

(204146)

<b>Medical Benefit</b>		<b>Effective Date:</b> 10/01/20	<b>Next Review Date:</b> 07/21
<b>Preauthorization</b>	No	<b>Review Dates:</b> 07/18, 07/19, 07/20	

***This protocol considers this test or procedure investigational. If the physician feels this service is medically necessary, preauthorization is recommended.***

*The following protocol contains medical necessity criteria that apply for this service. The criteria are also applicable to services provided in the local Medicare Advantage operating area for those members, unless separate Medicare Advantage criteria are indicated. If the criteria are not met, reimbursement will be denied and the patient cannot be billed. Please note that payment for covered services is subject to eligibility and the limitations noted in the patient's contract at the time the services are rendered.*

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With suspicious pigmented lesions (based on ABCDE and/or ugly duckling criteria) being considered for biopsy</li> </ul>	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gene expression profiling with the DermTech Pigmented Lesion Assay to determine which lesions should proceed to biopsy</li> </ul>	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dermatology exam and dermoscopy</li> </ul>	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall survival</li> <li>Disease-specific survival</li> <li>Test accuracy</li> <li>Test validity</li> <li>Resource utilization</li> </ul>
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Who have melanocytic lesions with indeterminate histopathologic features</li> </ul>	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gene expression profiling with the myPath Melanoma test added to histopathology to aid in diagnosis of melanoma</li> </ul>	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Histopathology alone</li> <li>Comparative genomic hybridization added to histopathology</li> <li>Fluorescence in situ hybridization added to histopathology</li> </ul>	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall survival</li> <li>Disease-specific survival</li> <li>Test accuracy</li> <li>Test validity</li> <li>Change in disease status</li> <li>Treatment-related morbidity</li> </ul>
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With American Joint Committee on Cancer stage I or II cutaneous melanoma</li> </ul>	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gene expression profiling with the DecisionDx-Melanoma test to inform management decisions regarding enhanced surveillance</li> </ul>	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sentinel lymph node biopsy</li> <li>Prognostic tools</li> </ul>	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall survival</li> <li>Disease-specific survival</li> <li>Test validity</li> <li>Change in disease status</li> <li>Resource utilization</li> <li>Treatment-related morbidity</li> </ul>
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With American Joint Committee on Cancer stage I or II cutaneous melanoma</li> </ul>	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gene expression profiling with the DecisionDx-Melanoma test to inform management decisions regarding adjuvant therapy</li> </ul>	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sentinel lymph node biopsy</li> <li>Prognostic tools</li> </ul>	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall survival</li> <li>Disease-specific survival</li> <li>Test accuracy</li> <li>Test validity</li> <li>Change in disease status</li> <li>Resource utilization</li> <li>Treatment-related morbidity</li> </ul>
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With cutaneous melanoma</li> </ul>	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gene expression profiling with the DecisionDx-</li> </ul>	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sentinel lymph node</li> </ul>	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall survival</li> <li>Disease-specific survival</li> </ul>

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With clinically negative sentinel node basins who are being considered for sentinel lymph node biopsy</li> </ul>	Melanoma test to identify patients who can avoid sentinel lymph node biopsy	biopsy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prognostic tools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Test accuracy</li> <li>Test validity</li> <li>Change in disease status</li> <li>Resource utilization</li> <li>Treatment-related morbidity</li> </ul>

## DESCRIPTION

Laboratory tests have been developed that detect the expression of different genes in pigmented lesions or melanoma tumor tissue. Test results may help providers and patients decide whether to biopsy suspicious pigmented lesions, aid in diagnosis lesions with indeterminate histopathologic lesions or determine whether to perform sentinel lymph node biopsy in patients diagnosed with stage I or II cutaneous melanoma. This report summarizes the evidence of three tests.

## SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

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

For individuals who have melanocytic lesions with indeterminate histopathologic features who receive GEP with the myPath Melanoma test added to histopathology to aid in the diagnosis of melanoma, the evidence includes observational studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test validity, change in disease status, treatment-related morbidity. The myPath test has one clinical validity study, which includes long-term follow-up for metastasis as the reference standard. However, it is not clear if the study population included lesions that were indeterminate following histopathology and the study had other methodologic and reporting limitations. Therefore, performance characteristics are not well-characterized. No direct evidence of clinical utility was identified. Given that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals with American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) stage I or II cutaneous melanoma who receive GEP with the DecisionDx-Melanoma test to inform management decisions regarding enhanced surveillance, the evidence includes retrospective observational studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test validity, change in disease status, resource utilization and treatment-related morbidity. The DecisionDx-Melanoma test has three independent clinical validity studies that have reported five-year recurrence-free survival (RFS) in AJCC stage I or II patients. Gerami et al (2015) reported RFS rates of 37% for DecisionDx class 2 (high-risk) in patients in AJCC stage I and II patients combined. Zager et al (2018) reported RFS rates of 85% (95% confidence interval [CI], 74% to 97%) for DecisionDx class 2 patients in AJCC stage 1 and 55% (95% CI, 44% to 69%) for DecisionDx class 2 in AJCC stage II disease. RFS does not appear to be well-characterized as evidenced by the variation in estimates across studies. This indication is to 'rule-in' patients for enhanced surveillance; therefore, specificity and positive predictive value (PPV) are key performance characteristics. Zager et al (2018)

and Greenhaw et al (2018) the specificities were 71% and 87% respectively while the PPV were 48% and 24%, respectively. The PPV suggests that the majority of patients identified as high-risk by the DecisionDx test would not develop metastasis and would be unnecessarily subjected to additional surveillance. Greenhaw et al (2018) also reported that in 219 AJCC stage I patients, 201 had DecisionDx class 1 (low-risk) scores and 18 had DecisionDx class 2 (high-risk) scores. The only metastasis in stage I patients occurred in a patient with a DecisionDx class 1 score. Therefore none of their stage 1 patients benefited from DecisionDx testing but 18 (8%) were incorrectly identified as high-risk for metastasis and could have received unnecessary surveillance. There is no evidence that changes to the frequency and methods for surveillance improve outcomes. Given that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance and there is no evidence that changes in surveillance improve outcomes, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

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

For individuals with cutaneous melanoma with clinically negative sentinel node basins who are being considered for sentinel lymph node biopsy (SLNB) who receive GEP with the DecisionDx-Melanoma test to determine whether to perform SLNB, the evidence includes retrospective observational studies. The relevant outcomes are OS, disease-specific survival, test validity, change in disease status, resource utilization and treatment-related morbidity. The DecisionDx-Melanoma test has three independent clinical validity studies that have reported five-year RFS in AJCC stage I or II patients. Gerami et al (2015) reported RFS rates of 98% in DecisionDx class 1 (low-risk) without CIs, in AJCC stage I or II patients. Zager et al (2017) reported RFS rates of 96% (95% CI, 94% to 99%) for DecisionDx class 1 in patients with AJCC stage I disease; they also reported RFS rates of 74% (95% CI, 60% to 91%) for DecisionDx class 1 in patients with AJCC stage II disease. Although CIs were not available for the first study, RFS does not appear to be well-characterized as evidenced by the variation in estimates across studies. Zager et al (2017) also reported that in 56 patients who were DecisionDx class 1 (low-risk) but SLNB-positive, 22 recurrences (39%) occurred over five years. If the DecisionDx test were used as a triage for SLNB, these patients would not undergo SLNB and would likely not receive adjuvant therapy, which has shown to be effective at prolonging time to recurrence in node-positive patients. No direct evidence of clinical utility was identified. Given that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance, no inferences can be made about

clinical utility through a chain of evidence. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## POLICY

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

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

Gene expression testing, including but not limited to DecisionDx-Melanoma, in the evaluation of patients with cutaneous melanoma is considered **investigational** for all indications.

## POLICY GUIDELINES

### GENETIC COUNSELING

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

### MEDICARE ADVANTAGE

For Medicare Advantage the DecisionDx-melanoma test is **medically necessary** only when the following clinical conditions are met:

- Patients diagnosed with clinical stage sentinel lymph node biopsy (SLNB) eligible T1 and T2 cutaneous melanoma tumors (as defined in AJCC Staging Manual v8, 2017) with clinically negative sentinel node basins who are being considered for SLNB to determine eligibility for adjuvant therapy.

For Medicare Advantage all other DecisionDx-Melanoma testing not meeting the above criteria is **not medically necessary**.

