MEDICAL POLICY

Excellus
An independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Medical Policy Title	**Colorectal Cancer Screening and Surveillance**
Policy Number	**2.01.51**
Current Effective Date	**March 19, 2026**
Next Review Date	**March 2027**

Our medical policies are guides to evaluate technologies or services for medical necessity. Criteria are established through the assessment of evidence based, peer-reviewed scientific literature, and national professional guidelines. Federal and state law(s), regulatory mandates and the member's subscriber contract language are considered first in the determination of a covered service.
(Link to Product Disclaimer)

POLICY STATEMENT(S)

I. **ANY** of the following colorectal cancer (CRC) screening tests are considered **medically necessary** for individuals at average risk who are aged 45 years or older:

A. Colonoscopy every 10 years;

B. Flexible sigmoidoscopy every 5 years;

C. Computed tomography colonography (CTC; virtual colonoscopy) every 5 years (CPT 74263);

D. High-sensitivity guaiac fecal occult blood test (gFOBT) annually;

E. Fecal immunochemical test (FIT) annually;

F. Multi-target stool DNA (mt-sDNA) (i.e., Cologuard and Cologuard Plus; CPT 81528 and 0464U) every 1 to 3 years;

G. Multi-target stool RNA (mt-sRNA) (i.e., Colosense; CPT 0421U) every 3 years.

II. A diagnostic CT colonography (CTC; virtual colonoscopy) is considered **medically appropriate** for CRC screening or surveillance of individuals at increased/higher risk of CRC (see Policy Guidelines) when the following criteria are met:

Diagnostic CTC without contrast (CPT 74261):

A. Failed conventional colonoscopy due to known colonic lesion, structural abnormality, or technical difficulty; **or**

B. Conventional colonoscopy is medically contraindicated (e.g., coagulopathy, intolerance to sedation, aged 80 years of age or older, or recent [within the last 60-days] myocardial infraction [MI]).

Diagnostic CTC with contrast (CPT 74262):

C. There is a known obstructing colorectal malignancy so that staging prior to surgery can be performed, if desired; **or**

D. There is a clearly stated indication for intravenous (IV) contrast to evaluate extra-colonic organs.

III. Any other testing modality for CRC screening or surveillance is considered **investigational,** including but not limited to:

A. Blood-based marker testing and/or gene expression profiling (e.g., methylated DNA [e.g., Epi proColon, ColoVantage], cell-free DNA [e.g., Shield], cell-free RNA, microRNA, messenger RNA, ColonSentry, BeScreened-CRC);

B. Urine-based testing (e.g., metabolite biomarker [e.g., PolypDX], microRNA);

C. Stool-based protein marker or molecular genetic testing, other than Cologuard or Cologuard Plus, ColoSense (e.g., CRCbioscreen);

D. Colon capsule endoscopy (Refer to Corporate Medical Policy #6.01.27).

IV. The following adjunct endoscopic techniques are considered **investigational**, including:

A. Chromoendoscopy (also known as chromoscopy and chromocolonoscopy);

B. Narrow band imaging;

C. Confocal laser endomicroscopy (also known as confocal fluorescent endomicroscopy and optical endomicroscopy;

D. Fiberoptic analysis.

RELATED POLICIES

Corporate Medical Policy

2.02.60 Germline Genetic Testing for Hereditary Cancers

6.01.27 Capsule Endoscopy, for colon capsule endoscopy

11.01.03 Experimental or Investigational Services

POLICY GUIDELINE(S)

I. Colonoscopy is indicated if a noninvasive screening test result is abnormal (positive).

II. The U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) recommends that people at average risk for CRC should undergo routine CRC screening as follows:

A. Begin screening at age 45 years and continue to age 75 years (Grade A and B);

B. For ages 76 through 85 years, CRC screening should be individualized and include a discussion of the risks and benefits of each modality (Grade C);

C. Screening modalities and frequency intervals include:

1. High-sensitivity gFOBT every year;

2. FIT every year;

3. sDNA-FIT every 1 to 3 years;

4. CT colonography every 5 years;

5. Flexible sigmoidoscopy every 5 years;
6. Flexible sigmoidoscopy every 10 years + FIT every year;
7. Colonoscopy screening every 10 years.

III. The National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) Colorectal Cancer Screening Clinical Practice Guidelines (v.2.2025 – June 24, 2025) recommends that individuals at increased or higher risk of CRC undergo earlier or more frequent screenings, with colonoscopy as the preferred screening method.

IV. Individuals at increased or higher risk of CRC include those with any of the following:

A. A personal history of colorectal cancer, adenomatous polyps, or SSP/SSL (sessile serrated polyp, sessile serrated lesion, sessile serrae adenoma are all synonymous);

B. A personal history of childhood, adolescent, or young adult cancer treated with chemotherapy and/or radiation therapy;

C. A personal history of inflammatory bowel disease (e.g., ulcerative colitis or Crohn's disease);

D. A personal history of Cystic fibrosis;

E. A strong first-degree family history of colorectal cancer or polyps; or

F. A personal or known family history of a hereditary colorectal cancer syndrome (i.e., polyposis syndromes [e.g., familial adenomatous polyposis (FAP), Peutz-Jeghers, juvenile polyposis, Cowden syndrome/PTEN hamartoma tumor syndrome], hereditary non-polyposis CRC [HNPCC, Lynch syndrome]).

V. NCCN (v.2.2025) recommended screening modality and frequency intervals for individuals at average risk of colorectal cancer:

A. Colonoscopy every 10 years;

B. Flexible sigmoidoscopy every 5 to 10 years;

C. CT colonography every 5 years;

D. High-sensitivity guaiac fecal occult blood test (gFOBT) every year;

E. Quantitative fecal immunochemical (FIT) (using OC-Sensor or OC-Light) every year;

F. Multi-targeted stool DNA test (mt-sDNA, sDNA-FIT) every 1 to 3 years;

G. Multi-targeted stool RNA test (mt-sRNA) every 3 years;

H. Blood-based circulating free DNA (bb-cfDNA) every 3 years.

1. Per NCCN, given bb-cfDNA modest performance, particularly among advanced precancerous lesions, this test is only recommended for individuals who would not be willing to undergo screening through another modality.

