

Cell-free DNA (cfDNA) Testing for Fetal Aneuploidy

Policy MP-018

Origination Date: 07/25/2018

Review/Revised Date: 08/18/2021

Next Review Date: 08/18/2022

Current Effective Date: 08/18/2021

Disclaimer:

1. Policies are subject to change in accordance with State and Federal notice requirements.
2. Policies outline coverage determinations for U of U Health Plans Commercial, and Healthy U (Medicaid) plans. Refer to the "Policy" section for more information.

Description:

Chromosomal abnormalities can complicate pregnancy. Such chromosomal abnormalities such as trisomy (having three copies of a given chromosome or chromosome segment in each somatic cell rather than the normal number of 2) occur more commonly in children of women older than age 35 when they become pregnant and if certain other high risk indicators exist. The most common trisomy conditions to occur involve Trisomy 21 (Downs syndrome), Trisomy 18 (Edwards syndrome), and Trisomy 13 (Patau syndrome).

To help families and pregnant women determine if these conditions may exist various prenatal testing is undertaken particularly in high risk individuals. Currently, several different blood tests in combination with nuchal translucency assessment by ultrasound are the standard of care for screening for presence of trisomy. Either amniocentesis or chorio-villous sampling are then performed as definitive test to determine if a trisomy condition is truly present.

With the discovery of cell free fetal DNA circulating in maternal blood new methods to test for trisomy have been developed. There are a number of companies currently providing this testing including Sequenom [Materniti21], Natera [Panorama], Roche/Ariosa [Harmony] and others. These tests or assays are based on the purification of cell-free DNA from maternal plasma applying recent high-tech developments in sequence (and bioinformatics) analysis of DNA fragments. It is not known whether or to what extent the results of these and other testing technologies would be in agreement.

It is hoped that the use of these more definitive tests to detect fetal trisomy will result in the need for fewer invasive procedures such as amniocentesis or chorio-villous sampling with an associated reduction in procedure complications resulting in miscarriages and loss of the pregnancy.

Policy Statement and Criteria

1. Commercial Plans

U of U Health Plans covers testing for fetal aneuploidy when the following criteria are met:

- A. Pregnancy is a singleton pregnancy (with only one fetus) at greater than 10 weeks of gestation; **and**
- B. **ONE** of the following are present:
 - i. Women with a first or second trimester positive screen; or
 - ii. Pregnant women 35 years of age or older at delivery* ; or
 - iii. Previously affected pregnancy with a trisomy; or
 - iv. Documented first degree relative with a translocation specific for a common trisomy; or
 - v. Abnormal sonographic findings.

**In cases where the pregnant woman has received a 'donor' egg and is acting as a surrogate, it is the age of the donor that is relevant to the decision process not the age of the surrogate.*

U of U Health Plans does NOT cover testing for fetal aneuploidy in multiple gestation pregnancies or any other indications.

U of U Health Plans does NOT cover fetal chromosomal microdeletions syndromes and other chromosomal disorders using circulating cell-free fetal DNA testing.

2. Medicaid Plans

Coverage is determined by the State of Utah Medicaid program; if Utah State Medicaid has no published coverage position and InterQual criteria are not available, the U of U Health Plans Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, please visit their website at <http://health.utah.gov/medicaid/manuals/directory.php> or the [Utah Medicaid code Look-Up tool](#)

3. Medicare Plans

Coverage is determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); if a coverage determination has not been adopted by CMS and InterQual criteria are not available, the U of U Health Plans Commercial criteria will apply. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit their search website at:

<http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/overview-and-quick-search.aspx?from2=search1.asp&> or [the manual website](#)

Clinical Rationale

A review of the literature performed in August 2012 identified 3 systematic reviews and 23 primary studies. A systematic review from the California Technology Assessment Forum (CTAF) summarized well the current testing methods and sensitivity and specificity rates of seven studies conducted to evaluate the use of cfDNA for screening for fetal aneuploidy. The analysis affirmed the accuracy of cfDNA for detecting Trisomy 21. Limitations cited of the studies were the low number of patients of normal patients enrolled in the studies which may influence the specificity, the studies only included high risk women, a lack of direct comparison to current screening methods for aneuploidy and lack of data outside of an investigational study.

