

Concert Genetic Testing: General Approach To Genetic and Molecular Testing

Reference Number: V2.2025
Date of Last Revision 04/26

[Coding implications](#)
[Revision Log](#)

See [Important Reminder](#) at the end of this policy for important regulatory and legal information.

OVERVIEW

This policy addresses the evaluation of genetic or molecular testing, as well as general laboratory testing, that has not been more specifically addressed by other criteria.

In addition to the criteria outlined below for reviewing specific classes of tests, state-specific regulations may also direct coverage for certain types of tests and may necessitate review of National Guidelines, National or Local Coverage Determinations and/or FDA approvals.

Pre-test and post-test genetic counseling that facilitates informed decision-making, addresses the possibility of secondary or incidental findings, and a plan for returning results before testing occurs is strongly advised.

For additional information see the [Rationale](#) section.

The tests, CPT codes, and ICD codes referenced in this policy are not comprehensive, and their inclusion does not represent a guarantee of coverage or non-coverage. Please see the [Concert Platform](#) for additional registered tests.

RELATED POLICIES

This policy document provides criteria for testing not specifically addressed in other related policies. Please refer to the following policies as needed:

- *Infectious Disease Testing: Dermatology*
- *Infectious Disease Testing: Gastroenterology*
- *Infectious Disease Testing: Genitourinary*
- *Infectious Disease Testing: Multisystem*
- *Infectious Disease Testing: Screening and Prevention*
- *Infectious Disease Testing: Respiratory*
- *Infectious Disease Testing: Vector-Borne*
- *Oncology Testing: Algorithmic Assays*

- *Oncology Testing: Cancer Screening and Surveillance*
- *Oncology Testing: Hematologic Malignancy Molecular*
- *Oncology Testing: Hematologic Malignancy Molecular*
- *Oncology Testing: Hereditary Cancer*
- *Oncology Testing: Solid Tumor Molecular Diagnostics*
- *Reproductive Testing: Carrier Screening*
- *Reproductive Testing: Fertility*
- *Reproductive Testing: Prenatal Diagnosis*
- *Reproductive Testing: Prenatal Screening*
- *Specialty Testing: Allergy*
- *Specialty Testing: Cardiovascular*
- *Specialty Testing: Dermatology*
- *Specialty Testing: Endocrinology*
- *Specialty Testing: Gastroenterology*
- *Specialty Testing: Gynecology*
- *Specialty Testing: Hematology*
- *Specialty Testing: Identity and Forensics*
- *Specialty Testing: Immunology and Rheumatology*
- *Specialty Testing: Multisystem Genetic Conditions*
- *Specialty Testing: Nephrology*
- *Specialty Testing: Neurology*
- *Specialty Testing: Nutrition and Metabolism*
- *Specialty Testing: Ophthalmology*
- *Specialty Testing: Orthopedics*
- *Specialty Testing: Otolaryngology*
- *Specialty Testing: Respiratory*
- *Specialty Testing: Toxicology and Pharmacogenetics*

[back to top](#)

CRITERIA

It is the policy of Louisiana Healthcare Connections that the specific genetic testing noted below is **medically necessary** when meeting the related criteria:

General Criteria for Known Familial Variant Analysis for a Genetic Condition

The criteria below is intended for the evaluation of genetic testing that has not been more specifically addressed by criteria in another policy or another section of this policy.

- I. Targeted mutation analysis for a known familial variant for a genetic condition is considered **medically necessary** when:
 - A. The member/enrollee is 18 years or older (if the condition is [adult-onset](#)), **AND**
 - B. The member/enrollee has a [close relative](#) with a known pathogenic or likely pathogenic variant causing the condition, **AND**
 - C. An association between the gene and disease has been established.
- II. Current evidence does not support targeted mutation analysis for a known familial variant of uncertain significance.
- III. Current evidence does not support targeted mutation analysis for a known familial variant for a genetic for all other indications.

[view rationale](#)

[back to top](#)

General Criteria for Targeted Carrier Screening

The criteria below is intended for the evaluation of genetic testing that has not been more specifically addressed by criteria in another policy or another section of this policy.

Targeted carrier screening is defined as a test that screens via full gene sequencing or targeted mutation analysis for a pathogenic or likely pathogenic variant in a gene associated with a specific genetic condition.

- I. Carrier screening for a genetic disorder may be considered **medically necessary** when:
 - A. The member/enrollee is considering pregnancy or is currently pregnant, **AND**
 - B. The genetic disorder is a [recessive condition](#) with a [childhood](#) onset, **AND**
 - C. One of the following:
 - 1. The member/enrollee has a [close relative](#) with a known pathogenic or likely pathogenic variant associated with the disorder, **OR**
 - 2. The member/enrollee's reproductive partner is a carrier for the genetic disorder, **OR**
 - 3. The member or the member/enrollee's reproductive partner are members of a population known to have a carrier rate of 1% or higher for the genetic condition, **OR**
 - 4. The member or the member/enrollee's reproductive partner has a [first- or second-degree relative](#) who is affected with the genetic disorder.