VI. Screening CTC (CPT 74263) for colorectal cancer is not indicated if FIT-DNA (multi-targeted stool DNA test) within the last 3 years, or colonoscopy within the last 10 years. A diagnostic CTC

would be the appropriate code, if approvable, for any other reason than average risk screening. This would include surveillance for a history of colon polyps, the evaluation of a change in bowel habits, abdominal pain, bleeding, etc.

VII. CT Colonography is routinely performed without contrast, and intravenous (IV) contrast is not needed in most cases.

DESCRIPTION

Colorectal cancer (CRC) is a leading cause of cancer-related illness and death among both men and women in the United States. Screening is one of the most effective strategies for identifying precancerous lesions or early-stage cancer in people who have no symptoms. Because colorectal polyps can take 10 to 15 years to progress into cancer, routine screening allows for the detection and removal of polyps before malignant transformation, thereby preventing some cases of CRC. Screening also increases the likelihood of diagnosing colorectal cancer at an early stage, when it is smaller, has not spread, and is more responsive to treatment.

There are several testing options for CRC screening, divided into two three main groups: stool-based tests, structural exams/direct visualization, and blood-based tests. For individuals at increased risk, colonoscopy is the preferred method. Urine-based tests are being investigated as screening options and not yet supported by professional guidelines.

Colonoscopy

Colonoscopy is the most comprehensive screening modality and is widely regarded as the gold standard for detecting colorectal polyps, cancer, and other mucosal abnormalities. The procedure requires a full bowel preparation to allow adequate visualization. During the exam, a flexible tube with a miniature camera (a colonoscope) is inserted through the anus to visualize the rectum and the entire colon. Polyps or suspicious tissue can be removed or biopsied during the procedure and submitted for pathological evaluation. While generally safe, potential adverse events include transient discomfort/bloating due to insufflation and, rarely, perforation, bleeding, or infection

Flexible Sigmoidoscopy

Flexible sigmoidoscopy examines the distal colon (rectum, sigmoid, and descending colon) using a shorter endoscope. Bowel preparation is required (often less extensive than for colonoscopy), sedation is typically not needed, and small polyps or tissue samples may be removed for evaluation. Because the instrument is approximately two feet long, the proximal colon is not visualized.

Computed Tomography Colonography (CTC; Virtual Colonoscopy)

CTC is a noninvasive imaging technique that produces two- and three-dimensional views of the colonic lumen from thin-section helical CT data. It requires full bowel preparation, does not require sedation, and uses gas insufflation to distend the colon for image acquisition. If polyps are detected, a follow-up optical colonoscopy is required for removal, which may necessitate a repeat bowel preparation

Stool-Based Testing

Fecal Occult Blood Test (FOBT): Guaiac-Based (gFOBT) and Immunochemical (FIT)

Guaiac-based FOBT detects the heme component of hemoglobin through a peroxidase reaction. Its limitations include susceptibility to dietary and medication interferences and lower sensitivity for intermittent or minimal gastrointestinal bleeding. Historically, gFOBT required multiple stool specimens and adherence to specific dietary restrictions to improve accuracy. In contrast, the fecal immunochemical test (FIT) detects human globin using antibody-based methods, eliminating most dietary restrictions and typically requiring only a single sample. Any positive stool-based screening result should be followed by diagnostic colonoscopy.

Molecular Stool Testing (DNA- and RNA-Based Biomarkers)

Colorectal neoplasia is associated with characteristic cellular genetic alterations. Because colorectal epithelial cells are shed continuously into stool, tests have been developed to detect DNA or RNA from these exfoliated cells. While neoplastic bleeding may be intermittent, epithelial shedding is constant, potentially making stool-based molecular assays more sensitive than blood-based or occult blood tests for detecting early lesions.

Multi-Targeted Stool Deoxyribonucleic Acid (mt-sDNA)

Multi-targeted stool deoxyribonucleic acid (mt-sDNA) test combines FIT with DNA analysis of multiple stool biomarkers associated with colorectal neoplasia. The test is approved by the Food & Drug Administration (FDA) and guideline-recognized as a screening option for average-risk adults, at recommended intervals. Abnormal results require follow-up diagnostic colonoscopy.

Multi-targeted stool ribonucleic acid (mt-sRNA) tests combine FIT with measurement of RNA transcript in stools that reflect gene expression patterns associated with colorectal neoplasia. In the pivotal CRC-PREVENT Phase 3 study (JAMA 2023), a specific mt-sRNA assay (ColoSense) demonstrated 94% sensitivity for CRC, 46% sensitivity for advanced adenomas, and 88% specificity for absences of lesions on colonoscopy in adults ≥45 years. Sensitivity for both colorectal cancer and advanced adenomas was significantly higher than FIT in paired testing: however, the study did not include direct comparisons with existing mt-sDNA tests.

Blood-Based Biomarker Tests

Blood-based biomarker tests are designed to detect and measure specific gene mutations, gene-methylation patterns, and tumor-associated antigens in circulation. Several serum biomarkers shed from colorectal tumors have been identified, including hypermethylated Septin9 (SEPT9) DNA. SEPT9 plays a role in cell division, migration, and apoptosis, and functions as a tumor suppressor. Hypermethylation of the SEPT9 promoter reduces gene expression and is associated with colorectal cancer.

Blood-based testing for CRC screening is commercially available and includes tests that detect methylated SEPT9 DNA (e.g., ColoVantage, Epi proColon 2.0); circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) assays (e.g., Shield, Guardant Health); protein-based panels (e.g., BeScreened-CRC); and gene-expression–based risk stratification tests (e.g., the seven-gene expression test ColonSentry).
The Galleri test (GRAIL), a multi-cancer early detection (MCED) assay, is currently under investigation for its ability to identify cancer signals in blood and predict tissue of origin. Galleri does not detect all

cancers and must be used in addition to recommended guideline-based cancer screening.

Urine-Based Testing

Urinary biomarker screening aims to identify colorectal cancer or advanced adenomas at an earlier stage than would occur through clinical presentation alone. A noninvasive test capable of detecting precancerous polyps could improve referral for colonoscopy and facilitate earlier intervention.

PolypDx (Metabolomic Technologies) is a non-invasive urine-based test developed to detect colorectal cancer and adenomatous polyps. The test measures specific urine metabolites and applies an algorithmic analysis to estimate the likelihood of colonic adenomatous polyps, which are known precursors to colorectal cancer.

