinical utility. Some states (e.g., New York) have chosen to regulate DTC laboratories. Because these reviews are not public, the scientific standards applied are unknown.

Benefit Application:

Coverage is subject to member’s specific benefits. Group specific policy will supersede this policy when applicable.

ITS: Home Policy provisions apply

FEP: FEP does not consider investigational if FDA approved and will be reviewed for medical necessity.

Current Coding:

CPT Codes:

81479	Unlisted molecular pathology procedure (Effective 01/01/2013)
81599	Unlisted multianalyte assay with algorithmic analysis (Effective 01/01/2013)
84999	Unlisted chemistry procedure

Previous Coding:

CPT Codes:

There is no specific CPT code for these tests. A series of molecular diagnostic codes (**83890-83914**) would likely be used. (**Deleted 01/01/2013**)

References:

1. 23andMe. Changes to our health-related product. Available online at: www.23andme.com/health/. Last accessed March 2014.
2. Ahmed S, Thomas G, et al. Newly discovered breast cancer susceptibility loci on 3p24 and 17q23.2. Nat Genet, May 2009; 41(5): 585-590.
3. American Cancer Society. Breast cancer: early detection, diagnosis, and staging topics - Can breast cancer be found early?; last revised January 31, 2014. Available online at: www.cancer.org/cancer/breastcancer/detailedguide/breast-cancer-detection. Last accessed March, 2014.

4. Annas GJ, Elias S. 23andMe and the FDA. N Engl J Med 2014; 370(11):985-8.
5. Armstrong K, Handorf EA, Chen J et al. Breast cancer risk prediction and mammography biopsy decisions: a model-based study. Am J Prev Med 2013; 44(1):15-22.
6. Aston CE, Ralph DA, Lalo DP et al. Oligogenic combinations associated with breast cancer risk in women under 53 years of age. Hum Genet 2005; 116(3):208-21.
7. Baldwin RM, Owzar K, Zembutsu H et al. A genome-wide association study identifies novel loci for paclitaxel-induced sensory peripheral neuropathy in CALGB 40101. Clin Cancer Res 2012; 18(18):5099-109.
8. Beeghly-Fadiel A, Shu XO, Lu W et al. Genetic variation in VEGF family genes and breast cancer risk: a report from the Shanghai Breast Cancer Genetics Study. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2011; 20(1):33-41.
9. Bloss CS, Schork NJ, Topol EJ. Effect of direct-to-consumer genomewide profiling to assess disease risk. N Engl J Med 2011; 364(6):524-34.
10. Bodelon C, Malone KE, Johnson LG et al. Common sequence variants in chemokine-related genes and risk of breast cancer in post-menopausal women. Int J Mol Epidemiol Genet 2013; 4(4):218- 27.
11. Bolland MJ, Grey A, Gamble GD et al. Calcium and vitamin D supplements and health outcomes: a reanalysis of the Women's Health Initiative (WHI) limited-access data set. Am J Clin Nutr 2011; 94(4):1144-49.
12. Braun R, Buetow K. Pathways of distinction analysis: a new technique for multi-SNP analysis of GWAS data. PLoS Genet 2011; 7(6):e1002101.
13. BREVAGen™. What is BREVAGen? Available online at: brevagen.com/c/brca-testing-overview. Last accessed March 2014.
14. Cai Q, Wen W, Qu S et al. Replication and functional genomic analyses of the breast cancer susceptibility locus at 6q25.1 generalize its importance in women of Chinese, Japanese, and European ancestry. Cancer Res 2011; 71(4):1344-55.
15. Campa D, Kaaks R, Le Marchand L et al. Interactions Between Genetic Variants and Breast Cancer Risk Factors in the Breast and Prostate Cancer Cohort Consortium. J Natl Cancer Inst 2011.
16. Chen QH, Wang QB, Zhang B. Ethnicity modifies the association between functional microRNA polymorphisms and breast cancer risk: a HuGE meta-analysis. Tumour Biol 2014; 35(1):529-43.
17. Chen J, Yuan T, Liu M et al. Association between TCF7L2 gene polymorphism and cancer risk: a meta-analysis. PLoS One 2013; 8(8):e71730.
18. Claus EB, Risch N, Thompson WD. Autosomal dominant inheritance of early-onset breast cancer. Implications for risk prediction. Cancer 1994; 73(3):643-51.
19. Cummings SR, Tice JA, Bauer S et al. Prevention of breast cancer in postmenopausal women: approaches to estimating and reducing risk. J Natl Cancer Inst 2009; 101(6):384-98.
20. Dai J, Hu Z, Jiang Y et al. Breast cancer risk assessment with five independent genetic variants and two risk factors in Chinese women. Breast Cancer Res 2012; 14(1):R17.
21. Dalessandri KM, Miike R, Wiencke JK et al. Vitamin D Receptor Polymorphisms and Breast Cancer Risk in a High-Incidence Population: A Pilot Study. J Am Coll Surg 2012; 215(5):652-57.
22. Dalessandri KM, Miike R, Wrensch MR. Breast cancer risk assessment in the high risk Marin County population using OncoVue compared to SNPs from genome wide association studies. 2009 San Antonio Breast Cancer Symposium; Abstract 3057.

