

Reproductive Carrier Screening for Genetic Diseases

Effective: January 1, 2021

Next Review: September 2021

Last Review: December 2020

IMPORTANT REMINDER

Medical Policies are developed to provide guidance for members and providers regarding coverage in accordance with contract terms. Benefit determinations are based in all cases on the applicable contract language. To the extent there may be any conflict between the Medical Policy and contract language, the contract language takes precedence.

PLEASE NOTE: Contracts exclude from coverage, among other things, services or procedures that are considered investigational or cosmetic. Providers may bill members for services or procedures that are considered investigational or cosmetic. Providers are encouraged to inform members before rendering such services that the members are likely to be financially responsible for the cost of these services.

DESCRIPTION

The purpose of reproductive carrier screening is to identify asymptomatic individuals who are heterozygous for serious or lethal single-gene disorders, in order to evaluate the risk of conceiving an affected child and inform reproductive decisions.

MEDICAL POLICY CRITERIA

Notes:

- This policy is not intended to address preimplantation genetic testing, prenatal testing, or diagnostic genetic testing (see Cross References section).
- This policy applies only if there is not a separate Medical Policy that outlines specific criteria for carrier testing. If a separate policy does exist, then the criteria for medical necessity in that policy supersede the guidelines in this policy (see Cross References section).

- I. Reproductive carrier screening for the following genes in adults, either as individual genes or in a panel test (see Policy Guidelines 1 section), may be considered **medically necessary**:

- A. *ABCC8* for familial hyperinsulinism
- B. *ACADM* for medium-chain acyl-CoA-dehydrogenase deficiency
- C. *ASPA* for Canavan disease
- D. *BCKDHA*, *BCKDHB* for maple syrup urine disease
- E. *BLM* for Bloom syndrome
- F. *CFTR* for cystic fibrosis
- G. *DHCR7* for Smith-Lemli-Opitz syndrome
- H. *ELP1* (also known as *IKAP*, *IKBKAP*, *TOT1*) for familial dysautonomia/Riley-Day syndrome
- I. *FANCC* for Fanconi anemia group C
- J. *FMR1* for fragile X syndrome
- K. *G6PC* for glycogen storage disease type 1A
- L. *GALT* for galactosemia
- M. *GBA* for Gaucher disease
- N. *HBA* for α -thalassemia
- O. *HBB* for β -thalassemia, sickle cell anemia
- P. *HEXA* for Tay-Sachs disease
- Q. *MCOLN1* for mucopolipidosis IV
- R. *PAH* for phenylketonuria
- S. *SMN1*, *SMN2* for spinal muscle atrophy
- T. *SMPD1* for Niemann-Pick disease type A
- U. *TMEM216* for Joubert syndrome 2

II. Reproductive carrier testing for other specific diseases using genetic testing may be considered **medically necessary** for adults when all of the following criteria (A and B) are met:

- A. There is an increased risk for affected offspring, due to any of the following:
 1. One or both reproductive partners have a first- or second-degree relative who is affected (see Policy Guidelines 2 section); OR
 2. Reproductive partner is known to be a carrier; OR
 3. One or both reproductive partners are members of a population known to have a carrier rate that exceeds a threshold considered appropriate for testing for a particular condition (see Policy Guidelines 2 section).
- B. All of the following criteria are met:
 1. The natural history of the disease is well understood and there is a reasonable likelihood that the disease is one with high morbidity.

2. Alternative biochemical or other clinical tests to definitively diagnose carrier status are not available, or, if available, provide an indeterminate result or are individually less efficacious than genetic testing.
 3. The genetic test has adequate clinical validity to guide clinical decision making and residual risk is understood (see Policy Guidelines 3 section).
 4. An association of the marker with the disorder has been established.
- III. All targeted reproductive genetic carrier screening not meeting any of the above criteria is considered **not medically necessary**, including screening of children.
- IV. Expanded carrier screening panels are considered **investigational** (see Policy Guidelines 4 section).

NOTE: A summary of the supporting rationale for the policy criteria is at the end of the policy.