- II. Current evidence does not support carrier screening for a genetic disorder for all other indications.

[view rationale](#)

[back to top](#)

General Criteria for Single Gene or Multigene Panel Analysis

- I. Genetic testing for a genetic condition via single-gene or multigene panel analysis may be considered **medically necessary** when:
- A. The member/enrollee displays clinical features of the suspected genetic condition, **AND**
 - B. The diagnosis remains uncertain after appropriate clinical evaluation and other standard laboratory tests/imaging/etc. have been performed, **AND**
 - C. The test has [clinical validity](#), as demonstrated by accurately determining diagnostic, prognostic or clinical information for a disease, **AND**
 - D. The test has [clinical utility](#), as demonstrated by at least one of the following:
 - 1. The test will determine if a particular therapeutic intervention is effective (or ineffective) in the member/enrollee, or if a particular intervention may be harmful, **OR**
 - 2. The test will directly impact the member/enrollee's clinical management, **OR**
 - 3. The test will determine prognosis, **OR**
 - 4. The test will provide or refine estimates of the natural history, recurrence risk, or the predicted course of the genetic condition, **AND**
 - E. There is no known pathogenic or likely pathogenic familial variant for the genetic condition for which targeted variant analysis would be more appropriate, **AND**
 - F. Non-genetic causes for the member/enrollee's clinical features have been ruled out (e.g., pathogens, drug toxicity, environmental factors, etc.), **AND**
 - G. An association with the gene or multigene panel and disease has been established.
- II. Current evidence does not support genetic testing via single-gene or multigene panel analysis for all other indications.

[view rationale](#)

[back to top](#)

Prenatal Diagnosis for Single Gene Disorders

- I. Prenatal diagnosis for single-gene disorders via amniocentesis, CVS (chorionic villus sampling), or PUBS (percutaneous umbilical blood sampling), may be considered **medically necessary** when:
 - A. The member/enrollee meets any of the following:
 1. At least one biological parent has a known pathogenic variant for an autosomal dominant condition, **OR**
 2. Both biological parents are known carriers of an autosomal recessive condition, **OR**
 3. One biological parent is suspected or known to be a carrier of an X-linked condition, **OR**
 4. The member/enrollee has a history of a previous child with a genetic condition and the member/enrollee is suspected to have [germline](#) mosaicism, **AND**
 - B. The natural history of the disease is well-understood, and there is a high likelihood that the disease has high morbidity, **AND**
 - C. The genetic test has adequate sensitivity and specificity to guide clinical decision making and residual risk is understood.
- II. Prenatal diagnosis for single-gene disorders via amniocentesis, CVS, or PUBS, for adult onset single-gene disorders (e.g., hereditary cancer syndromes such as *BRCA1/2*, etc.) is considered **not medically necessary**.
- III. Current evidence does not support prenatal diagnosis for single-gene disorders, via amniocentesis, CVS, or PUBS, for variants of unknown significance (VUS).
- IV. Current evidence does not support prenatal diagnosis for single-gene disorders, via amniocentesis, CVS, or PUBS, for all other indications.

[view rationale](#)

[back to top](#)

General Criteria for Other Laboratory Tests

- I. Other laboratory tests are considered **medically necessary** when:
 - A. The member/enrollee displays relevant clinical features consistent with the intended use of the test, **AND**

- B. The test has [clinical validity](#), as demonstrated by accurately determining diagnostic, prognostic or clinical information for a disease, **AND**
- C. The test has [clinical utility](#), as demonstrated by at least one of the following:
 - 1. The test will determine if a particular therapeutic intervention is effective (or ineffective) in the member/enrollee, or if a particular intervention may be harmful, **OR**
 - 2. The test will directly impact the member/enrollee's clinical management, **OR**
 - 3. The test will determine prognosis, **OR**
 - 4. The test will provide or refine estimates of the natural history, recurrence risk, or the predicted course of the disease or genetic condition, **AND**
- D. Testing is being performed in a Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA) approved laboratory.

II. Current evidence does not support other laboratory tests for all other indications.

NOTE: See policies Oncology Testing: Solid Tumor Molecular Diagnostics, Oncology Testing: Hematologic Malignancy Molecular Diagnostics, and Oncology: Algorithmic Assays for criteria regarding common tests in these clinical areas.

[view rationale](#)

[back to top](#)

RATIONALE

General Criteria for Known Familial Variant Analysis for a Genetic Condition

Genetic Support Foundation

The Genetic Support Foundation's Genetics 101 information on genetic testing says the following about testing for familial pathogenic variants:

“Genetic testing for someone who may be at risk for an inherited disease is always easier if we know the specific genetic cause. Oftentimes, the best way to find the genetic cause is to start by testing someone in the family who is known or strongly suspected to have the disease. If their testing is positive, then we can say that we have found the familial pathogenic (harmful) variant. We can use this as a marker to test other members of the family to see who is also at risk.”