In-Vivo Adjunctive Procedures

Several real-time endoscopic imaging techniques are being investigated to enhance lesion detection and support in vivo assessment of colorectal polyps. These adjunctive technologies aim to improve the sensitivity of colonoscopy beyond standard white-light imaging.

Chromoendoscopy, also known as chromoscopy and chromocolonoscopy, involves applying topical stains or dyes during endoscopy to enhance mucosal visualization and improve detection of subtle lesions, such as flat or depressed polyps. Dye is sprayed through a catheter passed via the endoscope's working channel. Chromoendoscopy may be performed pancolonically or targeted to specific lesions.
This technique differs from endoscopic tattooing, which involves permanent pigment marking for future localization rather than transient mucosal staining.

Virtual (electronic) chromoendoscopy uses built-in endoscopy system algorithms to digitally alter reflected light wavelengths, enhancing mucosal contrast without dye application. One example is Fujinon Intelligent Color Enhancement (FICE), which digitally processes white-light images to highlight surface structures and vascular patterns.

Confocal laser endomicroscopy (CLE), also known as confocal fluorescent endomicroscopy or optical endomicroscopy, provides real-time, microscopic visualization of cellular structure during endoscopy. This technology uses low-power laser illumination and a confocal detection system to capture high-resolution images from the same focal plane, while excluding scattered light.
CLE is being evaluated as a potential tool for real-time "optical biopsy," lesion characterization, and targeted sampling, including in patients with inflammatory bowel disease or Barrett esophagus.

SUPPORTIVE LITERATURE

Colonoscopy

In the 2021 Updated Evidence Report and Systematic Review for the United States Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF), two large prospective observational studies evaluated the association between screening colonoscopy and colorectal cancer (CRC) incidence and mortality (Lin 2021). After 24 years of follow-up, a study of 88,902 health professionals found lower CRC-specific mortality among individuals who self-reported at least one screening colonoscopy compared with those who had never undergone screening (adjusted hazard ratio, 0.32; 95% CI, 0.24–0.45). This study

reported lower CRC mortality for both distal and proximal cancers. In a second study of 348,025 Medicare beneficiaries with a shorter follow-up period, adults aged 70–74 years who underwent screening colonoscopy had a lower 8-year standardized risk of CRC than those who were not screened. The updated review also reported higher estimates of major bleeding associated with colonoscopy than were described in 2016.

Flexible Sigmoidoscopy

Evidence from RCTs and meta-analyses demonstrates that flexible sigmoidoscopy reduces both the incidence of and mortality from CRC. Compared to colonoscopy, sigmoidoscopy typically does not require sedation, involves less intensive bowel preparation, and is limited to examination of the distal colon. In the 2021 USPSTF Updated Evidence Report and Systematic Review, the same four RCTs from the 2016 review were re-evaluated. Although three of these trials have reported longer-term follow-up, the additional data did not change the conclusions regarding screening effectiveness. Across 22 studies (n=5.4 million), serious bleeding complications after screening colonoscopy were reported at a pooled rate of 14.6 per 10,000 procedures.

Fecal Occult Blood Test (FOBT): Guaiac-Based (gFOBT) and Immunochemical (FIT)

In the USPSTF Updated Evidence Report and Systematic Review (2021), six well-conducted trials (n= 780,458) of annual or biennial gFOBT screening demonstrated reductions in CRC incidence and mortality. Across five RCTs (n = 419,966) using intention-to-screen analyses, biennial Hemoccult II (Beckman Coulter) reduced CRC-specific mortality compared with no screening after 2 to 9 screening rounds at 11-30 years of follow-up.

Prospective diagnostic accuracy of FIT was evaluated by six qualitative and seven quantitative studies. In cohorts with colonoscopy follow-up for all participants, FIT sensitivity varied considerably across assays for each outcome. OC-Light had the highest sensitivity and specificity for CRC, from 88% and 91%, respectively, to 79% and 93%, respectively. OC FIT-CHEK had the best sensitivity and specificity for CRC, from 73% and 96%, respectively, to 92% and 87%, respectively. Variation in test performance resulted from the use of 18 different FITs (FIT families), different numbers of stool samples, and, to some extent, different assay cut-off values. Sparse data for many individual tests limited comparisons.

Multi-Targeted Stool DNA

The 2021 USPSTF recommendations describe sDNA-FIT as a stool-based strategy that combines FIT with assays for abnormal stool DNA biomarkers shed from colorectal neoplasia. sDNA-FIT offers higher single-test sensitivity for CRC than FIT alone; however, its lower specificity yields more false positives and therefore more follow-up colonoscopies, increasing exposure to procedure-related harms. Evidence for optimal longitudinal management after an abnormal sDNA-FIT followed by a negative colonoscopy remains insufficient, raising concern for potentially intensive surveillance triggered by the test's genetic component.

Cologuard – (mt-sDNA)

Imperiale et al (2014) conducted a large-scale evaluation of FIT-DNA (Cologuard) with colonoscopy in 12,000 asymptomatic average-risk adults between the ages of 50 and 84 years (mean age, 64

years).

The results of this study supported the initial FDA approval of Cologuard. All participants provided stool within 90 days prior to screening colonoscopy (reference standard). In 9,989 evaluable subjects, sensitivity for CRC was 92.3% with sDNA-FIT vs 73.8% with FIT ($p<0.0001$). For advanced precancerous lesions, sensitivity was 42.4% with sDNA-FIT vs 23.8% with FIT. Sensitivity did not differ by cancer stage or location; among advanced precancerous lesions, sensitivity was higher for distal than proximal lesions and increased with lesion size. Specificity was lower for sDNA-FIT than FIT: 86.6% vs 94.9% when "no significant lesions" and negative colonoscopy defined true negatives; 89.8% vs 96.4% when restricted to negative colonoscopy only. The authors concluded that sDNA-FIT detects more cancers than FIT but yields more false positives.

Imperiale et al (2023) published a longitudinal cohort study evaluating a 3-year screening interval for the mt-sDNA. Of 2,044 participants with a valid baseline result, 1,760 were negative and invited to repeat mt-sDNA and colonoscopy at year 3; 591 completed both (intention-to-screen cohort), of whom 122 were mt-sDNA positive. The year-3 Predictive Summary Index (PSI) was 0% for CRC ($p=1$) and 9.3% for advanced precancerous lesions ($p=0.01$). Observed 3-year CRC yield was lower than expected ($p=0.09$), while yield for advanced precancerous lesions was higher than expected ($p=0.009$), indicating increased detection of advanced precancerous lesions with repeat 3-year testing.