Most published evidence on cfDNA is based on studies conducted on high-risk populations. There is now data on the performance of cfDNA in the general obstetric population. One study conducted in 2013 compared the clinical performance of cfDNA in detecting trisomies 21, 18 and 13 in 146,958 pregnancies in low-risk versus high-risk pregnancies. There was no significant difference in test performance between the 72 382 high-risk and 40 287 low-risk subjects (sensitivity, 99.21% vs 98.97% ($P = 0.82$); specificity, 99.95% vs 99.95% [$P = 0.98$]). However, due to the lower prevalence of aneuploidy in low-risk pregnancies (e.g., in women under the age of 35), the positive predictive value of this test is lower in the general obstetric population.

Two articles seminal to the determination of clinical validity are the studies of Palomaki et al. and Bianchi et al. Each evaluated 1 of the commercially available tests, Palomaki assessing the MaterniT21™ test and Bianchi assessing the Verify™ prenatal test. Each study demonstrated the detection for aneuploidies has high sensitivity and specificity for Trisomy 21 approaching 100% under the study conditions. Additionally, sensitivity and specificity for trisomies 13 and 18 are about 78% and 97% respectively, depending on the test method/vendor. Below are the abstracts of 2 major prospective studies.

Another study by Palomaki et al, in 2017, assessed the clinical utility of cfDNA-based screening for aneuploidies offered through primary obstetrical care providers to a general pregnancy population. Among 2,681 tests reported, 16 women (0.6%) were screen-positive for trisomy 21, 18 or 13. Twelve were confirmed (PPV, 75%) and four were false-positives (0.15%). Of 150 test failures (5.6%), 79% had a negative serum or subsequent cfDNA test. There were no reported cases of aneuploidy among cfDNA test failures. This first clinical utility study of cfDNA screening found higher uptake rates, patient understanding of basic concepts, and easy incorporation into routine obstetrical practices.

Additionally, there are concerns about how the testing will fit into existing clinical care pathways. A recently published economic study, funded by the manufacturer of the Verify prenatal test suggested the greatest benefit of the testing may come from a reduction in miscarriages due to invasive testing. In the modeled population, invasive diagnostic-induced miscarriages are reduced by 66%. When an invasive procedure is not used following a positive test result, miscarriages are further reduced to about 81%. The study also suggests annual savings related to prenatal screening and diagnosis of fetal aneuploidy to be about 1%. These measures are most impacted by the cost of the cfDNA test; secondarily by the cost of amniocentesis, the rate of second trimester ultrasound and the specificity of prenatal screening.

Some evidence supports the statistical and clinical validity of fetal cell-free DNA as a means of identifying aneuploidy issues in high risk populations. Many unanswered questions remain regarding its exact clinical role, but evidence exists which supports use of the test in the appropriate setting has potential cost effectiveness and improves quality of life.

A study by Grace et al, in 2016, found that since 2011 the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology (ACOG) and the Society for Maternal Fetal Medicine (SMFM), the International Society for Prenatal Diagnosis (ISPD), the National Society for Genetic Counselors, and the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics only recommended cfDNA screening in singleton pregnancies, of women who are considered “high risk” defined by: 1. Their maternal age is 35 or older at time of birth; 2. Having a previous effected pregnancy with a trisomy; 3. Having a positive first or second trimester screening; 4. Having an abnormal ultrasonic finding; and 5. Parental balanced Robertsonian translocation that increases the risk of Trisomy 21 or 13. As more research became available validating the performance of cfDNA screening in general obstetric populations, some societies softened previous recommendations to limit cfDNA screening to high-risk patient populations (ie ISPD and The American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics).

In 2015 ACOG and SMFM published a joint committee opinion on the use of cfDNA testing concluded that “given the performance of traditional screening methods and the limitations of cfDNA, conventional screening methods remain the most appropriate choice for first-line screening for most women in the general obstetric population.” However, if low risk women choose to have the screening they should have pre and post-test counseling of the limitations and benefits and should not make any pregnancy management decisions, including termination based on this test alone.