National Society of Genetic Counselors (NSGC)

The National Society of Genetic Counselors updated a position statement (2017) regarding the genetic testing of minors for adult-onset conditions, stating the following:

“[NSGC] encourages deferring predictive genetic testing of minors for adult-onset conditions when results will not impact childhood medical management or significantly benefit the child. Predictive testing should optimally be deferred until the individual has the capacity to weigh the associated risks, benefits, and limitations of this information, taking his/her circumstances, preferences, and beliefs into account to preserve his/her autonomy and right to an open future.”

[back to top](#)

General Criteria for Targeted Carrier Screening

American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG)

ACOG published practice bulletin No. 690 (March 2017, reaffirmed 2023), which includes the following recommendations related to carrier screening:

- Given the multitude of conditions that can be included in expanded carrier screening panels, the disorders selected for inclusion should meet several of the following consensus-determined criteria: have a carrier frequency of 1 in 100 or greater, have a well-defined phenotype, have a detrimental effect on quality of life, cause cognitive or physical impairment, require surgical or medical intervention, or have an onset early in life. Additionally, screened conditions should be able to be diagnosed prenatally and may afford opportunities for antenatal intervention to improve perinatal outcomes, changes to delivery management to optimize newborn and infant outcomes, and education of the parents about special care needs after birth.
- Carrier screening panels should not include conditions primarily associated with a disease of adult onset (p. e36).

ACOG published practice bulletin No. 691 (March 2017, reaffirmed 2023), which includes the following recommendations related to carrier screening:

- Information about carrier screening should be provided to every pregnant woman.
- Carrier screening and counseling ideally should be performed before pregnancy because this enables couples to learn about their reproductive risk and consider the most complete range of reproductive options. A patient may decline any or all screening.
- When an individual is found to be a carrier for a genetic condition, his or her relatives are at risk of carrying the same mutation. The patient should be encouraged to inform his or her relatives of the risk and the availability of carrier screening.
- If an individual is found to be a carrier for a specific condition, the patient's reproductive partner should be offered testing in order to receive informed genetic counseling about potential reproductive outcomes.
- If both partners are found to be carriers of a genetic condition, genetic counseling should

be offered (p. 597).

[back to top](#)

General Criteria for Single Gene or Multigene Panel Analysis

American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG) and the Association for Molecular Pathology (AMP)

- The ACMG and AMP released criteria on the types and severity of mutations, which are as follows:
 - **Very strong evidence of pathogenicity:** Null variants in a gene where loss of function (LOF) is a known mechanism of disease. The guidelines note to use caution in genes where LOF is not a mechanism, if LOF variants are at the 3' end, if exon skipping occurs, and if multiple transcripts are present.
 - **Strong:** Amino acid change to a pathogenic version, de novo mutations, established studies supporting a damaging gene or gene product, or if the prevalence of the variant is increased in affected individuals compared to healthy controls. The guidelines note to be careful of changes impacting splicing and if only the paternity has been confirmed.
 - **Moderate:** Located in a mutational hot spot or well-established functional domain without a benign variant, absent from controls in Exome Sequencing Project, 1000 Genomes Project, or Exome Aggregation Consortium, detected in trans with pathogenic variants for a recessive disorder, protein length changes, novel missense changes where a different missense change has been pathogenic before, and a possible de novo mutation.
 - **Supporting:** Cosegregation with disease in multiple affected family members/enrollees in a gene definitively known to cause the disease, missense variant in a gene with low rate of benign missense variation, if the mutation has evidence that it is deleterious, or if the patient's phenotype is highly specific for disease with a single genetic cause (p. 412).

American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG)

The American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics Board of Directors (2015) published a position statement regarding the clinical utility of genetic and genomic services that stated the following regarding individuals and situations where a definitive genetic diagnosis has clinical utility:

Clinical Utility for Individual Patients

- Situations in which definitive diagnosis specifically informs causality, prognosis, and treatment

- Newborn screening for conditions recommended by the Secretary's Discretionary Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders of Newborns and Children
- The discovery of medically actionable secondary findings in the course of genomic testing that have associated treatments that improve/affect outcome
- Patients with complex and often poorly understood clinical disorders such as autism spectrum disorders and intellectual disability
- Patients with rare disorders, including those diagnosed by chromosome analysis (such as karyotype) or microarray
- Patients with genetic conditions such that definitive and specific guidance regarding prognosis and medical management is not yet available

Clinical Utility for Families

- Enables at-risk family members to obtain testing to determine whether they carry a causative mutation, offering the possibility for early intervention. This clinical utility is independent of whether the affected family member/enrollee has benefited directly from this diagnosis.
- Enables specific and informed reproductive decision-making and family planning.
- Brings resolution to the costly (in terms of both psychosocial and financial contexts) and wasteful (for the medical system at large) diagnostic odyssey that is often pursued in a quest to establish a diagnosis. There are countless examples of economic and psychological costs to the health-care system and to patients and families during the quest to obtain a diagnosis.
- Enables involvement in disease support groups and other types of social support for families.