POLICY GUIDELINES

POLICY GUIDELINES 1

Examples of panel tests that may be necessary include, but are not limited to, the following tests:

- Beacon ACOG/ACMG Female Carrier Screening Panel (Fulgent)
- Inheritest® CF/SMA Panel (Integrated Genetics)
- Inheritest® Core Panel (Integrated Genetics)
- Inheritest® Carrier Screen, Society-guided Panel (Integrated Genetics)
- Invitae Core Carrier Screen (Invitae)
- Foresight® Fundamental Panel (Myriad)
- Prenatal Carrier Panel (CFvantage, Fragile X, SMA) (Quest Diagnostics)
- Standard Pan-ethnic Panel (Mount Sinai)

POLICY GUIDELINES 2

- First-degree relatives include a biological parent, brother, sister, or child
- Second-degree relatives include biologic grandparent, aunt, uncle, niece, nephew, grandchildren, and half-sibling.

If there is no family history of, or other form of increased risk for a disease, such as ethnicity, carrier screening is not recommended when the carrier rate is less than 1% in the general population. Disorders with carrier rates in the general population that exceed 1% include, but are not limited to, cystic fibrosis (*CFTR* gene) and spinal muscular atrophy (*SMN1* gene).

POLICY GUIDELINES 3

The American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG) has recommended testing for specific variants, which will result in carrier detection rate of 95% or higher for most disorders.

POLICY GUIDELINES 4

ACMG has defined expanded panels as those that use next-generation sequencing to screen for variants in many genes, as opposed to gene-by-gene screening. Expanded panels may include the diseases that are present with increased frequency in specific populations, but typically include testing for a wide range of diseases for which the patient is not at risk of being a carrier.

LIST OF INFORMATION NEEDED FOR REVIEW

In order to determine the clinical utility of gene test(s), all of the following information must be submitted for review:

1. Name of the genetic test(s) or panel test
2. Name of the performing laboratory and/or genetic testing organization (more than one may be listed)
3. The exact gene(s) and/or mutations being tested
4. Relevant billing codes
5. Brief description of how the genetic test results will guide clinical decisions that would not otherwise be made in the absence of testing
6. Medical records related to this genetic test
 - o History and physical exam
 - o Conventional testing and outcomes
 - o Conservative treatment provided, if any

CROSS REFERENCES

1. [Genetic Testing for Alzheimer's Disease](#), Genetic Testing, Policy No. 01
2. [Preimplantation Genetic Testing of Embryos](#), Genetic Testing, Policy No. 18
3. [Genetic and Molecular Diagnostic Testing](#), Genetic Testing, Policy No. 20
4. [Genetic Testing for FMR1 and AFF2 Variants \(Including Fragile X and Fragile XE Syndromes\)](#), Genetic Testing, Policy No. 43
5. [Noninvasive Prenatal Testing to Determine Fetal Aneuploidies and Microdeletions using Cell-Free DNA](#), Genetic Testing, Policy No 44
6. [Genetic Testing for \$\alpha\$ -Thalassemia](#), Genetic Testing, Policy No. 52
7. [Chromosomal Microarray Analysis \(CMA\) or Copy Number Analysis for the Genetic Evaluation of Patients with Developmental Delay, Intellectual Disability, Autism Spectrum Disorder or Congenital Anomalies](#), Genetic Testing, Policy No. 58
8. [Evaluating the Utility of Genetic Panels](#), Genetic Testing, Policy No. 64
9. [Genetic Testing for Rett Syndrome](#), Genetic Testing, Policy No. 68
10. [Genetic Testing for Duchenne and Becker Muscular Dystrophy](#), Genetic Testing, Policy No. 69
11. [Invasive Prenatal \(Fetal\) Diagnostic Testing Using Chromosomal Microarray Analysis \(CMA\)](#), Genetic Testing, Policy No. 78
12. [Genetic Testing for the Evaluation of Products of Conception and Pregnancy Loss](#), Genetic Testing, Policy No. 79
13. [Maternal Serum Analysis for Risk of Preterm Birth](#), Laboratory, Policy No. 75

BACKGROUND

There are more than 1300 inherited recessive disorders (autosomal or X-linked) that affect 30 out of every 10,000 children.^[1] Some diseases have limited impact on either length or quality of life, while others are uniformly fatal in childhood. See Appendix I for a glossary of terms related to carrier screening.