The Pigmented Lesion Assay (PLA) may be considered **medically necessary** only for use on:

- Primary melanocytic skin lesions between 5mm and 19 mm
- Lesions where the skin is intact (i.e., non-ulcerated or non-bleeding lesions)
- Lesions that do not contain a scar or were previously biopsied
- Lesions not located in areas of psoriasis, eczema or similar skin conditions
- Lesions not clinically diagnosed as melanoma
- Lesions in areas other than palms of hands, soles of feet, nails, mucous membranes and hair covered areas that cannot be trimmed

## MEDICARE ADVANTAGE POLICY GUIDELINES

Per current NCCN and ASCO guidelines, SLNB eligible patients are defined as:

- Patients with T1a tumors:
  - in whom there is significant uncertainty about the adequacy of microstaging (positive deep margin), or
  - with Breslow depth <0.8 mm and with other adverse features (e.g., very high mitotic index [ $\geq 2/\text{mm}^2$ ], lymphovascular invasion, or a combination of these factors)
- Patients with T1b tumors ( $\geq 0.8$  mm or <0.8 mm with ulceration)
- Patients with T2 tumors

The PLA is indicated for use on melanocytic skin lesions with one or more clinical or historical characteristics suggestive of melanoma, including one or more ABCDE criteria (Asymmetry, Border, Color, Diameter, Evolving) when a clinician trained in the clinical diagnosis of skin cancer is considering the need for biopsy to rule out melanoma.

## BACKGROUND

### CUTANEOUS MELANOMA

Cutaneous melanoma accounts for more than 90% of cases of melanoma.<sup>1</sup> For many decades, melanoma incidence was rapidly increasing in the U.S. However, recent estimates have suggested the rise may be slowing. In 2018, more than 90,000 new cases of melanoma are expected to be diagnosed, and more than 9,000 people are expected to die of melanoma.<sup>2</sup>

#### Risk Factors

Exposure to solar ultraviolet radiation is a major risk factor for melanoma. Most melanomas occur on the sun-exposed skin, particularly those areas most susceptible to sunburn. Likewise, features that are associated with an individual's sensitivity to sunlight, such as light skin pigmentation, red or blond hair, blue or green eyes, freckling tendency, and poor tanning ability are well-known risk factors for melanoma.<sup>3,4</sup> There is also a strong association between high total body nevus counts and melanoma.<sup>5</sup>

Several genes appear to contribute to melanoma predisposition such as tumor suppressor gene CDKN2A, melanocortin-1 receptor (MC1R) gene, and BAP1 variants.<sup>6-8</sup> Individuals with either familial or sporadic melanoma have a two to three times increased risk of developing a subsequent primary melanoma.<sup>9</sup> Several occupational exposures and lifestyle factors, such as body mass index and smoking, have been evaluated as POSSIBLE RISK FACTORS FOR MELANOMA.<sup>10</sup>

### GENE EXPRESSION PROFILING

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

## REGULATORY STATUS

Clinical laboratories may develop and validate tests in-house and market them as a laboratory service; laboratory-developed tests must meet the general regulatory standards of the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments. The Pigmented Lesion Assay, myPath Melanoma, and DecisionDx-Melanoma tests are available

under the auspices of the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments. Laboratories that offer laboratory-developed tests must be licensed by the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments for high-complexity testing. To date, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration has chosen not to require any regulatory review of this test.

---

Services that are the subject of a clinical trial do not meet our Technology Assessment and Medically Necessary Services Protocol criteria and are considered investigational. *For explanation of experimental and investigational, please refer to the Technology Assessment and Medically Necessary Services Protocol.*

It is expected that only appropriate and medically necessary services will be rendered. We reserve the right to conduct prepayment and postpayment reviews to assess the medical appropriateness of the above-referenced procedures. **Some of this protocol may not pertain to the patients you provide care to, as it may relate to products that are not available in your geographic area.**

## REFERENCES

We are not responsible for the continuing viability of web site addresses that may be listed in any references below.