Clinical Utility for Society

- Understanding the etiology of disease and increased accrual into clinical trials will propel research, benefitting society as a whole.
- Many genetic disease risks can be identified decades before the time when benefits accrue to the individual or their family members. In the current health-care environment, cost-effectiveness often is measured by return on investment to payers and is measured over much shorter time periods, despite long-term benefits to population health (p. 506).

National Society of Genetic Counselors (NSGC)

The National Society of Genetic Counselors released a position statement (2017) (reaffirmed 2020 and 2023) endorsing the use of multi-gene panels when clinically warranted and appropriately applied, stating the following:

“These tests can provide a comprehensive and efficient route to identifying the genetic causes of disease. Before ordering a multi-gene panel test, providers should thoroughly evaluate the analytic and clinical validity of the test, as well as its clinical utility. Additional factors to consider include, but are not limited to: clinical and family

history information, gene content of the panel, limitations of the sequencing and informatics technologies, and variant interpretation and reporting practices.

Panels magnify the complexities of genetic testing and underscore the value of experts, such as genetic counselors, who can educate stakeholders about appropriate utilization of the technology to mitigate risks of patient harm and unnecessary costs to the healthcare system. NSGC supports straightforward and transparent pricing so that patients, providers, laboratories, and health plans can easily weigh the value of genetic testing in light of its cost.”

The National Society of Genetic Counselors updated a position statement (2017) regarding the genetic testing of minors for adult-onset conditions, stating the following:

“[NSGC] encourages deferring predictive genetic testing of minors for adult-onset conditions when results will not impact childhood medical management or significantly benefit the child. Predictive testing should optimally be deferred until the individual has the capacity to weigh the associated risks, benefits, and limitations of this information, taking his/her circumstances, preferences, and beliefs into account to preserve his/her autonomy and right to an open future.”

American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) and American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG)

In their 2013 joint technical report, the AAP and ACMG state the following:

“Decisions about whether to offer genetic testing and screening should be driven by the best interest of the child” (p. 234).

“The AAP and the ACMG do not support routine carrier testing or screening for recessive conditions when carrier status has no medical relevance during minority” (p. 236).

“Predictive genetic testing for adult onset conditions generally should be deferred unless an intervention initiated in childhood may reduce morbidity or mortality” (p. 238).

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)

The CDC’s Office of Public Health Genomics developed the ACCE Model (Analytic Validity, Clinical Validity, Clinical Utility, and Ethical/Legal/Social Implications), which is a clinical framework in which to evaluate a genetic test. The ACCE model process “...is composed of a standard set of 44 targeted questions that address disorder, testing, and clinical scenarios, as well as analytic and clinical validity, clinical utility, and associated ethical, legal, and social issues.” A complete list of the 44 targeted questions referenced can be found at the following website:

https://www.cdc.gov/genomics/gtesting/acce/acce_proj.htm

[back to top](#)

Prenatal Diagnosis for Single Gene Disorders

National Society of Genetic Counselors (NSGC)

The National Society of Genetic Counselors updated a position statement (2019) regarding prenatal testing for adult-onset conditions, stating the following:

“The National Society of Genetic Counselors (NSGC) does not recommend prenatal genetic testing for known adult-onset conditions if pregnancy or childhood management will not be affected. Due to potential medical and ethical complexities, NSGC recommends that prior to undergoing testing, prospective parents meet with a genetic counselor or other healthcare specialists with genetics expertise to discuss the implications of prenatal testing for adult-onset conditions. Pre-test counseling should include a discussion of the natural history of the condition, availability of treatments or interventions, concerns that prenatal testing for adult-onset conditions may deny a child’s future autonomy, and potential for genetic discrimination.”

American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG)

ACOG practice bulletin 162 (published 2016, reaffirmed 2024) states the following:

All pregnant women should be offered prenatal assessment for aneuploidy by screening or diagnostic testing regardless of maternal age or other risk factors. Patients with an increased risk of a fetal genetic disorder include those in the following categories:

- Older maternal age
- Older paternal age
- Prior child with structural birth defect
- Previous fetus or child with autosomal trisomy or sex chromosome aneuploidy
- Structural anomalies identified by ultrasonography
- Parental carrier of chromosome rearrangement
- Parental aneuploidy or aneuploidy mosaicism
- Parental carrier of a genetic disorder
- Biological parent who is affected by an autosomal dominant disorder (p. e112-e113).