Dolatkhah et al (2022) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis that pooled 11 studies and reported combined sensitivity of 89% for CRC, 51% for advanced adenoma, and 76% for the composite of CRC/advanced adenoma, with specificity of 91%, 89%, and 90%, respectively. These values were lower than colonoscopy for detecting CRC and advanced adenoma.

Cologuard Plus (mt-sDNA)

Imperial et al (2024) reported the pivotal BLUE-C study of the next generation mt-sDNA test (Cologuard Plus) in asymptomatic adults 40 years of age or older undergoing screening colonoscopy (n=20,176). CRC prevalence was 0.5% (98 cases; 84% stage I–III). Most advanced findings were advanced precancerous lesions (10.6%); nonadvanced adenomas (34.6%); nonneoplastic findings (17.1%); and negative colonoscopy (37.2%). Among 2,144 participants with advanced precancerous lesions, the next-generation mt-sDNA test was positive in 931 (sensitivity 43.4%). Compared with a commercial FIT, the next-generation test had higher sensitivity for CRC and advanced precancerous lesions (both $p<0.0001$) but lower specificity for advanced neoplasia ($p<0.0001$). The study did not directly compare the next-generation and current mt-sDNA tests within the same participants/specimens; therefore, cross-study comparisons to the currently marketed test are not definitive.

Multi-Targeted Stool RNA Test (mt-sRNA)

Barnell et al (2023) reported the pivotal, blinded, prospective, cross-sectional CRC-PREVENT study of an mt-sRNA test (ColoSense). The assay combined a commercial FIT, eight RNA transcripts, and smoking status, with colonoscopy as the reference standard. A total of 8,920 eligible participants aged ≥45 years were enrolled (stool collected before colonoscopy) across >3,800 U.S. endoscopy centers. Primary outcomes were sensitivity for CRC and advanced adenomas and specificity for

absence of lesions on colonoscopy. The mt-sRNA test demonstrated 94% sensitivity for CRC and 46% for advanced adenomas, with specificity of 88% for no colonoscopic lesions; sensitivity for colorectal neoplasia was significantly higher among adults <50 years (p=0.04). Limitations included decentralized recruitment, variability in colonoscopy quality and bowel preparation, and high attrition. The authors concluded that mt-sRNA is a noninvasive option with sensitivity for CRC and advanced adenomas comparable to existing molecular stool tests and a similar false-positive profile.

CT Colonography (CTC; Virtual Colonoscopy)

CT colonography (CTC) has been investigated as an alternative to conventional endoscopic colonoscopy. It has been most widely studied as an alternative screening technique for CRC, as well as for evaluating symptomatic individuals and other colorectal conditions. Based on current evidence, CTC-based screening strategy is likely to produce outcomes similar to those of optical colonoscopy (e.g., Johnson 2008; Weinberg 2018; Sali 2022). The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Overall, diagnostic accuracy of CTC is in the same range or slightly below optical colonoscopy, with a moderate-to-high sensitivity and high specificity for the detection of larger polyps and CRC. As a result, screening with CTC may provide similar diagnostic results to screening using conventional optical colonoscopy. Results of available studies indicate CTC can have relatively high sensitivity and specificity for detection of cancerous colorectal lesions that are at least 6-10 mm in diameter, with lower sensitivity for precancerous, smaller, and flat lesions. The sensitivity of CTC in published studies is heterogeneous, varying widely, but improving as polyp size increases. CTC specificity in published studies is homogeneous, also improving as polyp size increases. CTC does not allow for removal of lesions during the procedure, as can be done during conventional colonoscopy.

Blood-Based Biomarker Tests

Early detection of CRC reduces disease-specific mortality, but many individuals do not participate in recommended screening with stool-based tests or colonoscopy. A simplified blood-based screening test could potentially improve participation; however, current evidence is insufficient to determine whether these technologies improve clinical outcomes.

Epi proColon was studied in the international prospective screening study, PRESEPT (Church 2014). Of 1516 patients selected for laboratory analysis, colonoscopy identified 53 invasive cancers (3%), 315 advanced adenomas (21%), and 210 nonadvanced adenomas (14%). Test sensitivity was 48% for any adenoma and 11% for advanced adenomas. The authors concluded that while the mSEPT9 assay can detect CRC signals in asymptomatic, average-risk individuals, its sensitivity for early cancers and advanced adenomas is insufficient for population-level screening.

Methylated SEPT9 biomarker testing underwent a systematic review and meta-analysis (Hariharan and Jenkins 2020). Pooled data from 19 studies found that the mSEPT9 test has high specificity (92%) and moderate sensitivity (69%) for CRC; however, the mSEPT9 test is limited by its poor diagnostic performance for precancerous lesions (advanced adenomas and polyps) and is more expensive.

Shield (Guardant Health) is a multi-target, blood-based CRC screening assay that analyzes cell-free

DNA (cfDNA). Its performance characteristics were evaluated in ECLIPSE, an industry-sponsored, prospective study of 7,861 average-risk adults undergoing screening colonoscopy (Chung et al., 2024). Reported results were 83.1% sensitivity for CRC, 89.6% specificity for advanced neoplasia (CRC or advanced precancerous lesions), and 13.2% sensitivity for advanced precancerous lesions. Among participants without advanced colorectal neoplasia, 10.4% had a positive cfDNA result (false positive). Among participants with negative colonoscopy (no CRC, advanced, or non-advanced precancerous lesions), specificity was 89.9%. Stage-grouped sensitivity for stage I–III CRC combined was 87.5%. Study limitations include industry sponsorship with sponsor involvement in design, analysis, and manuscript drafting; a small number of CRC cases (n=65); and single-round screening in an average-risk cohort with exclusions that may limit generalizability. The authors concluded that additional real-world and longitudinal studies are warranted.

Urine-Based Testing

The clinical data supporting a urine metabolite assay for adenomatous polyps involves a report of a training and validation set. There is insufficient evidence on the diagnostic accuracy of urinary tumor markers to draw conclusions about its use to screen asymptomatic individuals for precancerous colon polyps.

