Investigational (Experimental) Services

Description of Procedure or Service

BCBSNC defines the terms "investigational" or "experimental" as the use of a service, procedure or supply that is not recognized by the Plan as standard medical care for the condition, disease, illness or injury being treated. A service, procedure or supply includes, but is not limited to the diagnostic service, treatment, facility, equipment, drug or device.

A service is considered investigational (experimental) if any of the following criteria are met:

1. The services, procedures or supplies requiring Federal or other Governmental body approval, such as drugs and devices, do not have unrestricted market approval from the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) or final approval from any other governmental regulatory body for use in treatment of a specified condition. Any approval that is granted as an interim step in the regulatory process is not a substitute for final or unrestricted market approval.

2. There is insufficient or inconclusive medical and scientific evidence to permit the Plan to evaluate the therapeutic value of the service, procedure or supply. (Adequate evidence is defined as at least two documents of medical and scientific evidence that indicate that the proposed treatment is likely to be beneficial to the member.)

3. There is inconclusive medical and scientific evidence in peer-reviewed medical literature that the service, procedure or supply has a beneficial effect on health outcomes.

4. The service, procedure or supply under consideration is not as beneficial as any established alternatives.

5. There is insufficient information or inconclusive scientific evidence that, when used in a non-investigational setting, the service, procedure or supply has a beneficial effect on health outcomes or is as beneficial as any established alternatives.

Refer to Clinical Trial Services for additional information.

***Note: This Medical Policy is complex and technical. For questions concerning the technical language and/or specific clinical indications for its use, please consult your physician.

Policy

BCBSNC will not provide coverage for Investigational (Experimental) Services, except for covered clinical trial services (see Clinical Trial Services policy). Investigational (Experimental) Services do not meet the criteria for "medically necessary services" because these services are not standard medical practice (see Medical Necessity policy).
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Benefits Application
This medical policy relates only to the services or supplies described herein. Please refer to the Member's Benefit Booklet for availability of benefits. Member's benefits may vary according to benefit design; therefore member benefit language should be reviewed before applying the terms of this medical policy.

This policy will apply to all product lines of business unless otherwise indicated by the member’s certificate/contract (e.g., self-funded groups).

When Investigational (Experimental) Services are covered
Investigational (Experimental) Services are not covered except as delineated in the Clinical Trial Services medical policy.

When Investigational (Experimental) Services are not covered
Investigational (Experimental) Services are not covered. BCBSNC does not cover investigational (experimental) services, procedures or supplies.

A service is considered investigational (experimental) if any of the following criteria are met:

1. The services, procedures or supplies requiring Federal or other Governmental body approval, such as drugs and devices, do not have unrestricted market approval from the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) or final approval from any other governmental regulatory body for use in treatment of a specified condition. Any approval that is granted as an interim step in the regulatory process is not a substitute for final or unrestricted market approval.

2. There is insufficient or inconclusive medical and scientific evidence to permit the Plan to evaluate the therapeutic value of the service, procedure or supply. (Adequate evidence is defined as at least two documents of medical and scientific evidence that indicate that the proposed treatment is likely to be beneficial to the member.)

3. There is inconclusive medical and scientific evidence in peer-reviewed medical literature that the service, procedure or supply has a beneficial effect on health outcomes.

4. The service, procedure or supply under consideration is not as beneficial as any established alternatives.

5. There is insufficient information or inconclusive scientific evidence that, when used in a non-investigational setting, the service, procedure or supply has a beneficial effect on health outcomes or is as beneficial as any established alternatives.

Note: BCBSNC does not cover investigational, cosmetic or not medically necessary services and will not reimburse for any services, procedures, drugs or supplies associated with those investigational, cosmetic or not medically necessary services.

Policy Guidelines
Investigational (Experimental) Services

Determinations are made by the Plan after BCBSNC’s review of available scientific data. Opinions of experts in a particular field and opinions and assessments of nationally recognized review organizations may also be considered by the Plan but are not determinative or conclusive.

Medical and Scientific Evidence is defined by BCBSNC as one of the following:

1. Peer-reviewed scientific studies published in or accepted for publication by medical journals that meet nationally recognized requirements for scientific manuscripts and that submit most of their published articles for review by experts who are not part of the editorial staff.