Some autosomal dominant disorders seen in a previous child but with no other family history may have arisen as a new mutation. In such cases, there may be a small increased risk of recurrence, depending on the disorder. To ensure that any testing for recurrence is informative, a diagnosis established by molecular testing of the affected child usually is necessary. Such confirmation also will ensure that the risk for a future pregnancy has been assessed accurately.

American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG)

ACOG released a committee opinion (no. 693) in April 2017 (reaffirmed 2020) regarding counseling about genetic testing and communication of genetic test results.

The opinion states: “As with any medical test, expectations regarding the performance of a genetic test should be discussed with the patient before the test is ordered. Pretest counseling that

includes information on the types of potential results as well as the risks, limitations, and benefits of testing should be provided to all patients before performing any form of genetic test. After counseling, patients should have the option to decline any or all testing” (p. 1).

A discussion of the sensitivity and specificity of the test for each of the disorders being tested is important to ensure patient understanding. For example, in the case of expanded carrier screening, patients should be informed of the overall range of the carrier detection rate and the range of residual risk of the disorders examined. With reference to each patient’s specific a priori risk, the patient should be informed of the meaning and significance of positive, negative, or indeterminate test results, as well as results that are normal but may have variable phenotypes. This discussion of the positive predictive value and negative predictive value of the test result facilitates a discussion of the potential need for follow-up diagnostic testing (p. 3).

[back to top](#)

General Criteria for Other Laboratory Tests

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)

The CDC’s Office of Public Health Genomics developed the ACCE Model (Analytic Validity, Clinical Validity, Clinical Utility, and Ethical/Legal/Social Implications), which is a clinical framework in which to evaluate a genetic test. The ACCE model process “...is composed of a standard set of 44 targeted questions that address disorder, testing, and clinical scenarios, as well as analytic and clinical validity, clinical utility, and associated ethical, legal, and social issues.” A complete list of the 44 targeted questions referenced can be found at the following website:

https://www.cdc.gov/genomics/gtesting/acce/acce_proj.htm

Burke, et al

This article from the NIH defines clinical validity and clinical utility, provides examples, and considers the implications of these test properties for clinical practice. When a test is used diagnostically, clinical validity measures the accuracy with which the test identifies a person with the clinical condition in question. The positive and negative predictive values of the test are important measures of clinical validity. These measures allow the clinician to determine how reliably the test can confirm or refute a suspected diagnosis (p. 2-3).

Table 9.15.1 (p. 12) describes the test properties of measuring clinical validity as follows:

- Sensitivity: Among people with a specific condition, the proportion who have a positive test result
- Specificity: Among people who do not have the condition, the proportion who have a negative test result
- Positive predictive value: Among people with a positive test result, the proportion who have the condition
- Negative predictive value: Among people with a negative test result, the proportion who do not have the condition

Clinical utility refers to the risks and benefits resulting from genetic test use. The most important considerations in determining clinical utility are: (1) whether the test and any subsequent interventions lead to an improved health outcome among people with a positive test result; and (2) what risks occur as a result of testing (p. 6).

Hayes, et al

In an article by Hayes, et al (2020), the authors state that while there is no strict definition of clinical utility for tumor biomarker tests (TBT), there are several factors that should be considered when deciding on the overall clinical utility (p. 238):

- (1) What is the intended use of the tumor biomarker test?
- (2) What are the endpoints that are used to determine clinical utility?
- (3) How substantial does the difference in endpoints between groups defined by the TBT need to be to determine therapeutic strategies?
- (4) What is the risk tolerance of the stakeholders?
- (5) Who are the stakeholders that make the decision?

The authors note that “for a TBT to have clinical utility, it must have high analytical validity and be shown, with high levels of evidence, to improve outcomes compared with if the TBT results are not known. A pragmatic determination of clinical utility is dependent on several factors, including what end point is considered, how large the difference in that end point must be to apply the TBT, the level of evidence that exists to support the decision to apply the TBT, and the risk tolerance of whichever stakeholder makes the decision to apply it. None of these factors can be the absolute determinant, but they must be included in the deliberations of whether a TBT does or does not have clinical utility” (p. 239).

The American Association for Clinical Chemistry (AACC)

An online article released from the AACC in 2018 defined and reviewed the use of multianalyte assays with algorithmic analyses (MAAAs). They state:

“...these tests combine results from two or more biochemical or molecular markers, along with patient demographics and clinical information, into an algorithm to generate diagnostic, prognostic, or predictive information for a disease. In cases where single biomarker tests lack acceptable clinical sensitivity and specificity, MAAAs can improve or refine disease detection through individualized risk assessment.

Incorporating multiple biochemical or molecular analytes into algorithms with or without clinical information allows for a personalized risk assessment of a patient’s disease.”