23. Dalessandri KM, Miike R, Wrensch MR. Validation of OncoVue, a new individualized breast cancer risk estimator in the Marin County, California adolescent risk study. 2008 San Antonio Breast Cancer Symposium; Abstract 502.
24. Darabi H, Czene K, Zhao W et al. Breast cancer risk prediction and individualised screening based on common genetic variation and breast density measurement. *Breast Cancer Res* 2012; 14(1):R25.
25. Devilee P, Rookus MA. A tiny step closer to personalized risk prediction for breast cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2010; 362(11):1043-5.
26. Dite GS, Mahmoodi M, Bickerstaffe A et al. Using SNP genotypes to improve the discrimination of a simple breast cancer risk prediction model. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2013; 139(3):887-96.
27. Easton DF, Poolery KA, Dunning AM, et al. Genome-wide association study identifies novel breast cancer susceptibility loci. *Nature*, June 2007; 447(7148): 1087-1093.
28. easy-DNA.com. Genetic predisposition health testing: your future health is in your genes. Available online at: www.easy-dna.com/genetic-predisposition-dna-testing.html. Last accessed March 2014.
29. Evans DG, Howell A. Breast cancer risk-assessment models. *Breast Cancer Res* 2007; 9(5):213.
30. Fan C, Chen C, Wu D. The association between common genetic variant of microRNA-499 and cancer susceptibility: a meta-analysis. *Mol Biol Rep* 2013; 40(4):3389-94.
31. FGF receptor genes and breast cancer susceptibility: results from the Breast Cancer Association Consortium. *Br J Cancer* 2014; 110(4):1088-100.
32. Fletcher O, Johnson N, et al. Association of genetic variants at 8q24 with breast cancer risk. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2008; 17(3): 702-705.
33. Garcia-Closas M, Couch FJ, Lindstrom S et al. Genome-wide association studies identify four ER negative-specific breast cancer risk loci. *Nat Genet* 2013; 45(4):392-8.
34. Garcia-Closas M, Hall P, et al. Heterogeneity of breast cancer associations with five susceptibility loci by clinical and pathological characteristics. *PLoS Genetics*, April 2008, Vol. 4, Issue 4.
35. Gold B, Kirchhoff T, Stefanov S, et al. Genome-wide association study provides evidence for a breast cancer risk locus at 6q22.33. *PNAS*, March 18, 2008, Vol. 105, No. 11, pp. 4340-4345.
36. Gong WF, Zhong JH, Xiang BD et al. Single Nucleotide Polymorphism 8q24 rs13281615 and Risk of Breast Cancer: Meta-Analysis of More than 100,000 Cases. *PLoS One* 2013; 8(4):e60108.
37. Gu C, Zhou L, Yu J. Quantitative assessment of 2q35-rs13387042 polymorphism and hormone receptor status with breast cancer risk. *PLoS One* 2013; 8(7):e66979.
38. Han W, Woo JH, Yu JH et al. Common genetic variants associated with breast cancer in Korean women and differential susceptibility according to intrinsic subtype. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2011; 20(5):793:798.
39. He XF, Wei W, Li SX et al. Association between the COMT Val158Met polymorphism and breast cancer risk: a meta-analysis of 30,199 cases and 38,922 controls. *Mol Biol Rep* 2012; 39(6):6811-23.
40. He XF, Wei W, Liu ZZ et al. Association between the CYP1A1 T3801C polymorphism and risk of cancer: evidence from 268 case-control studies. *Gene* 2013.