1. Chang AE, Karnell LH, Menck HR. The National Cancer Data Base report on cutaneous and noncutaneous melanoma: a summary of 84,836 cases from the past decade. The American College of Surgeons Commission on Cancer and the American Cancer Society. *Cancer*. Oct 15 1998;83(8):1664-1678. PMID 9781962.
2. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2018. *Jan 2018*;68(1):7-30. PMID 29313949.
3. Gilchrest BA, Eller MS, Geller AC, et al. The pathogenesis of melanoma induced by ultraviolet radiation. *N Engl J Med*. Apr 29 1999;340(17):1341-1348. PMID 10219070.
4. Gandini S, Sera F, Cattaruzza MS, et al. Meta-analysis of risk factors for cutaneous melanoma: III. Family history, actinic damage and phenotypic factors. *Eur J Cancer*. Sep 2005;41(14):2040-2059. PMID 16125929.
5. Caini S, Gandini S, Sera F, et al. Meta-analysis of risk factors for cutaneous melanoma according to anatomical site and clinico-pathological variant. *Eur J Cancer*. Nov 2009;45(17):3054-3063. PMID 19545997.
6. Goldstein AM, Chan M, Harland M, et al. Features associated with germline CDKN2A mutations: a GenoMEL study of melanoma-prone families from three continents. *J Med Genet*. Feb 2007;44(2):99-106. PMID 16905682.
7. Wendt J, Rauscher S, Burgstaller-Muehlbacher S, et al. Human determinants and the role of melanocortin-1 receptor variants in melanoma risk independent of UV radiation exposure. *JAMA Dermatol*. Jul 1 2016; 152(7):776-782. PMID 27050141.
8. Wiesner T, Obenaus AC, Murali R, et al. Germline mutations in BAP1 predispose to melanocytic tumors. *Nat Genet*. Aug 28 2011;43(10):1018-1021. PMID 21874003.
9. Chen T, Fallah M, Forsti A, et al. Risk of next melanoma in patients with familial and sporadic melanoma by number of previous melanomas. *JAMA Dermatol*. Jun 2015;151(6):607-615. PMID 25671687.
10. Jiang AJ, Rambhatla PV, Eide MJ. Socioeconomic and lifestyle factors and melanoma: a systematic review. *Br J Dermatol*. Apr 2015;172(4):885-915. PMID 25354495.
11. Abbasi NR, Shaw HM, Rigel DS, et al. Early diagnosis of cutaneous melanoma: revisiting the ABCD criteria. *Jama*. Dec 8 2004;292(22):2771-2776. PMID 15585738.
12. Grob JJ, Bonerandi JJ. The 'ugly duckling' sign: identification of the common characteristics of nevi in an individual as a basis for melanoma screening. *Arch Dermatol*. Jan 1998;134(1):103-104. PMID 9449921.
13. Wilson RL, Yentzer BA, Isom SP, et al. How good are US dermatologists at discriminating skin cancers? A number-needed-to-treat analysis. *J Dermatolog Treat*. Feb 2012;23(1):65-69. PMID 21756146.