Deng et al (2017) reported on the development and validation of PolypDx. PolypDx (Metabolomic Technologies) is a urine metabolite assay that uses an algorithm to compare urine metabolite concentrations to determine the likelihood of colonic adenomatous polyps. Urine and stool samples were prospectively collected from 695 individuals participating in a colorectal cancer screening program to undergo colonoscopy. Metabolites in urine that were associated with adenomatous polyps were determined from 67% of the samples using nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy. Blinded testing on the validation set was performed in 33% of the samples using mass spectrometry, with a resulting area under the curve of 0.692. No direct evidence on clinical utility was identified.

The 2021 USPSTF recommendations for colorectal rectal screening tests specifically indicate that the recommendation does not include urine-based tests for colorectal cancer screening due to limited available evidence on these tests, that other effective tests are available, and additional more research is needed on the accuracy and effectiveness of emerging screening technologies such as urine-based tests.

In-Vivo Adjunctive Procedures:

Chromoendoscopy

For individuals who have an average risk of CRC who receive chromoendoscopy, the evidence includes randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and a meta-analysis of these RCTs. The meta-analysis conducted by Antonelli et al (2022) evaluated the efficacy of dye-based chromoendoscopy in detecting colorectal neoplasia. The analysis included 10 RCTs of individuals at average or increased risk of colon cancer undergoing conventional (standard or high-definition white light) colonoscopy, or colonoscopy with dye-based chromoendoscopy. Patients with IBD or genetic/familial syndromes were excluded. In patients at average or increased risk of colon cancer, the meta-analysis showed that dye-based chromoendoscopy increased adenoma detection rate by 20%, and adenomas per colonoscopy by 50%. Several RCTs included in the meta-analysis showed that the use of dye-based

chromoendoscopy improved detection of colorectal neoplasia compared to conventional colonoscopy, but clinical outcomes were lacking. Limitations of the meta-analysis included unclear indication for use of colonoscopy in the studies and some heterogeneity in mean adenomas per patient. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome for colorectal cancer screening patients at average risk.

Virtual Chromoendoscopy

Desai et al (2019) published a systematic review and meta-analysis that assessed the adenoma miss rate of white-light colonoscopy compared with virtual chromoendoscopy (e.g., narrow-band imaging (NBI) Fujinon intelligent chromoendoscopy, blue-light imaging, linked-color imaging, and i-SCAN) in a total of 3507 patients from 7 eligible RCTs. Of these patients, 1423 underwent a white-light colonoscopy as the first of tandem examinations; the remaining patients underwent virtual chromoendoscopy first. Results revealed a pooled adenoma miss rate for virtual chromoendoscopy compared to white-light colonoscopy of 17.9% versus 21% (p=.13). Additionally, the pooled adenoma detection rate was not significantly different with virtual chromoendoscopy as compared to white-light colonoscopy (p=.78).

The available RCTs have not found that virtual chromoendoscopy improves the detection of clinically important polyps compared with standard white-light colonoscopy. Moreover, there is a lack of studies assessing the impact of virtual chromoendoscopy on CRC incidence and mortality rates compared with standard colonoscopy. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

PROFESSIONAL GUIDELINE(S)

Colonoscopy

NCCN Colorectal Cancer Screening Guidelines (v.2.2025) indicate that colonoscopy is the most commonly employed CRC screening procedure and is considered the gold standard for assessing the sensitivity of detecting neoplasia for other screening modalities. There are numerous case controls and cohort studies that support that a colonoscopy has the potential ability to prevent CRC associated morbidity and cancer deaths. Per NCCN, the general consensus is that a 10-year interval is appropriate for most average-risk individuals who had a high-quality normal colonoscopy, defined as an exam complete to the cecum with bowel preparation adequate to detect polyps greater than 5 mm in size. And, if a colonoscopy is incomplete or preparation is suboptimal, consider either repeating colonoscopy within a year or screening with another modality.

The American College of Gastroenterology (ACG) Clinical Guidelines for Colorectal Cancer Screening 2021 (Shaukat 2021) recommends colonoscopy and fecal immunochemical testing (FIT) as the primary screening modalities for CRC screening [strong recommendation; low quality] and suggests consideration of flexible sigmoidoscopy, multitarget stool DNA test, CT colonography, or colon capsule [conditional recommendation; very low quality].

Multi-Targeted Stool DNA (mt-sDNA) Testing

NCCN Colorectal Cancer Screening Guidelines (v.2.2025) recommend the inclusion of mt-sDNA or sDNA-FIT) as a potential screening modality in patients with an average risk for colon cancer.

Following a negative test, the recommendation is to rescreen with any modality in 3 years. Use of sDNA-FIT is not described for the screening of high-risk individuals.

Multi-Targeted Stool RNA (mt-sRNA) Testing

To date, mt-sRNA testing for CRC screening has not been included in the USPSTF recommendations.

In 2025, NCCN updated the Colorectal Cancer Screening Guidelines to include mt-sRNA-based testing as a recommended screening modality for average risk individuals. The guideline specifies that individuals with a positive mt-sRNA result should undergo diagnostic colonoscopy as soon as possible. NCCN (v.2.2025) cites clinical performance data demonstrating 46% sensitivity and 86% specificity for detecting advanced adenomas.

Fecal Occult Blood Test (FOBT): Guaiac-Based (gFOBT) and Immunochemical (FIT)

NCCN Colorectal Cancer Screening Guidelines (v.2.2025) indicate that there is direct evidence from RCTs that FOBT reduces CRC incidence and mortality by detecting precancerous polyps at an early, curable stage.

Urine-Based Testing

To date, the use of urine metabolite assay for colorectal cancer screening is not recommended within any professional clinical guidelines (e.g., NCCN, American College of Gastroenterology).

Blood-Based Biomarker Tests

In 2025, NCCN updated the Colorectal Cancer Screening Guidelines (v.2.2025) to include blood-based cell-free DNA (bb-cfDNA) testing as a screening modality for average risk individuals every 3 years, with colonoscopy evaluation as soon as possible for positive result. Given its modest performance, particularly among advanced precancerous lesions (13% sensitivity; 90% specificity), this test is only recommended for individuals who would not be willing to undergo screening through another modality.

The American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ASGE) issued a position statement on blood-based colorectal cancer screening recognizing the potential for the blood-based test to improve screening participation, particularly among those who are unwilling to undergo other screening modalities; however, blood test is not recommended as a first line screening tool. ASGE has determined that blood-based tests are inferior to established screening options (i.e., colonoscopy and stool-based tests) and recommends that blood-based tests should only be recommended for patients who are otherwise unwilling to get screened for CRC with colonoscopy or stool-based tests.