41. He XF, Wei W, Su J et al. Association between the XRCC3 polymorphisms and breast cancer risk: meta-analysis based on case-control studies. *Mol Biol Rep* 2012; 39(5):5125-34.
42. He Y, Zhang Y, Jin C et al. Impact of XRCC2 Arg188His Polymorphism on Cancer Susceptibility: A Meta-Analysis. *PLoS One* 2014; 9(3):e91202.
43. Huijts PE, Vreeswijk MP, et al. Clinical correlates of low-risk variants in FGFR2, TNRC9, MAP3K1, LSP1 and 8q24 in a Dutch cohort of incident breast cancer cases. *Breast Cancer Res* 2007; 9(6):R78.
44. Hunter DJ, Altshuler D and Rader DJ. From Darwin's finches to canaries in the coal mine—mining the genome for new biology. *NEJM*, June 2008; 358(26): 2760-2763.
45. Hunter DJ, Kraft P, Jacobs KB, et al. A genome-wide association study identifies alleles in FGFR2 associated with risk of sporadic postmenopausal breast cancer. *Nat Genet*, July 2007; 39(7): 870-874.
46. Huo D, Zheng Y, Ogundiran TO et al. Evaluation of 19 susceptibility loci of breast cancer in women of African ancestry. *Carcinogenesis* 2012; 33(4):835-40.
47. Intergenetics™, Inc. OncoVue® Breast Cancer Risk Testing Network. Available online at: www.intergenetics.com/cms/technologyandproducts/whatisoncovue/testingnetwork. Last accessed March 2014.
48. Intergenetics™, Inc. OncoVue® clinical indications. Available online at: www.intergenetics.com/cms/technologyandproducts/clinicalindications. Last accessed March 2014.
49. Intergenetics™, Inc. OncoVue® frequently asked questions. Available online at: www.intergenetics.com/cms/technologyandproducts/whatisoncovue/faqs#12. Last accessed March 2014.
50. Janssens AC, Ioannidis JP, Bedrosian S et al. Strengthening the reporting of genetic risk prediction studies (GRIPS): explanation and elaboration. *Eur J Clin Invest* 2011; 41(9):1010-35.
51. Janssens AC, Ioannidis JP, van Duijn CM et al. Strengthening the Reporting of Genetic Risk Prediction Studies: The GRIPS Statement. *Genet Med* 2011 *Eur J Clin Invest* 2011; 41(9):1004-1009.
52. Jiang Y, Han J, Liu J et al. Risk of genome-wide association study newly identified genetic variants for breast cancer in Chinese women of Heilongjiang Province. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2011; 128(1):251-257.
53. Jupe E, Pugh T, Knowlton N et al. Accurate Identification of Women at High Risk of Breast Cancer Using OncoVue. 2010 San Antonio Breast Cancer Symposium; Poster P6-09-04.
54. Jupe ER, Pugh TW, Knowlton NS. Breast cancer risk estimation using the OncoVue model compared to combined GWAS single nucleotide polymorphisms. 2009 San Antonio Breast Cancer Symposium; Abstract 3177.
55. Jupe ER, Ralph DA, Manjeshwar S. The OncoVue model for predicting breast cancer risk. 2007 San Antonio Breast Cancer Symposium; Abstract 4038.
56. Lin WY, Brock IW, Connley D et al. Associations of ATR and CHEK1 single nucleotide polymorphisms with breast cancer. *PLoS One* 2013; 8(7):e68578.
57. Liu JJ, Liu JL, Zhang X et al. A meta-analysis of the association of glutathione S-transferase P1 gene polymorphism with the susceptibility of breast cancer. *Mol Biol Rep* 2013; 40(4):3203-12.