CARRIER SCREENING

Carrier screening is testing asymptomatic individuals to identify those who are heterozygous for serious or lethal single-gene disorders with the purpose of informing the risk of conceiving an affected child “to provide ... information to optimize pregnancy outcomes based on ... personal preferences and values.”^[2] Risk-based carrier screening is performed in individuals having an increased risk based on population carrier prevalence, and personal or family history. Conditions selected for screening can be based on ethnicities at high risk (e.g., Tay-Sachs disease in Ashkenazi Jews) or may be pan-ethnic (e.g., screening for cystic fibrosis carriers). Ethnicity-based screening for some conditions has been offered for decades and, in some cases, has reduced the prevalence of diseases. For example, a 90% reduction in Tay-Sachs disease followed introduction carrier screening in the 1970s in the United States and Canada.^[3] In addition, the U.S. population has become increasingly ethnically intermarried^[4]—a phenomenon the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists noted when offering a recommendation in 2005 for pan-ethnic cystic fibrosis carrier screening.^[6]

While methods for carrier screening of conditions individually may have been onerous in the past, contemporary molecular techniques including next-generation sequencing allow simultaneously identifying carriers of a wide range of disorders efficiently and inexpensively.

EXPANDED CARRIER SCREENING

Expanded carrier screening (ECS) involves screening individuals or couples for disorders in many genes (up to 100s). The disorders included may also span a range of disease severity or phenotype. Arguments for ECS include potential issues in assessing ethnicity, ability to identify more potential conditions, efficiency, and cost. However, there are possible downsides of screening individuals at low risk, including a potential for incorrect variant ascertainment and the consequences of screening for rare single-gene disorders in which the likely phenotype may be uncertain (e.g., due to variable expressivity and uncertain penetrance). The list of conditions included in ECS panels is not standardized. Although ECS panels would include conditions assessed in risk-based screening, ECS panels include many conditions not routinely evaluated and for which there are no existing professional guidelines.

REGULATORY STATUS

Clinical laboratories may develop and validate tests in-house and market them as a laboratory service; laboratory-developed tests (LDTs) must meet the general regulatory standards of the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA). Laboratories that offer LDTs must be licensed by CLIA for high-complexity testing. To date, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration has chosen not to require any regulatory review of this test.

A number of commercially available genetic tests exist for carrier screening. They range from testing for individual diseases, to small panels designed to address testing based on ethnicity as recommended by practice guidelines (American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics), to large expanded panels that test for numerous diseases.

EVIDENCE SUMMARY

Validation of the clinical use of any genetic test focuses on three main principles:

1. The analytic validity of the test, which refers to the technical accuracy of the test in detecting a mutation that is present or in excluding a mutation that is absent;

2. The clinical validity of the test, which refers to the diagnostic performance of the test (sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive values) in detecting clinical disease; and
3. The clinical utility of the test, which refers to how the results of the diagnostic test will be used to change management of the patient, and whether these changes in management lead to clinically important improvements in health outcomes.

RISK-BASED CARRIER SCREENING

The purpose of carrier screening is testing asymptomatic individuals to identify those who are heterozygous for serious or lethal single-gene disorders with the purpose of informing the risk of conceiving an affected child and to inform reproductive decisions.

Risk-based carrier screening can be pan-ethnic (e.g., cystic fibrosis [CF], spinal muscular atrophy) or based on disease and carrier risk determined by family history, ethnicity, and race. Pan-ethnic screening is recommended when carrier rates in the general population approach or exceed those judged to offer clinical utility and/or ethnicity may be difficult to evaluate. Risk-based carrier screening is typically performed by genotyping for a set of defined variants (in contrast to identifying variants by sequencing an entire gene).

This evidence review applies only if there is no separate evidence review that outlines specific criteria for carrier screening. If a separate evidence review exists, then criteria for medical necessity in that evidence review supersede the evidence herein.