[back to top](#)

DEFINITIONS

1. An **adult-onset condition** is one in which the signs, symptoms, or manifestations of a disease typically begin after a person is age 18 years or older.
2. **Childhood** is the period of development until the 18th birthday.
3. **Clinical validity**, according to the National Institutes of Health-Department of Energy (NIH-DOE) Task Force on Genetic Testing, describes the accuracy with which a test identifies a particular clinical condition. The components of measuring clinical validity are:
 - a. **Sensitivity**: among people with a specific condition, the proportion who have a positive test result
 - b. **Specificity**: among people who do not have the condition, the proportion who have a negative test result
 - c. **Positive predictive value**: among people with a positive test result, the proportion of people who have the condition
 - d. **Negative predictive value**: among people with a negative test result, the proportion who do not have the condition
4. **Clinical utility** refers to the risks and benefits resulting from genetic test use. The most important considerations in determining clinical utility are: (1) whether the test and any subsequent interventions lead to an improved health outcome among people with a positive test result; and (2) what risks occur as a result of testing.
5. **Close relatives** include first, second, and third degree blood relatives:
 - a. **First-degree relatives** are parents, siblings, and children
 - b. **Second-degree relatives** are grandparents, aunts, uncles, nieces, nephews, grandchildren, and half siblings
 - c. **Third-degree relatives** are great grandparents, great aunts, great uncles, great grandchildren, and first cousins
6. **Germline** pathogenic or likely pathogenic variants are mutations that occur in the egg and sperm cells, also known as the germ cells. These variants are inherited; that is, passed down in families by blood relatives. Most germline mutations do not result in disease.
7. **Multifactorial conditions** are complex conditions that are inherited and may be caused by a combination of the effects of multiple genes or by interactions between genes and the environment.

8. A **recessive condition** is one in which both copies of a gene have a mutation (autosomal recessive inheritance), or an individual with one X chromosome is hemizygous for a mutation, resulting in an X-linked recessive condition.

Reviews, Revisions, and Approvals	Revision Date	Approval Date	Effective Date
Converted corporate to local policy.	09/23	11/27/23	
Semi-annual review. Updated title to reflect V1.2024 version. Overview, coding, reference-table, background and references updated. Throughout policy: replaced “coverage criteria” with “criteria. Removed Policy Reference Table. For Single Gene or Multigene Panel Analysis: removed “conventional diagnostic testing” and added “clinical evaluation and other standard...”. Added “General Tumor Biomarker Analysis...”. Added “Oncology Algorithmic Tests...”. Added “Other Tests”. For Notes and Definitions: added “9. Clinical validity, according to the National...”; added “10. Clinical utility refers to the risks...”; added “11. An algorithmic test is one that combines...”. For Background and Rationale; under Known Familial Variant Analysis: added “National Society of Genetic Counselors (NSGC)...”; added “General Tumor Biomarker Analysis...”; added “Oncology Algorithmic Test...”; added “Other Genetic Tests...”.	12/23	2/27/24	
Semi-annual review. Updated title to reflect V2.2024 version. In General Criteria for Oncology Algorithmic Tests criteria, minor expansion of criteria to be consistent with guidelines (added “suspected neoplasm and/or malignancy” to the coverage criteria, previously only allowed for confirmed neoplasm). Criteria set name changed (former name: Oncology Algorithmic Tests). Updated coverage criteria assessing for clinical validity and utility. In General Criteria for Known Familial Variant Analysis for a Genetic Condition criteria, several Known Familial Variant criteria moved to policy “Genetic Testing: General Approach to Genetic and Molecular Testing” to consolidate criteria for known familial variant tests. Removed subjective criteria point: “The genetic condition is associated with a significant health problem or problems.” In Single Gene or Multigene Panel Analysis criteria, updated coverage criteria assessing for clinical validity and utility. Removed subjective criteria point: “Genetic testing for the suspected genetic condition has been scientifically validated to improve health outcomes (i.e., the test has been shown to have clinical utility).” In General Criteria for Targeted Carrier Screening criteria, moved criteria FROM policy “Genetic Testing: Prenatal and Preconception Carrier Screening” to align with other general coverage criteria tests. In General Criteria for Tumor Biomarker Analysis criteria, criteria set name changed (former name: General Tumor Biomarker Analysis). Updated coverage criteria assessing for clinical validity and utility. In General Criteria for Other Tests criteria, criteria set name changed (former name: Other Tests). Updated coverage criteria assessing for	06/24	8/19/24	9/19/24