58. Long J, Cai Q, Sung H et al. Genome-wide association study in East Asians identifies novel susceptibility loci for breast cancer. *PLoS Genet* 2012; 8(2):e1002532.
59. Ma H, Li H, Jin G et al. Genetic Variants at 14q24.1 and Breast Cancer Susceptibility: a Fine- Mapping Study in Chinese Women. *DNA Cell Biol* 2012.
60. McCarthy AM, Armstrong K, Handorf E et al. Incremental impact of breast cancer SNP panel on risk classification in a screening population of white and African American women. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2013; 138(3):889-98.
61. Mcinerney N, Colleran G, Rowan A, et al. Low penetrance breast cancer predisposition SNPs are site specific. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*, September 2009; 117(1): 151-159.
62. Mealiffe ME, Stokowski RP, Rhees BK et al. Assessment of clinical validity of a breast cancer risk model combining genetic and clinical information. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2010; 102(21):1618-27.
63. Michailidou K, Hall P, Gonzalez-Neira A et al. Large-scale genotyping identifies 41 new loci associated with breast cancer risk. *Nat Genet* 2013; 45(4):353-61.
64. Milne RL, Benitez J, Nevanlinna H, et al. Risk of estrogen receptor-positive and –negative breast cancer and single-nucleotide polymorphism 2q35-rs13387042. *J Natl Cancer Inst*, July 2009; 101(14): 1012-1018.
65. Milne RL, Herranz J, Michailidou K et al. A large-scale assessment of two-way SNP interactions in breast cancer susceptibility using 46 450 cases and 42 461 controls from the breast cancer association consortium. *Hum Mol Genet* 2014; 23(7):1934-46.
66. Mong FY, Kuo YL, Liu CW et al. Association of gene polymorphisms in prolactin and its receptor with breast cancer risk in Taiwanese women. *Mol Biol Rep* 2011; 38(7):4629-36.
67. Mukherjee N, Bhattacharya N, Sinha S et al. Association of APC and MCC polymorphisms with increased breast cancer risk in an Indian population. *Int J Biol Markers* 2011; 26(1):43-9.
68. National Cancer Institute. Breast cancer risk assessment tool. Available online at: www.cancer.gov/bcrisktool/. Last accessed March 2014.
69. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. NCCN clinical practice guidelines® in oncology: genetic/familial high-risk assessment: breast and ovarian, version 1.2014 (discussion update in progress). Available online at: www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/genetics_screening.pdf. Last accessed March 2014.
70. Nickels S, Truong T, Hein R et al. Evidence of gene-environment interactions between common breast cancer susceptibility loci and established environmental risk factors. *PLoS Genet* 2013; 9(3):e1003284.
71. Offit K. Breast cancer single-nucleotide polymorphisms: Statistical significance and clinical utility. *J Natl Cancer Inst*, July 2009; 101(14): 1012-1018.
72. Ota I, Sakurai A, Toyoda Y et al. Association between breast cancer risk and the wild-type allele of human ABC transporter ABCC11. *Anticancer Res* 2010; 30(12):5189-94.
73. Pei J, Li F, Wang B. Single nucleotide polymorphism 6q25.1 rs2046210 and increased risk of breast cancer. *Tumour Biol* 2013; 34(6):4073-9.
74. Perna L, Butterbach K, Haug U et al. Vitamin D receptor genotype rs731236 (Taq1) and breast cancer prognosis. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2013; 22(3):437-42.
75. Pharoah P, Antoniou AC, et al. Polygenes, risk prediction, and targeted prevention of breast cancer. *NEJM*, June 2008; 358(26): 2796-2803.