A 2015 statement from the Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine (SMFM), indicates their recommendation for cell-free DNA aneuploidy testing should not be offered to all pregnant women, only “high risk” pregnancies described above. When it comes to patient autonomy, SMFM believes any woman who requests additional testing should be given the option of this test, even though professional societies do not recommend testing in “low risk” pregnancies. Furthermore, SMFM suggests that insurance coverage should not be required for any “low risk” pregnancies.

An updated ACOG Practice Bulletin in 2016 does not recommend use of cfDNA in twin gestations based on limited data regarding its efficacy (Canick et al., 2012; Huang et al, 2014). This is supported by a recent Hayes (2017) clinical utility study evaluated the use of cell-free DNA screening for fetal sex chromosome aneuploidy in women with singleton or multiple gestation pregnancies. A total of 4103 abstracts were reviewed and of those 117 studies were selected for further review. Seven studies (5 multicenter and 2 single-center) concluded that there is no evidence of cfDNA screening regarding multiple gestation pregnancies; some women with singleton pregnancies and positive cfDNA screening results for fetal sex chromosome aneuploidy (SCA) elect diagnostic testing and use the results for pregnancy decisions.

CfDNA provides information on the three most common aneuploidies but has not been validated for screening of microdeletions, thus cannot be recommended for clinical use. Given the low prevalence of microdeletion disorders, the significance of the results from cfDNA screening is unknown. Detection of a microdeletion would require diagnostic testing using microarray of fetal cells obtained from chorionic villus sampling or amniocentesis.

Several systemic reviews and meta-analyses of studies on the diagnostic accuracy of sequencing based tests for the detection of fetal aneuploidies have been published. For instance, a study by Iwarsson et al in 2017, reviewed the performance of noninvasive prenatal testing (NIPT) for detection of trisomy 21, 18 and 13 (T21, T18, and T13) in a general pregnant population as well as on high risk pregnancies. In the

general pregnant population, there is moderate evidence that the pooled sensitivity is 0.993 (95% CI, 0.955-0.999) and specificity was 0.999 (95% CI, 0.998-0.999) for the analysis of T21. Pooled sensitivity and specificity for T13 and T18 was not calculated in this population due to the low number of studies. In the high risk pregnant population, there is moderate evidence that the pooled sensitivities for T21 and T18 are 0.998 (95% CI, 0.981-0.999) and 0.977 (95% CI, 0.958-0.987) respectively, and low evidence that the pooled sensitivity for T13 is 0.975 (95% CI, 0.819-0.997). The pooled sensitivity for all three trisomies is 0.999 (95% CI, 0.998-0.999). The authors concluded, this is the first meta-analysis using GRADE that shows that NIPT performs well as a screen for trisomy 21 in general pregnant population. Although the false positive rate is low compared with first trimester combined screening, women should still be advised to confirm a positive result by invasive testing if termination of pregnancy is under consideration.

In conclusion, current published evidence demonstrates strong clinical validity for cfDNA testing for aneuploidy; the clinical utility is also well-established for “high risk” patients and less so for “low” or “average” risk patients given the infrequency of these genetic changes in these populations. Further study is necessary to determine if clinical utility and economic utility exist for “low” and “average risk” patients. In addition the evidence does not support use in multiple gestation pregnancies and the testing has not been validated in this setting. Lastly, the use of this testing for microdeletions testing due to the lack of clinical utility studies demonstrating meaningful action based on the findings from this testing.

Applicable Coding

CPT Codes

Covered codes if criteria are met:

- 81420** Fetal chromosomal aneuploidy (e.g., trisomy 21, monosomy X) genomic sequence analysis panel, circulating cell-free fetal DNA in maternal blood, must include analysis of chromosomes 13, 18, and 21
- 81507** Fetal aneuploidy (trisomy 21, 18, and 13) DNA sequence analysis of selected regions using maternal plasma, algorithm reported as a risk score for each trisomy

Non-covered code:

- 81422** Fetal chromosomal microdeletion(s) genomic sequence analysis (e.g., DiGeorge syndrome, Cri-du-chat syndrome), circulating cell-free fetal DNA in maternal blood

HCPCS Codes

No specific codes found

References:

1. ACOG Committee; "Committee Opinion No. 640: Cell-Free DNA Screening For Fetal Aneuploidy." *Obstet Gynecol* 126(3): e31-37 (2015).
2. Ashoor, G, Syngelaki, A, Wagner, M, et al. (2012). Chromosome-selective sequencing of maternal plasma cell-free DNA for first-trimester detection of trisomy 21 and trisomy 18. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 206. 4:322 e1-5.
3. Ashwood, ER, LaGrave, D, South, ST. (2011). *Prenatal Screening and Diagnosis*. ARUP Laboratories. Last Update: December 2011. Available: <http://www.arupconsult.com/Topics/PrenatalScreenDx.html#>. Date Accessed: June 10. 2012.