Reviews, Revisions, and Approvals	Revision Date	Approval Date	Effective Date
clinical validity and utility. Minor rewording for clarity throughout. Coding, reference-table, background and references updated.			
Semi-annual review. Updated title to reflect V1.2025 version. General Approach to Genetic and Molecular Testing: Updated the definition of targeted prenatal screening from, "Targeted carrier screening is defined as a test that screens for a known mutation in one gene associated with a specific genetic condition." to "Targeted carrier screening is defined as a test that screens via full gene sequencing or targeted mutation analysis for a pathogenic or likely pathogenic variant in a gene associated with a specific genetic condition."; Removed age restriction criteria from the General Criteria for Single Gene or Multigene Panel Analysis for adult onset tests as the member must meet the criterion of having clinical features of the condition; Added definition for autosomal recessive condition; Added Prenatal Diagnosis for Genetic Conditions to this policy (moved from the GT: Prenatal Diagnosis policy). Updated NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Occult Primary from version 2.2024 to 1.2025: Added the following references; 1. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists' Committee on Practice Bulletins—Obstetrics; Committee on Genetics; Society for Maternal–Fetal Medicine. Practice Bulletin No. 162: Prenatal Diagnostic Testing for Genetic Disorders. Obstet Gynecol. 2016 (Reaffirmed 2020);127(5):e108-e122. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000001405; 2. "Prenatal Testing for Adult-Onset Condition". Position Statement from National Society for Genetic Counselors. https://www.nsgc.org/Policy-Research-and-Publications/Position-Statements/Position-Statements/Post/prenatal-testing-for-adult-onset-conditions-1 . Released October 9, 2018. Updated June 26, 2019.; 3. Committee Opinion No. 693: Counseling About Genetic Testing and Communication of Genetic Test Results. Obstet Gynecol. 2017 (reaffirmed 2020);129(4):e96-e101. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000002020	1/25	3/31/25	5/1/25
Annual review. Removed criteria for General Criteria for Tumor Biomarker Analysis and General Criteria for Oncology Algorithmic Tests as it falls under General Criteria for Other Tests. Removed the note stating "The criteria below is intended for the evaluation of genetic testing that has not been more specifically addressed by coverage criteria in another policy or another section of this policy. State-level regulations may also necessitate review of National Guidelines, National or Local Coverage Determinations and/or FDA approvals" before the following criteria sets: General Criteria for Single Gene or Multigene Panel Analysis, Prenatal Diagnosis for Single Gene Disorders, and General Criteria for Other Tests. Replaced "investigational" policy statement with "Current evidence does not support....." throughout policy. Background, rationale, and references were updated.	04/26	6/29/26	7/29/26

[back to top](#)

REFERENCES

1. ACMG Board of Directors. Clinical utility of genetic and genomic services: a position statement of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics. *Genet Med*. 2015;17(6):505-507. doi:10.1038/gim.2015.41
2. "Genetic Testing of Minors for Adult-Onset Conditions". Position Statement from National Society of Genetic Counselors. <https://www.nsgc.org/Policy-Research-and-Publications/Position-Statements/Position-Statements/Post/genetic-testing-of-minors-for-adult-onset-conditions>. Released February 15, 2017. Updated April 18, 2018.
3. Ross LF, Saal HM, David KL, Anderson RR; American Academy of Pediatrics; American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics. Technical report: Ethical and policy issues in genetic testing and screening of children [published correction appears in *Genet Med*. 2013 Apr;15(4):321. Ross, Laine Friedman [corrected to Ross, Lainie Friedman]]. *Genet Med*. 2013;15(3):234-245. doi:10.1038/gim.2012.176
4. Richards S, Aziz N, Bale S, et al. Standards and guidelines for the interpretation of sequence variants: a joint consensus recommendation of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics and the Association for Molecular Pathology. *Genet Med*. 2015;17(5):405-424. doi:10.1038/gim.2015.30
5. "Use of Multi-Gene Panel Testing." Position Statement from National Society of Genetic Counselors. <https://www.nsgc.org/Policy-Research-and-Publications/Position-Statements/Position-Statements/Post/use-of-multi-gene-panel-tests>. Released March 14, 2017. Reaffirmed 2020 and 2023
6. Genetic Support Foundation. Genetics 101 Inheritance Patterns: Familial Pathogenic Variant. Accessed 5/17/2024. <https://geneticsupportfoundation.org/genetics-101/#>
7. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Occult Primary. Version 2.2025. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/occult.pdf
8. ACCE Model Process for Evaluating Genetic Tests. (2010, December 28). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Accessed 2023, June 5. <https://www.cdc.gov/genomics/gtesting/acce/index.htm>
9. Hayes DF. Defining Clinical Utility of Tumor Biomarker Tests: A Clinician's Viewpoint. *J Clin Oncol*. 2021;39(3):238-248. doi:10.1200/JCO.20.01572
10. Burke W. Genetic tests: clinical validity and clinical utility. *Curr Protoc Hum Genet*. 2014;81:9.15.1-9.15.8. Published 2014 Apr 24. doi:10.1002/0471142905.hg0915s81
11. Wang HY, Chen CH, Shi S, et al. Improving Multi-Tumor Biomarker Health Check-up Tests with Machine Learning Algorithms. *Cancers (Basel)*. 2020;12(6):1442. Published 2020 Jun 1. doi:10.3390/cancers12061442
12. Turner, KA, Algeciras-Schimmich, A. Multianalyte Assays with Algorithmic Analysis in Women's Health. *Association for Diagnostics and Laboratory Medicine (ADLM)*. 2018. <https://www.aacc.org/cln/articles/2018/july/multianalyte-assays-with-algorithmic-analysis-in-womens-health>
13. Committee Opinion No. 690 (Reaffirmed 2023: Carrier Screening in the Age of Genomic Medicine. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2017;129(3):e35-e40. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000001951
14. Committee Opinion No. 691 Summary: Carrier Screening for Genetic Conditions. *Obstet*