Analytic Validity

The analytic validity of many targeted carrier screening tests has been reported to be high. For example, one major laboratory has reported that the analytic sensitivities and specificities of its CF 165-variant panel and Ashkenazi Jewish panel (which includes testing for 51 variants and 16 conditions) are all 99% (both approved by the New York State Department of Health).^[7] Depending on the population and disease, not all risk-based carrier screening relies on testing for genetic variants (e.g., the hexosaminidase A enzyme assay for Tay-Sachs disease or blood tests for hemoglobinopathies). The analytic validity of these tests performed in Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA)–or College of American Pathologists (CAP)–certified labs is anticipated to be high. For genetic assays of pathogenic variants in risk-based carrier screening, analytic validity is similarly anticipated to be high.

Clinical Validity

The clinical validity of a carrier screening test is evaluated by its ability to predict carrier status. Clinical validity is influenced by carrier prevalence, penetrance, expressivity, and environmental factors.^[1] Different variants in the same gene can result in different phenotypes (allelic heterogeneity) in most genetic disorders and impact clinical validity. The clinical sensitivity and predictive value of different assay methods (e.g., next-generation sequencing [NGS], microarray) vary depending on the proportion of known pathogenic variants evaluated. For example, clinical sensitivities for disorders in the previously mentioned Jewish panel ranged from 90% to 99% for all but Usher syndrome type 1F (62%). Clinical sensitivity will also vary according to the number of known variants tested. Additionally, not all testing strategies rely solely on genetic testing—for example, biochemical testing for hexosaminidase A may be the initial test to screen for Tay-Sachs carrier status. Finally, following a negative carrier screening test, the estimated residual risk of being a carrier reflects both the pretest

probability, that is, the estimated carrier prevalence in the population, and the sensitivity and specificity of the test. Consequently, limitations in clinical validity are quantified in residual risk estimates.

Clinical Utility

The clinical utility of carrier screening is defined by the extent to which reproductive decision making or choices are informed, increasing “reproductive autonomy and choice”^[11]. Evidence to support the clinical utility carrier screening for conditions with the highest carrier rates e.g., Tay-Sachs disease, CF) among specific ethnic groups is robust concerning the effect on reproductive decision making.^[3 8-10] For example, early studies of Tay-Sachs carrier screening in Ashkenazi Jews demonstrated a marked impact on reproductive decisions^[8 10] and, after more than four decades of ethnicity-based carrier screening, most Tay-Sachs disease cases occur in non-Jewish individuals.^[9] As another example, a 2014 systematic review of CF carrier screening found that while individual carrier status “did not affect reproductive intentions or behaviors,” most couple carriers terminated affected fetuses.^[11] For inherited single-gene disorders where carrier rates are of similar magnitude, recommendations to offer screening have therefore arguably a convincing rationale, even if partially based indirectly on results from other conditions.

EXPANDED CARRIER SCREENING

The purpose of expanded carrier screening (ECS) in asymptomatic individuals is to identify those who are heterozygous for any of a large number of serious or lethal single-gene disorders, with the purpose of evaluating the risk of conceiving an affected child and to inform reproductive decisions.

Analytic Validity

Hallam (2014) reported analytic validation of an ECS NGS panel (Good Start Genetics).^[12] From 11,691 in vitro fertilization patients, 447 pathogenic variants were identified in carriers—87 different variants across 14 genes. Sanger sequencing was used as the reference standard. The authors reported a series of studies to evaluate NGS technical performance characteristics: accuracy, lot-to-lot variability, limit of detection, reproducibility, interfering substances, and blinded accuracy. Performance characteristics were generally high. The assay did generate nine false-positive variant calls in 6.4 million base pairs. Srinivasan (2010) described performance of version 1.0 (current offering is v.2.0) of the Counsyl Family Prep Screen in testing for over 100 disorders using a median of 147 positive and 525 negative samples per variant.^[13] They reporting a false-positive call rate of 0.994 and false-negative rate of 0.002.

Establishing and reporting the analytic validity of relevant parameters for NGS across the genes and variants of interest presents challenges. Moreover, accuracy of variant ascertainment depends on many factors, including genomic region, read depth, variant type, and bioinformatics pipeline^[14]. Variants that not been assessed in studies of targeted testing require careful evaluation given the potential consequences of inaccuracies.