4. Benn, P., H. Cuckle, et al. (2013). "Non-invasive prenatal testing for aneuploidy: current status and future prospects." *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol* 42(1): 15-33.
5. Bianchi, DW, Platt, LD, Goldberg, JD, et al. (2012). Genome-wide fetal aneuploidy detection by maternal plasma DNA sequencing. *Obstet Gynecol.* 119. 5:890-901.
6. Bulletins, ACoP. (2016). ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 163: Screening for Fetal Aneuploidy. *Obstet Gynecol.* 127:e123-137.
7. Canick, J. A., E. M. Kloza, G. M. Lambert-Messerlian, J. E. Haddow, M. Ehrich, D. van den Boom, A. T. Bombard, C. Deciu and G. E. Palomaki (2012). "DNA sequencing of maternal plasma to identify Down syndrome and other trisomies in multiple gestations." *Prenat Diagn* 32(8): 730-734.
8. Canick, JA, Kloza, EM, Lambert-Messerlian, GM, et al. (2012). DNA sequencing of maternal plasma to identify Down syndrome and other trisomies in multiple gestations. *Prenat Diagn.* 1-5.
9. Chen, EZ, Chiu, RW, Sun, H, et al. (2011). Noninvasive prenatal diagnosis of fetal trisomy 18 and trisomy 13 by maternal plasma DNA sequencing. *PLoS One.* 6. 7:e21791.
10. Chiu, RW, Akolekar, R, Zheng, YW, et al. (2011). Non-invasive prenatal assessment of trisomy 21 by multiplexed maternal plasma DNA sequencing: large scale validity study. *BMJ.* 342. c7401.
11. Chiu, RW, Chan, KC, Gao, Y, et al. (2008). Noninvasive prenatal diagnosis of fetal chromosomal aneuploidy by massively parallel genomic sequencing of DNA in maternal plasma. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 105. 51:20458-63.
12. Chiu, RW, Sun, H, Akolekar, R, et al. (2010). Maternal plasma DNA analysis with massively parallel sequencing by ligation for noninvasive prenatal diagnosis of trisomy 21. *Clin Chem.* 56. 3:459-63.
13. Ehrich, M, Deciu, C, Zwiefelhofer, T, et al. (2011). Noninvasive detection of fetal trisomy 21 by sequencing of DNA in maternal blood: a study in a clinical setting. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 204. 3:205 e1-11.
14. Faas, BH, de Ligt, J, Janssen, I, et al. (2012). Non-invasive prenatal diagnosis of fetal aneuploidies using massively parallel sequencing-by-ligation and evidence that cell-free fetal DNA in the maternal plasma originates from cytotrophoblastic cells. *Expert Opin Biol Ther.* 12 Suppl 1. S19-26.
15. Garfield, SS, Armstrong, S. (2012). Clinical and Cost Consequences of Incorporating a Novel Non-Invasive Prenatal Test into the Diagnostic Pathway for Fetal Trisomies. *Journal of Managed Care Medicine.* 15. 2:34-41.
16. Gil M.M., et al. (2017). Analysis of cell-free DNA in maternal blood in screening for aneuploidies: updated meta-analysis. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol.* 2017 Sep;50(3):302-314.