2. Peer-reviewed literature or biomedical compendia from such sources as the National Institute of Health’s National Library of Medicine or The Cochrane Library.

3. An accepted indication for treatment in one of the following standard reference compendia:
   - The American Hospital Formulary Service-Drug Information,
   - The American Medical Association Drug Evaluations,
   - The American Dental Association Accepted Dental Therapeutics, and
   - The United States Pharmacopoeia Drug Information.

4. An accepted indication for treatment of cancer in one of the following standard reference compendia, for drugs approved by the FDA for treatment of cancer:
   - The National Comprehensive Cancer Network Drugs & Biologics Compendium
   - The Thomson Micromedex ® DRUGDEX ®
   - The Elsevier Gold Standard’s Clinical Pharmacology
   - Any other authoritative compendia as recognized periodically by the United States Secretary of Health and Human Services.

5. Findings, studies, or research conducted by or under the auspices of federal government agencies and nationally recognized federal research institutes including the:
   - U.S. Department of Health and Human Services,
   - Federal Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality,
   - National Institutes of Health,
   - National Cancer Institute,
   - National Academy of Sciences,
   - Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services, and
   - Any national board recognized by the National Institutes of Health for the purpose of evaluating the medical value of health services.

Billing/Coding/Physician Documentation Information
Investigational (Experimental) Services

This policy may apply to the following codes. Inclusion of a code in this section does not guarantee that it will be reimbursed. For further information on reimbursement guidelines, please see Administrative Policies on the Blue Cross Blue Shield of North Carolina web site at www.bcbsnc.com. They are listed in the Category Search on the Medical Policy search page.

Applicable service codes: See procedure code for the specific procedure or service.

BCBSNC may request medical records for determination of medical necessity. When medical records are requested, letters of support and/or explanation are often useful, but are not sufficient documentation unless all specific information needed to make a medical necessity determination is included.

Scientific Background and Reference Sources


Medical Policy Advisory Group - 12/2/1999


Senior Medical Director review 1/2017

Policy Implementation/Update Information

1/96 Original Policy issued

8/96 Revised: Updated list with removal of the following policies: Laser Prostatectomy, Terbutaline Infusion Pump, and TIPS.

6/97 Policy revised to include non-FDA approved drugs, devices, equipment, and supplies.

11/98 Revised to remove the list of procedures considered investigational. Check specific policy for proper coverage guidelines.

9/99 Reformatted, Medical Term definitions added.

12/99 Reaffirmed, Medical Policy Advisory Group

4/01 S9990, S9991 removed from coding section.

9/01 Medical Policy Advisory Group review. No change to policy.

4/02 Medical Policy Advisory Group review 2/02 and 3/02. Policy revised based on clinical trials mandate and medical consultant recommendations. Revised the
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definition for Medical and Scientific Evidence to include review from The Cochrane Library.


11/03 Corrected Benefit Application Section.

3/04 Policy Number changed from ADM9060 to MED1263.


4/9/07 Policy Number changed from MED1263 to ADM9051.

05/05/08 Policy reviewed 4/4/2008 by Vice President and Senior Medical Director of Provider Partnerships, Medical and Reimbursement Policy. No changes to policy criteria.

09/28/09 Under the section, “When Investigational (Experimental) Services are not covered” added the following: Note: BCBSNC does not cover investigational, cosmetic or not medically necessary services and will not reimburse for any services, procedures, drugs or supplies associated with those investigational, cosmetic or not medically necessary services.” for clarification purposes. Active policy, no longer scheduled for routine review.