14. National Center for Biotechnology Information. PRAME preferentially expressed antigen in melanoma. 2018; <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/gene/23532>. Accessed March 30, 2018.
15. DermTech. Pigmented Lesion Assay: Non-invasive gene expression analysis of pigmented skin lesions. Performance and Development Notes. 2015; <http://dermtech.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/White-Paper-DermTech-Melanoma-Assay-.pdf>. Accessed March 16, 2018.
16. Wachsman W, Morhenn V, Palmer T, et al. Noninvasive genomic detection of melanoma. *Br J Dermatol*. Apr 2011;164(4):797-806. PMID 21294715.
17. Gerami P, Alsobrook JP, 2nd, Palmer TJ, et al. Development of a novel noninvasive adhesive patch test for the evaluation of pigmented lesions of the skin. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. Aug 2014;71(2):237-244. PMID 24906614.
18. Gerami P, Yao Z, Polsky D, et al. Development and validation of a noninvasive 2-gene molecular assay for cutaneous melanoma. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. Jan 2017;76(1):114-120 e112. PMID 27707590.
19. Vestergaard ME, Macaskill P, Holt PE, et al. Dermoscopy compared with naked eye examination for the diagnosis of primary melanoma: a meta-analysis of studies performed in a clinical setting. *Br J Dermatol*. Sep 2008;159(3):669-676. PMID 18616769.
20. Murzaku EC, Hayan S, Rao BK. Methods and rates of dermoscopy usage: a cross-sectional survey of US dermatologists stratified by years in practice. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. Aug 2014;71(2):393-395. PMID 25037790.
21. Engasser HC, Warshaw EM. Dermoscopy use by US dermatologists: a cross-sectional survey. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. Sep 2010;63(3):412-419, 419.e411-412. PMID 20619490.
22. Bossuyt PM, Irwig L, Craig J, et al. Comparative accuracy: assessing new tests against existing diagnostic pathways. *Bmj*. May 6 2006;332(7549):1089-1092. PMID 16675820.
23. Ferris LL, Gerami PP, Skelsey MM, Peck GG, Hren CC, Gorman CC, Frumento TT, Siegel DD. Real-world performance and utility of a noninvasive gene expression assay to evaluate melanoma risk in pigmented lesions. *Melanoma Res.*, 2018 Jul 14;28(5). PMID 30004988.
24. Ferris LK, Jansen B, Ho J, et al. Utility of a noninvasive 2-gene molecular assay for cutaneous melanoma and effect on the decision to biopsy. *JAMA Dermatol*. Jul 1 2017;153(7):675-680. PMID 28445578.
25. Myriad. n.d. Understanding the myPath Melanoma Results; <https://mypathmelanoma.com/about-mypath-melanoma/understanding-the-mypath-melanoma-results/>. Accessed March 30, 2018.
26. Clarke LE, Warf MB, Flake DD, 2nd, et al. Clinical validation of a gene expression signature that differentiates benign nevi from malignant melanoma. *J Cutan Pathol*. Apr 2015;42(4):244-252. PMID 25727210.
27. Clarke LE, Flake DD, 2nd, Busam K, et al. An independent validation of a gene expression signature to differentiate malignant melanoma from benign melanocytic nevi. *Cancer*. Feb 15 2017;123(4):617-628. PMID 27768230.
28. Reimann JJ, Salim SS, Velazquez EE, Wang LL, Williams KK, Flejter WW, Brooke LL, Sunder SS, Busam KK. Comparison of melanoma gene expression score with histopathology, fluorescence in situ hybridization, and SNP array for the classification of melanocytic neoplasms. *Mod. Pathol.*, 2018 Jun 30;31(11). PMID 29955141.
29. Gaiser T, Kutzner H, Palmedo G, et al. Classifying ambiguous melanocytic lesions with FISH and correlation with clinical long-term follow up. *Mod Pathol*. Mar 2010;23(3):413-419. PMID 20081813.
30. Vergier B, Prochazkova-Carlotti M, de la Fouchardiere A, et al. Fluorescence in situ hybridization, a diagnostic aid in ambiguous melanocytic tumors: European study of 113 cases. *Mod Pathol*. May 2011;24(5):613-623. PMID 21151100.
31. Ko, JJ, Clarke, LL, Minca, EE, Brown, KK, Flake, DD, Billings, SS. Correlation of melanoma gene expression score with clinical outcomes on a series of melanocytic lesions. *Hum. Pathol.*, 2018 Dec 20. PMID 30566894.
32. Clarke, LL, Pimentel, JJ, Zalaznick, HH, Wang, LL, Busam, KK. Gene expression signature as an ancillary method in the diagnosis of desmoplastic melanoma. *Hum. Pathol.*, 2017 Oct 29;70:113-120. PMID 29079183.