- Gynecol. 2017 (Reaffirmed 2023);129(3):597-599.
doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000001948
15. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists' Committee on Practice Bulletins—Obstetrics; Committee on Genetics; Society for Maternal–Fetal Medicine. Practice Bulletin No. 162: Prenatal Diagnostic Testing for Genetic Disorders. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2016 (Reaffirmed 2024);127(5):e108-e122.
doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000001405
 16. “Prenatal Testing for Adult-Onset Condition”. Position Statement from National Society for Genetic Counselors. <https://www.nsgc.org/Policy-Research-and-Publications/Position-Statements/Position-Statements/Post/prenatal-testing-for-adult-onset-conditions-1>. Released October 9, 2018. Updated June 26, 2019.
 17. Committee Opinion No. 693: Counseling About Genetic Testing and Communication of Genetic Test Results. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2017 (reaffirmed 2020);129(4):e96-e101.
doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000002020
 18. Sun F, Bruening W, Erinoff E, et al. Addressing Challenges in Genetic Test Evaluation: Evaluation Frameworks and Assessment of Analytic Validity [Internet]. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2011 Jun. Table 1, Fryback and Thornbury hierarchical model of efficacy. Available from:
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK56754/table/results.t1/>

[back to top](#)

Important Reminder

This clinical policy has been developed by appropriately experienced and licensed health care professionals based on a review and consideration of currently available generally accepted standards of medical practice; peer-reviewed medical literature; government agency/program approval status; evidence-based guidelines and positions of leading national health professional organizations; views of physicians practicing in relevant clinical areas affected by this clinical policy; and other available clinical information. LHCC makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information used or relied upon in developing this clinical policy. This clinical policy is consistent with standards of medical practice current at the time that this clinical policy was approved.

The purpose of this clinical policy is to provide a guide to medical necessity, which is a component of the guidelines used to assist in making coverage decisions and administering benefits. It does not constitute a contract or guarantee regarding payment or results. Coverage decisions and the administration of benefits are subject to all terms, conditions, exclusions, and limitations of the coverage documents (e.g., evidence of coverage, certificate of coverage, policy, contract of insurance, etc.), as well as to state and federal requirements and applicable LHCC administrative policies and procedures.

This clinical policy is effective as of the date determined by LHCC. The date of posting may not be the effective date of this clinical policy. This clinical policy may be subject to applicable legal and regulatory requirements relating to provider notification. If there is a discrepancy between the effective date of this clinical policy and any applicable legal or

regulatory requirement, the requirements of law and regulation shall govern. LHCC retains the right to change, amend or withdraw this clinical policy, and additional clinical policies may be developed and adopted as needed, at any time.

This clinical policy does not constitute medical advice, medical treatment, or medical care. It is not intended to dictate to providers how to practice medicine. Providers are expected to exercise professional medical judgment in providing the most appropriate care and are solely responsible for the medical advice and treatment of member/enrollees. This clinical policy is not intended to recommend treatment for member/enrollees. Member/enrollees should consult with their treating physician in connection with diagnosis and treatment decisions.

Providers referred to in this clinical policy are independent contractors who exercise independent judgment and over whom LHCC has no control or right of control. Providers are not agents or employees of LHCC.

This clinical policy is the property of LHCC. Unauthorized copying, use, and distribution of this clinical policy or any information contained herein are strictly prohibited. Providers, member/enrollees, and their representatives are bound to the terms and conditions expressed herein through the terms of their contracts. Where no such contract exists, providers, member/enrollees and their representatives agree to be bound by such terms and conditions by providing services to member/enrollees and/or submitting claims for payment for such services.

©2026 Louisiana Healthcare Connections. All rights reserved. All materials are exclusively owned by Louisiana Healthcare Connections and are protected by United States copyright law and international copyright law. No part of this publication may be reproduced, copied, modified, distributed, displayed, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means, or otherwise published without the prior written permission of Louisiana Healthcare Connections. You may not alter or remove any trademark, copyright or other notice contained herein. Louisiana Healthcare Connections is a registered trademark exclusively owned by Louisiana Healthcare Connections.

[back to top](#)