6/22/10 Policy Number(s) removed (amw)

7/1/2014 Policy category changed from Medical Policy to Reimbursement policy. No change to current policy statement. (adn)

7/15/2014 Policy category name returned to “Corporate Medical Policy.” (adn)

11/24/15 Review dates removed from policy header. No change to policy content. (adn)

1/27/17 Added Appendix to the policy on pages 5-7. Under “Medical and Scientific Evidence as defined by BCBSNC on page 3, added accepted compendia for oncology drugs statement: “An accepted indication for treatment of cancer in one of the following standard reference compendia, for drugs approved by the FDA for treatment of cancer: The National Comprehensive Cancer Network Drugs & Biologics Compendium, The Thomson Micromedex® DRUGDEX®, The Elsevier Gold Standard’s Clinical Pharmacology, and Any other authoritative compendia as recognized periodically by the United States Secretary of Health and Human Services. Senior Medical Director review 1/2017. (lpr)

Medical policy is not an authorization, certification, explanation of benefits or a contract. Benefits and eligibility are determined before medical guidelines and payment guidelines are applied. Benefits are determined by the group contract and subscriber certificate that is in effect at the time services are rendered. This document is solely provided for informational purposes only and is based on research of current medical literature and review of common medical practices in the treatment and diagnosis of disease. Medical practices and knowledge are constantly changing and BCBSNC reserves the right to review and revise its medical policies periodically.
Appendix: Evidence Standards from NCCN, DrugDex ®, and Clinical Pharmacology/Gold Standard

NCCN

Category 1: Based upon high-level evidence, there is uniform NCCN consensus that the intervention is appropriate.

Category 2A: Based upon lower-level evidence, there is uniform NCCN consensus that the intervention is appropriate.

Category 2B: Based upon lower-level evidence, there is (non-uniform) NCCN consensus that the intervention is appropriate.

Category 3: Based upon any level of evidence, there is major NCCN disagreement that the intervention is appropriate.

DRUGDEX

Strength of recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>The given test or treatment has been proven to be useful, and should be performed or administered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class IIa</td>
<td>Recommended, In Most Cases</td>
<td>The given test, or treatment is generally considered to be useful, and is indicated in most cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class IIb</td>
<td>Recommended, In Some Cases</td>
<td>The given test, or treatment may be useful, and is indicated in some, but not most, cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>Not Recommended</td>
<td>The given test, or treatment is not useful, and should be avoided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strength of evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category A</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category A evidence is based on data derived from: Meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials with homogeneity with regard to the directions and degrees of results between individual studies. Multiple, well-done randomized clinical trials involving large numbers of patients.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category B</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category B evidence is based on data derived from: Meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials with conflicting conclusions with regard to the directions and degrees of results between individual studies. Randomized controlled trials that involved small numbers of patients or had significant methodological flaws (e.g., bias, drop-out rate, flawed analysis, etc.). Nonrandomized studies (e.g., cohort studies, case-control studies, observational studies).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category C</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category C evidence is based on data derived from: Expert opinion or consensus, case reports or case series.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class I</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Evidence and/or expert opinion suggests that a given drug treatment for a specific indication is effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class IIa</td>
<td>Evidence Favors Efficacy</td>
<td>Evidence and/or expert opinion is conflicting as to whether a given drug treatment for a specific indication is effective, but the weight of evidence and/or expert opinion favors efficacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Evidence and/or expert opinion is conflicting as to whether a given drug treatment for a specific indication is effective, but the weight of evidence and/or expert opinion argues against efficacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>Inconclusive</td>
<td>Evidence and/or expert opinion suggests that a given drug treatment for a specific indication is ineffective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>Evidence and/or expert opinion suggests that a given drug treatment for a specific indication is ineffective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Clinical Pharmacology/Gold Standard**

**Strong recommendation:** An off-label use that carries a Strong Recommendation “For” or “Against” use, with any level of evidence, should be considered binding and reflect that Elsevier recommends or does not recommend, respectively, the use of the drug for that indication in the situation described. All off-label uses with a strong level of recommendation will appear in the referential database and be clearly identified as recommended or not recommended; however, a strong recommendation “Against use” will not be found within the clinical decision support data.

**Equivocal/Weak Recommendation:** Off-label uses that have inconclusive data “For” or “Against” use carry a Weak Recommendation. A Weak recommendation, with any level of evidence, reflects a neutral or equivocal position (i.e., neither for or against use) by Elsevier. All off-label uses with a weak level of recommendation will appear in the referential database and be clearly identified as equivocal; however, a weak recommendation “Against use” will not be found within the clinical decision support data.

The GRADE system provides guidelines for evaluating and rating the quality of evidence and utilizes four (4) quality of evidence levels:

- High
- Moderate
- Low
- Very Low