The 2021 USPSTF recommendations specifically exclude serum-based tests from endorsed CRC screening strategies due to limited evidence regarding their accuracy, clinical utility, and impact on outcomes. The USPSTF notes that additional research is needed for emerging blood-based screening technologies.

The 2021 American College of Gastroenterology recommendations suggest against the use of Septin 9 for CRC screening; Conditional recommendation, very low-quality of evidence (Shaukat 2021).

The U.S. Multi-Society Task Force (MSTF) issued colorectal cancer screening recommendations

suggesting that Sept9 not be used for colorectal cancer screening (Rex 2017). Stating that although the test appears to have higher sensitivity for late-stage compared with early-stage cancer, there are disadvantages including markedly inferior performance characteristics compared with FIT, including lower sensitivity for cancer, inability to detect advanced adenomas, and low cost-effectiveness relative to other screening tests.

REGULATORY STATUS

In 2021, the United States Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) issued recommendations for CRC screening: Grade A recommendation for all adults aged 50 to 75 years; Grade B recommendation for adults aged 45 to 49 years; Grade C recommendation for adults aged 76 to 85 years.

Based on the recommendation from the USPSTF, New York State signed into law as Chapter 739 of the Laws of 2022, a law requiring Health Plans issuing policies that cover physician office visits to cover colon cancer screenings, examinations, and laboratory tests in accordance with the recommendations of the American Cancer Society for colorectal cancer screening of average risk individuals ages 45 or older, at average risk for CRC.

Multi-Targeted Stool DNA Test

Cologuard (Exact Sciences, Madison, WI) was approved by the FDA on August 11, 2014. The test includes molecular assays for aberrantly methylated BMP3 and NDRG4 promoter regions, mutant KRAS, β-actin, and an immunochemical assay for human hemoglobin.

Cologuard Plus (Exact Science, Madison, WI), the next generation multi-target stool DNA test, received FDA premarket approval on October 03, 2024. Cologuard Plus is a qualitative in vitro diagnostic test intended for the detection of colorectal neoplasia-associated DNA biomarkers and for the presence of occult hemoglobin in human stools. Results from the molecular and hemoglobin assays are integrated by the Exact Sciences Analysis Software to determine a positive, negative, or invalid result. The test is indicated to screen adults 45 years or older, who are at average risk for CRC, and is not a replacement for diagnostic colonoscopy or surveillance colonoscopy in high-risk individuals.

Multi-Targeted Stool RNA Test

ColoSense (Geneoscopy, ST. Louis, MO) received FDA approval to market ColoSense in May 2024. ColoSense is a multi-target stool test that measures RNA and hemoglobin in human stools and is FDA indicated as a screening test for adults, 45 years of age or older, who are at average risk for developing CRC. ColoSense is not a replacement for diagnostic colonoscopy or surveillance colonoscopy in high-risk individuals.

Fecal Occult Blood Test (FOBT) Guaiac-Based (gFOBT) and Immunochemical (FIT)

Two types of FOBT are approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to screen for colorectal cancer: guaiac FOBT (gFOBT) and the fecal immunochemical (or immunohistochemical) test (FIT). With both types of FOBT, stool samples are collected by the patient using a kit, and the samples are returned to the doctor.

CT Colonography (CTC)/Virtual Colonoscopy

Reformatted software systems for interpretation of virtual colonoscopy have been approved by the FDA. One example is the Viatronix V3D-colon virtual colonoscopy system (Viatronix, Inc., Stonybrook, NY), which was cleared for marketing by the FDA via the Section 510(k) process on April 19, 2004, for use as a screening tool in detecting colon cancer.

Blood-Based Biomarker Tests

The first FDA-approved blood serum test for CRC screening was for the detection of methylated septin 9 (mSEPT9) DNA, Epi proColon (Epigenomics, Seattle, Wash). In 2024, the FDA approved a test to detect colorectal cancer derived alterations in cell-free DNA (cfDNA), Shield (Guardant Health, Palo Alto, CA). ColonSentry (Stage Zero Life Science) is a proprietary liquid biopsy (blood sample) test that uses advance gene expression (mRNA) technology to detect the expression of 7 genes found to be differentially expressed in individuals with CRC compared with controls. BeScreened-CRC (Beacon Biomedical) is a PCR assay blood-based test to detect 3 protein biomarkers for colorectal cancer screening. BeScreened-CRC is available for clinical use, and it does not require FDA clearance or approval. In late 2023, the FDA approved an Investigational Device Exemption clinical trial (NCT05155605) to evaluate the Galleri multi-cancer early detection test (GRAIL, Menlo Park, CA).

CODE(S)

- Codes may not be covered under all circumstances.
- Code list may not be all inclusive (AMA and CMS code updates may occur more frequently than policy updates).
- (E/I)=Experimental/Investigational
- (NMN)=Not medically necessary/appropriate

CPT Codes

Code	Description
0002U (E/I)	Oncology (colorectal), quantitative assessment of three urine metabolites (ascorbic acid, succinic acid and carnitine) by liquid chromatography with tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS) using multiple reaction monitoring acquisition, algorithm reported as likelihood of adenomatous polyps. (e.g., PolypDx, Atlantic Diagnostic Laboratories, LLC, Metabolomic Technologies, Inc)
0091U (E/I)	Oncology (colorectal) screening, cell enumeration of circulating tumor cells, utilizing whole blood, algorithm, for the presence of adenoma or cancer, reported as a positive or negative result. (e.g., FirstSightCRC CellMax Life)
0163U (E/I)	Oncology (colorectal) screening, biochemical enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) of three plasma or serum proteins (teratocarcinoma-derived growth factor-1 [TDGF-1, Cripto-1], carcinoembryonic antigen [CEA], extracellular matrix protein [ECM]), with demographic data (age, gender, CRC-screening