17. Grace, M. R., et al. (2016). "Cell-Free DNA Screening: Complexities and Challenges of Clinical Implementation." *Obstet Gynecol Surv* 71(8): 477-487.
18. Guo, Q, Zhou, Y, Wang, X, et al. (2010). Simultaneous detection of trisomies 13, 18, and 21 with multiplex ligation-dependent probe amplification-based real-time PCR. *Clin Chem.* 56. 9:1451-9.
19. Hayes GTE Report. (2011) *MaterniT21™ Noninvasive Prenatal Test for Trisomy 21 (Down Syndrome)*. Winifred S. Hayes Inc. December 22.
20. Hill, M, Barrett, AN, White, H, et al. (2012). Uses of cell free fetal DNA in maternal circulation. *Best Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol.*
21. Huang, X., J. Zheng, M. Chen, Y. Zhao, C. Zhang, L. Liu, W. Xie, S. Shi, Y. Wei, D. Lei, C. Xu, Q. Wu, X. Guo, X. Shi, Y. Zhou, Q. Liu, Y. Gao, F. Jiang, H. Zhang, F. Su, H. Ge, X. Li, X. Pan, S. Chen, F. Chen, Q. Fang, H. Jiang, T. K. Lau and W. Wang (2014). "Noninvasive prenatal testing of trisomies 21 and 18 by massively parallel sequencing of maternal plasma DNA in twin pregnancies." *Prenat Diagn* 34(4): 335-340.
22. Innatal prenatal screen information available at: <https://www.progenity.com/tests/innatal>
23. Iwarsson E, Jacobsson B, Dagerhamn J, et. al. Analysis of cell-free fetal DNA in maternal blood for detection of trisomy 21, 18, and 13 in general pregnant population and in a high risk population – a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scan.* Jan 2017;96(1):7-18. PMID 27779757
24. Jensen, TJ, Dzakula, Z, Deciu, C, et al. (2012). Detection of microdeletion 22q11.2 in a fetus by next-generation sequencing of maternal plasma. *Clin Chem.* 58. 7:1148-51.
25. Kalia, S. S., et al. (2017). "Recommendations for reporting of secondary findings in clinical exome and genome sequencing, 2016 update (ACMG SF v2.0): a policy statement of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics." *Genet Med* 19(2): 249-255.
26. Langlois, S., J. A. Brock, et al. (2013). "Current status in non-invasive prenatal detection of down syndrome, trisomy 18, and trisomy 13 using cell-free DNA in maternal plasma." *J Obstet Gynaecol Can* 35(2): 177-181.
27. Lau, TK, Chen, F, Pan, X, et al. (2012). Noninvasive prenatal diagnosis of common fetal chromosomal aneuploidies by maternal plasma DNA sequencing. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med.* 25. 8:1370-4.
28. Liao, GJ, Lun, FM, Zheng, YW, et al. (2011). Targeted massively parallel sequencing of maternal plasma DNA permits efficient and unbiased detection of fetal alleles. *Clin Chem.* 57. 1:92-101.
29. Norton ME et al. Cell-free DNA analysis for noninvasive examination of trisomy. *N Engl J Med* 2015;372:1589-97.
30. Norton ME, Baer RJ, Wapner RJ, et al. Cell-free DNA vs sequential screening for the detection of fetal chromosomal abnormalities. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2016 Jun;214(6):727.e1-6.