33. Minca, EE, Al-Rohil, RR, Wang, MM, Harms, PP, Ko, JJ, Collie, AA, Kovalyshyn, II, Prieto, VV, Tetzlaff, MM, Billings, SS, Andea, AA. Comparison between melanoma gene expression score and fluorescence in situ hybridization for the classification of melanocytic lesions. *Mod. Pathol.*, 2016 May 14;29(8). PMID 27174586.
34. Ko JS, Matharoo-Ball B, Billings SD, et al. Diagnostic distinction of malignant melanoma and benign nevi by a gene expression signature and correlation to clinical outcomes. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* Jul 2017;26(7):1107-1113. PMID 28377414.
35. Cockerell C, Tschén J, Billings SD, et al. The influence of a gene-expression signature on the treatment of diagnostically challenging melanocytic lesions. *Per Med.* Mar 2017;14(2):123-130. PMID 28757886.
36. Cockerell CJ, Tschén J, Evans B, et al. The influence of a gene expression signature on the diagnosis and recommended treatment of melanocytic tumors by dermatopathologists. *Medicine (Baltimore).* Oct 2016; 95(40):e4887. PMID 27749545.
37. Gershenwald JES, R.A.; Hess, K.R.; et al. *Melanoma of the Skin.* Chicago, IL: American Joint Committee on Cancer; 2017.
38. Eggermont AM, Chiarion-Sileni V, Grob JJ, et al. Prolonged survival in stage III melanoma with ipilimumab adjuvant therap. *N Engl J Med.* Nov 10 2016;375(19):1845-1855. PMID 27717298.
39. Weber J, Mandala M, Del Vecchio M, et al. Adjuvant nivolumab versus ipilimumab in resected stage III or IV melanoma. *N Engl J Med.* Nov 9 2017;377(19):1824-1835. PMID 28891423.
40. Long GV, Hauschild A, Santinami M, et al. Adjuvant dabrafenib plus trametinib in stage III BRAF-mutated melanomas. *N Engl J Med.* Nov 9 2017;377(19):1813-1823. PMID 28891408.
41. Castle Biosciences. *Cutaneous Melanoma: DecisionDx-Melanoma Overview.* n.d.; <http://castlebiosciences.com/tests/cutaneous-melanoma/>. Accessed March 30, 2018.
42. Gerami P, Cook RW, Wilkinson J, et al. Development of a prognostic genetic signature to predict the metastatic risk associated with cutaneous melanoma. *Clin Cancer Res.* Jan 1 2015;21(1):175-183. PMID 25564571.
43. Zager JS, Gastman BR, Leachman S, et al. Performance of a prognostic 31-gene expression profile in an independent cohort of 523 cutaneous melanoma patients. *BMC Cancer.* Feb 5 2018;18(1):130. PMID 29402264.
44. Wrightson WR, Wong SL, Edwards MJ, et al. Complications associated with sentinel lymph node biopsy for melanoma. *Ann Surg Oncol.* Jul 2003;10(6):676-680. PMID 12839853.
45. Soong SJ, Ding S, Coit DG, et al. AJCC: Individualized melanoma patient outcome prediction tools. n.d.; <http://www.melanomaprognosis.net/>. Accessed March 21, 2018.
46. Callender GG, Gershenwald JE, Egger ME, et al. A novel and accurate computer model of melanoma prognosis for patients staged by sentinel lymph node biopsy: comparison with the American Joint Committee on Cancer model. *J Am Coll Surg.* Apr 2012;214(4):608-617; discussion 617-609. PMID 22342785.
47. Dicker TJ, Kavanagh GM, Herd RM, et al. A rational approach to melanoma follow-up in patients with primary cutaneous melanoma. Scottish Melanoma Group. *Br J Dermatol.* Feb 1999;140(2):249-254. PMID 10233217.
48. Garbe C, Paul A, Kohler-Spath H, et al. Prospective evaluation of a follow-up schedule in cutaneous melanoma patients: recommendations for an effective follow-up strategy. *J Clin Oncol.* Feb 1 2003;21(3):520-529. PMID 12560444.
49. Faries MB, Steen S, Ye X, et al. Late recurrence in melanoma: clinical implications of lost dormancy. *J Am Coll Surg.* Jul 2013;217(1):27-34; discussion 34-26. PMID 23643694.
50. Hsueh EC, DeBloom JR, Lee J, et al. Interim analysis of survival in a prospective, multi-center registry cohort of cutaneous melanoma tested with a prognostic 31-gene expression profile test. *J Hematol Oncol.* Aug 29 2017;10(1):152. PMID 28851416.
51. Podlipnik, SS, Carrera, CC, Boada, AA, Richarz, NN, López-Estebanz, JJ, Pinedo-Moraleda, FF, Elosua-González, MM, Martín-González, MM, Carrillo-Gijón, RR, Redondo, PP, Moreno, EE, Malveyh, JJ, Puig, SS. Early outcome of a 31-gene expression profile test in 86 AJCC stage IB-II melanoma patients. A prospective multicentre cohort study. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol*, 2019 Feb 1. PMID 30702163.