Code	Description
	compliance) using a proprietary algorithm and reported as likelihood of CRC or advanced adenomas (e.g., BeScreened-CRC, Beacon Biomedical)
0421U	Oncology (colorectal) screening, quantitative real-time target and signal amplification of 8 RNA markers (GAPDH, SMAD4, ACY1, AREG, CDH1, KRAS, TNFRSF10B, and EGLN2) and fecal hemoglobin, algorithm reported as a positive or negative for colorectal cancer risk (e.g., Colosense, Geneoscopy)
0453U (E/I)	Oncology (colorectal cancer), cell-free DNA (cfDNA), methylation-based quantitative PCR assay (SEPTIN9, IKZF1, BCAT1, Septin9-2, VAV3, BCAN), plasma, reported as presence or absence of circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) (e.g., ColonAiQ, Breakthrough Genomics, Singlera Genomics, Inc)
0464U	Oncology (colorectal) screening, quantitative real-time target and signal amplification, methylated DNA markers, including LASS4, LRRC4 and PPP2R5C, a reference marker ZDHHC1, and a protein marker (fecal hemoglobin), utilizing stool, algorithm reported as a positive or negative result (e.g., Cologuard Plus, Exact Sciences Laboratories)
0496U (E/I)	Oncology (colorectal), cell free DNA, 8 genes for mutations, 7 genes for methylation by real time RT PCR, and 4 proteins by enzyme linked immunosorbent assay, blood, reported positive or negative for colorectal cancer or advanced adenoma risk (e.g., ColoScape PLUS, DiaCarta)
0501U (E/I)	Oncology (colorectal), blood, quantitative measurement of cell- free DNA (cfDNA) (e.g., QuantiDNA Colorectal Cancer Triage Test, DiaCarta)
0537U (E/I)	Oncology (colorectal cancer), analysis of cell-free DNA for epigenomic patterns, next-generation sequencing, >2500 differentially methylated regions (DMRs), plasma, algorithm reported as positive or negative. (e.g., Shield, Guardant Health)
0558U (E/I)	Oncology (colorectal), quantitative enzyme-linked immunoassay (ELISA) for secreted colorectal cancer protein marker (BF7 antigen), using serum, result reported as indicative of response/no response to therapy or disease progression/regression (e.g., IgoCheck)

Code	Description
44388 - 44391, 44392, 44394, 44401 - 44408, 45378 - 45382, 45384 - 45386, 45388 - 45390	Colonoscopy, flexible; (code range)
44799 (*E/I)	Unlisted procedure, intestine (*E/I when used to report chromoendoscopy, fiberoptic polyp analysis, narrow band imaging, confocal fluorescent endomicroscopy.)
45330 - 45335, 45338, 45349	Sigmoidoscopy, flexible; (code range)
45399 (*E/I)	Unlisted procedure, colon (*E/I when used to report chromoendoscopy, fiberoptic polyp analysis, narrow band imaging, confocal fluorescent endomicroscopy.)
45999 (*E/I)	Unlisted procedure, rectum (*E/I when used to report chromoendoscopy, fiberoptic polyp analysis, narrow band imaging, confocal fluorescent endomicroscopy.)
74261	Computed tomographic (CT) colonography, diagnostic, including image postprocessing; without contrast material
74262	Computed tomographic (CT) colonography, diagnostic, including image postprocessing; with contrast material(s) including non-contrast images, if performed
74263	Computed tomographic (CT) colonography, screening, including image postprocessing
81327 (E/I)	SEPT9 (Septin9) (e.g., colorectal cancer) promoter methylation analysis
81528	Oncology (colorectal) screening, quantitative real-time target and signal amplification of 10 DNA markers (KRAS mutations, promoter methylation of NDRG4 and BMP3) and fecal hemoglobin, utilizing stool, algorithm reported as a positive or negative result (e.g., Cologuard)
82270	Blood, occult, by peroxidase activity (e.g., guaiac), qualitative; feces, consecutive collected specimens with single determination, for colorectal neoplasm screening (i.e., patient was provided 3 cards or single triple card for consecutive collection)
82274	Blood, occult, by fecal hemoglobin determination by immunoassay, qualitative,

Code	Description
	feces, 1-3 simultaneous determinations

HCPCS Codes

Code	Description
G0104	Colorectal cancer screening; flexible sigmoidoscopy
G0105	Colorectal cancer screening; colonoscopy on individual at high risk
G0121	Colorectal cancer screening; colonoscopy on individual not meeting criteria for high risk
G0327 (E/I)	Colorectal cancer screening; blood-based biomarker
G0328	Colorectal cancer screening; fecal occult blood test, immunoassay, one to three simultaneous determinations

ICD10 Codes

Code	Description
Multiple Codes	

REFERENCES

American Cancer Society [Internet]. Guideline for colorectal cancer screening. Last Revised: 2024 Jan 29; [accessed 2026 Jan 27]. Available from: https://www.cancer.org/cancer/colon-rectal-cancer/detection-diagnosis-staging/acs-recommendations.html

American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ASGE) [Internet]. ASGE position on blood-based colorectal cancer screening. 2024 [accessed 2026 Jan 30]. Available from: https://www.asge.org/home/practice-support/advocacy/policy-statements

Antonelli G, et al. Dye-based chromoendoscopy for the detection of colorectal neoplasia: meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Gastrointest Endosc. 2022 Sep;96(3):411-422.

Barnell EK, et al. Multitarget stool RNA test for colorectal cancer screening. JAMA. 2023 Nov 14;330(18):1760-1768. Erratum in: JAMA. 2024 Mar 12;331(10):888.

Boland RC, et al. Clinical practice guidelines. Diagnosis and management of cancer risk in the gastrointestinal hamartomatous polyposis syndromes: recommendations from the US multi-society task force (USMSTF) on colorectal cancer. Gastroenterol. 2022;162:2063-2085.

Burke CA, et al. AGA Clinical practice update on approach to the use of noninvasive colorectal cancer

screening options: commentary. Gastroenterol. 2022;162:952-956.

Cash BD, et al. Multicentre, prospective, randomized study comparing the diagnostic yield of colon capsule endoscopy versus CT colonography in a screening population (the TOPAZ study). Gut. 2021;70(11):2115-2122.

Char SK, et al. Biomarkers for early detection and monitoring of colorectal cancer. Gastroenterol Clin North Am. 2026 Mar;55(1):143-164. Epub 2025 Nov 27.

Church TR, et al. Prospective evaluation of methylated SEPT9 in plasma for detection of asymptomatic colorectal cancer. Gut. 2014;63:317–325.

Chung DC, et al. A cell-free DNA blood-based test for colorectal cancer screening. N Engl J Med. 2024 Mar;390(11):973-983.

Deng L, et al. Urinary metabolomics to identify a unique biomarker panel for detecting colorectal cancer: a multicenter study. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2019;28(8):1283-1291.