31. Palomaki GE, Kloza EM, O'Brien BM, et al. The clinical utility of DNA-based screening for fetal aneuploidy by primary obstetrical care providers in the general pregnancy population. *Genet Med.* 2017 Jul;19(7):778-786.
32. Palomaki, GE, Deciu, C, Kloza, EM, et al. (2012). DNA sequencing of maternal plasma reliably identifies trisomy 18 and trisomy 13 as well as Down syndrome: an international collaborative study. *Genet Med.* 14. 3:296-305.
33. Palomaki, GE, Kloza, EM, Lambert-Messerlian, GM, et al. (2011). DNA sequencing of maternal plasma to detect Down syndrome: an international clinical validation study. *Genet Med.* 13. 11:913-20.
34. Papageorgiou, EA, Karagrigoriou, A, Tsaliki, E, et al. (2011). Fetal-specific DNA methylation ratio permits noninvasive prenatal diagnosis of trisomy 21. *Nat Med.* 17. 4:510-3.
35. Pergament E., et al. (2014). Single-nucleotide polymorphism-based noninvasive prenatal screening in a high-risk and low-risk cohort. *Obstet Gynecol* 2014;124:210-8.
36. QNatal Advanced testing information available at <https://www.questdiagnostics.com/home/physicians/testing-services/by-test-name/noninvasive/about.html>
37. Sehnert, AJ, Rhees, B, Comstock, D, et al. (2011). Optimal detection of fetal chromosomal abnormalities by massively parallel DNA sequencing of cell-free fetal DNA from maternal blood. *Clin Chem.* 57. 7:1042-9.
38. Simpson, JL. (2012). Is cell-free fetal DNA from maternal blood finally ready for prime time? *Obstet Gynecol.* 119. 5:883-5.
39. Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine Publications Committee. Electronic address, e. s. o. (2015). "SMFM Statement: clarification of recommendations regarding cell-free DNA aneuploidy screening." *Am J Obstet Gynecol* **213**(6): 753-754.
40. Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine Publications Committee: Prenatal aneuploidy screening using cell-free DNA. SMFM Consult Series No. 36. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2015;212:711-6.
41. Sparks, AB, Struble, CA, Wang, ET, et al. (2012). Noninvasive prenatal detection and selective analysis of cell-free DNA obtained from maternal blood: evaluation for trisomy 21 and trisomy 18. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 206. 4:319 e1-9.
42. Sparks, AB, Wang, ET, Struble, CA, et al. (2012). Selective analysis of cell-free DNA in maternal blood for evaluation of fetal trisomy. *Prenat Diagn.* 32. 1:3-9.
43. Stumm, M, Entezami, M, Trunk, N, et al. (2012). Noninvasive prenatal detection of chromosomal aneuploidies using different next generation sequencing strategies and algorithms. *Prenat Diagn.* 32. 6:569-77.
44. Susman, MR, Amor, DJ, Muggli, E, et al. (2010). Using population-based data to predict the impact of introducing noninvasive prenatal diagnosis for Down syndrome. *Genet Med.* 12. 5:298-303.
45. Taylor-Phillips S, Freeman K, Geppert J, et. al. Accuracy of non-invasive prenatal testing using cell-free DNA for detection of Down, Edwards, and Patau syndromes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open* Jan 18 2016;6(1):e010002. PMID 26781507
46. van den Oever, JM, Balkassmi, S, Verweij, EJ, et al. (2012). Single molecule sequencing of free DNA from maternal plasma for noninvasive trisomy 21 detection. *Clin Chem.* 58. 4:699-706.
47. Verweij, EJ, van den Oever, JM, de Boer, MA, et al. (2012). Diagnostic accuracy of noninvasive detection of fetal trisomy 21 in maternal blood: a systematic review. *Fetal Diagn Ther.* 31. 2:81-6.
48. Walsh, J. (2012) Fetal Aneuploidy Detection by Maternal Plasma DNA Sequencing: a technology assessment. *Prenat Diagn.* 2013 Jun; 33(6):514-20.
49. Wright, CF, Burton, H. (2009). The use of cell-free fetal nucleic acids in maternal blood for non-invasive prenatal diagnosis. *Hum Reprod Update.* 15. 1:139-51.
50. Zhang H, Gao Y, Jiang F, et al. Non-invasive prenatal testing for trisomies 21, 18 and 13: clinical experience from 146,958 pregnancies. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol.* 2015 May;45(5):530-8.

Disclaimer:

This document is for informational purposes only and should not be relied on in the diagnosis and care of individual patients. Medical and Coding/Reimbursement policies do not constitute medical advice, plan preauthorization, certification, an explanation of benefits, or a contract. Members should consult with appropriate health care providers to obtain needed medical advice, care, and treatment. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the member's individual benefit plan that is in effect at the time services are rendered.

The codes for treatments and procedures applicable to this policy are included for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement policy. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

U of U Health Plans makes no representations and accepts no liability with respect to the content of any external information cited or relied upon in this policy. U of U Health Plans updates its Coverage Policies regularly, and reserves the right to amend these policies and give notice in accordance with State and Federal requirements.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without permission from U of U Health Plans.

"University of Utah Health Plans" and its accompanying logo, and its accompanying marks are protected and registered trademarks of the provider of this Service and or University of Utah Health. Also, the content of this Service is proprietary and is protected by copyright. You may access the copyrighted content of this Service only for purposes set forth in these Conditions of Use.

© CPT Only – American Medical Association