76. Pineda B, Garcia-Perez MA, Cano A et al. Associations between aromatase CYP19 rs10046 polymorphism and breast cancer risk: from a case-control to a meta-analysis of 20,098 subjects. PLoS One 2013; 8(1):e53902.
77. Pournaras DJ, Aasheim ET, Sovik TT et al. Effect of the definition of type II diabetes remission in the evaluation of bariatric surgery for metabolic disorders. Br J Surg 2012; 99(1):100-3.
78. Qin K, Wu C, Wu X. Two nonsynonymous polymorphisms (F31I and V57I) of the STK15 gene and breast cancer risk: a meta-analysis based on 5966 cases and 7609 controls. J Int Med Res 2013; 41(4):956-63.
79. Ralph DA, Zhao LP, Aston CE et al. Age-specific association of steroid hormone pathway gene polymorphisms with breast cancer risk. Cancer 2007; 109(10):1940-8.
80. Rebbeck TR, DeMichele A, et al. Hormone-dependent effects of FGFR2 and MAP3K1 in breast cancer susceptibility in a population-based sample of post-menopausal African-American and European-American women. Carcinogenesis 2009, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 269-274.
81. Reeves GK, Travis RC, Green J et al. Incidence of breast cancer and its subtypes in relation to individual and multiple low-penetrance genetic susceptibility loci. JAMA 2010; 304(4):426-34.
82. Ren J, Wu X, He W et al. Lysyl oxidase 473 G>A polymorphism and breast cancer susceptibility in Chinese Han population. DNA Cell Biol 2011; 30(2):111-6.
83. Romero A, Martin M, Oliva B et al. Glutathione S-transferase P1 c.313A > G polymorphism could be useful in the prediction of doxorubicin response in breast cancer patients. Ann Oncol 2012; 23(7):1750-6.
84. Saadat M. Paraoxonase 1 genetic polymorphisms and susceptibility to breast cancer: a meta-analysis. Cancer Epidemiol 2012; 36(2):e101-3.
85. Sakoda LC, Jorgenson E, Witte JS. Turning of COGS moves forward findings for hormonally mediated cancers. Nat Genet 2013; 45(4):345-8.
86. Schoeps A, Rudolph A, Seibold P et al. Identification of new genetic susceptibility loci for breast cancer through consideration of gene-environment interactions. Genet Epidemiol 2014; 38(1):84- 93.
87. Siddiq A, Couch FJ, Chen GK et al. A meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies of breast cancer identifies two novel susceptibility loci at 6q14 and 20q11. Hum Mol Genet 2012; 21(24):5373-84.
88. Silva SN, Guerreiro D, Gomes M et al. SNPs/pools: a methodology for the identification of relevant SNPs in breast cancer epidemiology. Oncology reports 2012; 27(2):511-6.
89. Stacey SN, Manolescu A, Sulem P, et al. Common variants on chromosomes 2q35 and 16q12 confer susceptibility to estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer. Nat Genet, July 2007; 39(7): 865-869.
90. Stacey SN, Manolescu A, Sulem P, et al. Common variants on chromosome 5p12 confer susceptibility to estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer. Nat Genet, June 2008; 40(6): 703-706.
91. Tamimi RM, Cox D, Kraft P, et al. Breast cancer susceptibility loci and mammographic density. Breast Cancer Research 2008, Vol. 10, No. 4.
92. Tang L, Xu J, Wei F et al. Association of STXBP4/COX11 rs6504950 (G>A) polymorphism with breast cancer risk: evidence from 17,960 cases and 22,713 controls. Arch Med Res 2012; 43(5):383-8.