Desai M, et al. Impact of electronic chromoendoscopy on adenoma miss rates during colonoscopy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Dis Colon Rectum. 2019 Sep;62(9):1124-1134.

Ebner DW, et al. Multi-target stool DNA and the fecal immunochemical test: a systematic review and meta-analysis on test performances. Am J Prev Med. 2025 Aug;69(2):107654.

El-Dallal M, et al. Meta-analysis of virtual-based chromoendoscopy compared with dye-spraying chromoendoscopy standard and high-definition white light endoscopy in patients with inflammatory bowel disease at increased risk of colon cancer, inflammatory bowel diseases. Inflamm Bowel Diseases. 2020 Sept;26(9):1319–1329.

Hariharan R, Jenkins M. Utility of the methylated SEPT9 test for the early detection of colorectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy. BMJ Open Gastroenterol. 2020 Feb 18;7(1):e000355.

Feuerstein JD, et al. Meta-analysis of dye-based chromoendoscopy compared with standard- and high-definition white-light endoscopy in patients with inflammatory bowel disease at increased risk of colon cancer. Gastrointestinal endoscopy. 2019;90(2):186-195.e1.

Imperiale TF, et al. Multitarget stool DNA testing for colorectal-cancer screening. N Engl J Med. 2014 Apr 3;370(14):1287-97.

Imperiale TF, et al. Next-generation multitarget stool DNA test for colorectal cancer screening. N Engl J Med. 2024;390:984-993.

Imperiale TF, et al. Three-year interval for the multi-target stool DNA test for colorectal cancer screening: a longitudinal study. Cancer Prev Res (Phila). 2023 Feb 6;16(2):89-97.

Johnson CD, et al. Accuracy of CT colonography for detection of large adenomas and cancers. N Engl J Med. 2008;359:1207-1217.

Lin JS, et al. Screening for colorectal cancer: updated evidence report and systematic review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. JAMA. 2021;325(19):1978–1997.

Murthy SK, et al. AGA clinical practice update on endoscopic surveillance and management of colorectal dysplasia in inflammatory bowel diseases: expert review. Gastroenterol. 2021 Sept;161(3):1043-1051.e4.

National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) [Internet]. Clinical practice guidelines in oncology. Colorectal cancer screening. Version 2.2025. 2025 Jun 24 [accessed 2026 Jan 27]. Available from: https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/colorectal_screening.pdf

New York State Department of Financial Services [Internet]. Supplement No. 1 to Insurance Circular Letter No. 4 (2022). Health Insurance Coverage for the Prevention of Colorectal Cancer. 2023 Jul 18 [accessed 2026 Jan 27]. Available from: https://www.dfs.ny.gov/industry_guidance/circular_letters/cl2023_cl2022_04_s01

Park CH, et al. Role of probe-based confocal laser endomicroscopy-targeted biopsy in the molecular and histopathological study of gastric cancer. J Gastroenterol and Hep. 2019 Jan;34(1):84-91.

Patel SG, et al. Updates on age to start and stop colorectal cancer screening: recommendations from the U.S. Multi-Society Task Force on colorectal cancer. Am J Gastroenterol. 2022 Jan;117(1):57-69.

Resende RH, et al. Surveillance in inflammatory bowel disease: is chromoendoscopy the only way to go? A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. Endoscopy Inter Open. 2020 May;8(5):E578-E590.

Rex DK, et al. Colorectal cancer screening: recommendations for physicians and patients from the U.S. Multi-Society Task Force on colorectal cancer. Am J Gastroenterol. 2017 Jul;112(7):1016-1030.

Sali L, et al. Single CT colonography versus three rounds of fecal immunochemical test for population-based screening of colorectal cancer (SAVE): a randomized controlled trial. Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2022 Nov;7(11):1016-1023.

Shaukat A, et al. ACG clinical guidelines: colorectal cancer screening. 2021. Am J of Gastroenterol. 2021 Mar;116(3):458-479.

Shaukat A, et al. AGA clinical practice update on current role of blood tests for colorectal cancer screening: commentary. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2025 Aug;23(9):1486-1491.

Spada C, et al. Imaging alternatives to colonoscopy: CT colonography and colon capsule. European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) and European Society of Gastrointestinal and Abdominal Radiology (ESGAR) Guideline - Update 2020. Endoscopy. 2020 Dec;52(12):1127-1141.

U.S. Preventative Services Task Force (USPSTF) [Internet]. Colorectal cancer: screening. Final recommendation statement. 2021 May 18 [accessed 2026 Jan 27]. Available from: https://www.uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/uspstf/recommendation/colorectal-cancer-screening

SEARCH TERMS

Not Applicable

CENTERS FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES (CMS)

Computed tomographic colonography (CTC) is not addressed in National or Regional Medicare

coverage determinations or policies.

Colorectal Cancer Screening Tests (NCD 210.3) [accessed 2026 Jan 27]

Screening for Colorectal Cancer - Blood-Based Biomarker Tests (NCA, CAG-00454N) [accessed 2026 Jan 27]

PRODUCT DISCLAIMER

- Services are contract dependent; if a product does not cover a service, medical policy criteria do not apply.
- If a commercial product (including an Essential Plan or Child Health Plus product) covers a specific service, medical policy criteria apply to the benefit.
- If a Medicaid product covers a specific service, and there are no New York State Medicaid guidelines (eMedNY) criteria, medical policy criteria apply to the benefit.
- If a Medicare product (including Medicare HMO-Dual Special Needs Program (DSNP) product) covers a specific service, and there is no national or local Medicare coverage decision for the service, medical policy criteria apply to the benefit.
- If a Medicare HMO-Dual Special Needs Program (DSNP) product DOES NOT cover a specific service, please refer to the Medicaid Product coverage line.

POLICY HISTORY/REVISION

Committee Approval Dates

08/17/17, 05/17/18, 06/20/19, 08/20/20, 05/20/21, 08/19/21, 08/18/22, 10/19/23, 10/17/24, 03/20/25, 03/19/26

Date	Summary of Changes
03/19/26	• Annual review, policy statement revised for mt-sRNA to change from investigational to medically necessary.
03/20/25	• Off-cycle policy update, policy statements revised for Cologuard Plus to change from E/I to MN.
01/01/25	• Summary of changes tracking implemented.
08/17/17	• Original effective date