52. Gastman, BB, Gerami, PP, Kurley, SS, Cook, RR, Leachman, SS, Vetto, JJ. Identification of patients at risk of metastasis using a prognostic 31-gene expression profile in subpopulations of melanoma patients with favorable outcomes by standard criteria. *J. Am. Acad. Dermatol.*, 2018 Aug 7;80(1). PMID 30081113.
53. Gastman, BB, Zager, JJ, Messina, JJ, Cook, RR, Covington, KK, Middlebrook, BB, Gerami, PP, Wayne, JJ, Leachman, SS, Vetto, JJ. Performance of a 31-gene expression profile test in cutaneous melanomas of the head and neck. *Head Neck*, 2019 Jan 30;41(4). PMID 30694001.
54. Vetto, JJ, Hsueh, EE, Gastman, BB, Dillon, LL, Monzon, FF, Cook, RR, Keller, JJ, Huang, XX, Fleming, AA, Hewgley, PP, Gerami, PP, Leachman, SS, Wayne, JJ, Berger, AA, Fleming, MM. Guidance of sentinel lymph node biopsy decisions in patients with T1-T2 melanoma using gene expression profiling. *Future Oncol*, 2019 Jan 30. PMID 30691297.
55. Greenhaw, BB, Zitelli, JJ, Brodland, DD. Estimation of Prognosis in Invasive Cutaneous Melanoma: An Independent Study of the Accuracy of a Gene Expression Profile Test. *Dermatol Surg*, 2018 Jul 12;44(12). PMID 29994951.
56. Gerami P, Cook RW, Russell MC, et al. Gene expression profiling for molecular staging of cutaneous melanoma in patients undergoing sentinel lymph node biopsy. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. May 2015;72(5):780-785 e783. PMID 25748297.
57. Ferris LK, Farberg AS, Middlebrook B, et al. Identification of high-risk cutaneous melanoma tumors is improved when combining the online American Joint Committee on Cancer Individualized Melanoma Patient Outcome Prediction Tool with a 31-gene expression profile-based classification. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. May 2017;76(5):818-825.e813. PMID 28110997.
58. Berger AC, Davidson RS, Poitras JK, et al. Clinical impact of a 31-gene expression profile test for cutaneous melanoma in 156 prospectively and consecutively tested patients. *Curr Med Res Opin*. Sep 2016;32(9):1599-1604. PMID 27210115.
59. Farberg AS, Glazer AM, White R, et al. Impact of a 31-gene expression profiling test for cutaneous melanoma on dermatologists' clinical management decisions. *J Drugs Dermatol*. May 1 2017;16(5):428-431. PMID 28628677.
60. Schuitevoerder D, Heath M, Cook RW, et al. Impact of gene expression profiling on decision-making in clinically node negative melanoma patients after surgical staging. *J Drugs Dermatol*. Feb 1 2018;17(2):196-199. PMID 29462228.
61. Dillon LD, Gadzia JE, Davidson RS, et al. Prospective, multicenter clinical impact evaluation of a 31-gene expression profile test for management of melanoma patients. *Skin*. 2018;2(2):111-121.
62. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Cutaneous Melanoma. Version 2.2019. Accessed Mar 19, 2019.
63. Swetter, SS, Tsao, HH, Bichakjian, CC, Curiel-Lewandrowski, CC, Elder, DD, Gershenwald, JJ, Guild, VV, Grant-Kels, JJ, Halpern, AA, Johnson, TT, Sober, AA, Thompson, JJ, Wisco, OO, Wyatt, SS, Hu, SS, Lamina, TT. Guidelines of care for the management of primary cutaneous melanoma. *J. Am. Acad. Dermatol.*, 2018 Nov 6;80(1). PMID 30392755.
64. PROPOSED/DRAFT Local Coverage Determination (LCD): MoIDX: Pigmented Lesion Assay (PLA) (DL37715). 2018; <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/lcd-details.aspx?LCDId=37714&ver=3&DocType=All&bc=AAIAAAAAAAAA&>. Accessed Apr 25, 2018.
65. PROPOSED/DRAFT Local Coverage Determination (LCD): MoIDX: Pigmented Lesion Assay (PLA) and PLA Score (DL37669). 2018; <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/lcd-details.aspx?LCDId=37668&ver=2&DocType=All&bc=AAIAAAAAAAAA&>. Accessed Apr 25, 2018.
66. PROPOSED/DRAFT Local Coverage Determination (LCD): MoIDX: Pigmented Lesion Assay (PLA) and PLA Score (DL37533). 2018; <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/lcd-details.aspx?LCDId=37532&ver=3&DocType=All&bc=AAIAAAAAAAAA&>. Accessed Apr 25, 2018.
67. PROPOSED/DRAFT Local Coverage Determination (LCD): MoIDX: DecisionDx-Melanoma (DL37725). 2018; <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/lcd-details.aspx?LCDId=37724&ver=7&DocID=DL37725&bc=gAAAABAAAA&>. Accessed Apr 25, 2018.