93. Thomas G, Jacobs KB, Kraft P, et al. A multistage genome-wide association study in breast cancer identifies two new risk alleles at 1p11.2 and 14q24.1 (RAD5111). *Nat Genet*, May 2009; 41(5): 579-584.
94. Tian Z, Li YL, Zhao L et al. Role of CYP1A2 1F polymorphism in cancer risk: evidence from a meta-analysis of 46 case-control studies. *Gene* 2013; 524(2):168-74.
95. Tyrer J, Duffy SW, Cuzick J. A breast cancer prediction model incorporating familial and personal risk factors. *Stat Med* 2004; 23(7):1111-30.
96. van der Rhee H, Coebergh JW, de Vries E. Is prevention of cancer by sun exposure more than just the effect of vitamin D? A systematic review of epidemiological studies. *Eur J Cancer* 2013; 49(6):1422-36.
97. Visvanathan K, Hurley P, Bantug E et al. Use of Pharmacologic Interventions for Breast Cancer Risk Reduction: American Society of Clinical Oncology Clinical Practice Guideline. *J Clin Oncol* 2013.
98. Wacholder S, Hartge P, Prentice R, et al. Performance of common genetic variants in breast-cancer risk models. *NEJM*, March 2010; 362(11): 1043-1045.
99. Wang Z, Wang T, Bian J. Association between MDR1 C3435T polymorphism and risk of breast cancer. *Gene* 2013; 532(1):94-9. Wu X, Xu QQ, Guo L et al. Quantitative assessment of the association between rs2046210 at 6q25.1 and breast cancer risk. *PLoS One* 2013; 8(6):e65206.
100. Xu Q, He CY, Liu JW et al. Pre-miR-27a rs895819A/G polymorphisms in cancer: a meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2013; 8(6):e65208.
101. Yao S, Graham K, Shen J et al. Genetic variants in microRNAs and breast cancer risk in African American and European American women. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2013; 141(3):447-59.
102. Yu JC, Hsiung CN, Hsu HM et al. Genetic variation in the genome-wide predicted estrogen response element-related sequences is associated with breast cancer development. *Breast Cancer Res* 2011; 13(1):R13.
103. Yu Z, Liu Q, Huang C et al. The interleukin 10 -819C/T polymorphism and cancer risk: a HuGE review and meta-analysis of 73 studies including 15,942 cases and 22,336 controls. *OMICS* 2013; 17(4):200-14.
104. Zhang H, Wang A, Ma H et al. Association between insulin receptor substrate 1 Gly972Arg polymorphism and cancer risk. *Tumour Biol* 2013; 34(5):2929-36.
105. Zheng W, Long Jirong, et al. Genome-wide association study identifies a novel breast cancer susceptibility locus at 6q25.1. *Nat Genet*, March 2009; 41(3): 324-328.
106. Zheng W, Wen W, Gao YT et al. Genetic and clinical predictors for breast cancer risk assessment and stratification among Chinese women. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2010; 102(13):972-81.
107. Zheng Q, Ye J, Wu H et al. Association between Mitogen-Activated Protein Kinase Kinase 1 Polymorphisms and Breast Cancer Susceptibility: A Meta-Analysis of 20 Case-Control Studies. *PLoS One* 2014; 9(3):e90771.
108. Zheng W, Zhang B, Cai Q et al. Common genetic determinants of breast-cancer risk in East Asian women: a collaborative study of 23 637 breast cancer cases and 25 579 controls. *Hum Mol Genet* 2013; 22(12):2539-50.
109. Zhong S, Chen Z, Xu J et al. Pre-mir-27a rs895819 polymorphism and cancer risk: a meta-analysis. *Mol Biol Rep* 2013; 40(4):3181-6.

110. Zhou ZC, Wang J, Cai ZH et al. Association between vitamin D receptor gene Cdx2 polymorphism and breast cancer susceptibility. Tumour Biol 2013; 34(6):3437-41.
111. Zhong S, Xu J, Li W et al. Methionine synthase A2756G polymorphism and breast cancer risk: an up-to-date meta-analysis. Gene 2013; 527(2):510-5.

Policy History:

Medical Policy Group, April 2010 **(1)**

Medical Policy Administration Committee, May 2010

Available for comment May 7-June 21, 2010

Medical Policy Group, May 2011 **(1)**: Updated Description, Key Points and References

Medical Policy Group, June 2012 **(3)**: 2012 Updates; Description, Key Points and References

Medical Policy Group, December 2012 **(3)**: 2013 Coding Updates: Added Code **81599**; code range 83890-83914 deleted effective 01/01/2013

Medical Policy Panel, May 2013

Medical Policy Group, June 2013 **(1)**: Update to Key Points, Key Words, Coding and References; addition of key words, Cancer Scan, and Navigenics with removal of linkage to words BRCA1 and BRCA2; addition of codes 81479 and 84999; no change to policy statement

Medical Policy Panel, April 2014

Medical Policy Group, April 2014 **(1)**: Updated medical policy #376 merged with this policy, no change in coverage related to policy #376; Update to original content of this policy, no change to policy statement.

Medical Policy Administration Committee, May 2014

This medical policy is not an authorization, certification, explanation of benefits, or a contract. Eligibility and benefits are determined on a case-by-case basis according to the terms of the member's plan in effect as of the date services are rendered. All medical policies are based on (i) research of current medical literature and (ii) review of common medical practices in the treatment and diagnosis of disease as of the date hereof. Physicians and other providers are solely responsible for all aspects of medical care and treatment, including the type, quality, and levels of care and treatment.

This policy is intended to be used for adjudication of claims (including pre-admission certification, pre-determinations, and pre-procedure review) in Blue Cross and Blue Shield's administration of plan contracts.