Clinical Validity

For conditions where pathogenic variants would be included in a risk-based genotyping carrier test, clinical validity should be similar or approach that of the targeted test. Outside those defined variants (or when genotyping includes only others with strong evidence supporting

pathogenicity), for the purposes of carrier screening pathogenicity, penetrance, and expressivity together with disease severity require accurate definition. Subsumed in clinical validity is the effect of a condition's severity on quality of life, impairments, and the need for intervention.

The ACOG (2017) made the following recommendations on ECS:

“Expanded carrier screening does not replace previous risk-based screening recommendations”

Based on consensus, characteristics of included disorders should meet the following criteria:

- Carrier frequency $\geq 1/100$
- Well-defined phenotype
- Detrimental effect on the quality of life, cause cognitive or physical impairment, require surgical or medical intervention, or have an onset early in life
- Not be primarily associated with a disease of adult-onset

The ACOG provided a detailed example of a panel that includes testing for 22 conditions that meet these criteria: α -thalassemia, β -thalassemia, Bloom syndrome, Canavan disease, CF, familial dysautonomia, familial hyperinsulinism, Fanconi anemia C, fragile X syndrome, galactosemia, Gaucher disease, glycogen storage disease type 1A, Joubert syndrome, medium-chain acyl-CoA dehydrogenase deficiency, maple syrup urine disease types 1A and 1B, mucopolidosis IV, Niemann-Pick disease type A, phenylketonuria, sickle cell anemia, Smith-Lemli-Opitz syndrome, spinal muscular atrophy, and Tay-Sachs disease.

Many of the genes included in ECS panels from different laboratories do not meet the prevalence criterion in all ethnic groups.^[15] However, self-reports of ethnicity may not be consistent with genetic ancestry in substantial proportion of individuals, particularly in countries with intermixed ethnicity such as the United States.^[16-18] A study by Guo and Gregg (2019) found that screening for the 40 genes that met the criterion of at least 1% prevalence in any ethnic group identified nearly all of the 2.52% of couples who would have been identified as at-risk with a 415-gene panel,^[19] while Stevens (2017) found that over half of the genes included in ECS panels from different laboratories did not meet the prevalence criterion.^[15]

Evidence on larger ECS panels (approximately 100 to 200 disorders) includes case series,^[20-23] and modeling studies^[15 24 25] that estimated the incremental number of potentially affected fetuses if ECS replaced a risk-based approach. Carrier rates with ECS ranged from 19% to 36% in individuals and from 0.2% to 1.2% of couples. Generally, as the size of the panel increases (risk-based to different sizes of expanded panels), the percentage of patients who are identified as carriers for any recessive disease also increases. With a 218-disorder panel, about one in three individuals were identified as a carrier of a recessive single-gene disorder. Not all publications specified whether the disorders identified met the ACOG criteria; Peyser (2019) commented that some diseases may have late-onset as well as variable phenotypes.^[22]

Ben-Shachar (2019) considered all 176 conditions in a commercially-available panel to meet ACOG criteria, except for the criterion of a carrier rate exceeding 1 in 100.^[26] Examination of the genes included in the panel suggests potential variability in penetrance and expressivity. In another analysis, medical geneticists evaluated disease severity associated with the 176 genes in the panel.^[27] After evaluation of published literature and mapping according to ACOG severity criteria, the investigators concluded that 65 of the genes (36.9%) were associated with

profound symptoms (shortened lifespan in infancy/childhood/adolescence and intellectual disability), 65 genes (36.9%) were associated with severe symptoms (shortened lifespan in infancy, childhood, or adolescence, or intellectual disability; or at least one of the following: shortened lifespan in premature adulthood, impaired mobility, internal physical manifestation with three or more traits: shortened lifespan in premature adulthood, impaired mobility, internal physical manifestation, sensory impairment, immunodeficiency/cancer, mental illness, or dysmorphic features), and 42 genes were associated with moderate symptoms. Moderate severity was classified as shortened lifespan in premature adulthood, impaired mobility, or internal physical manifestation; or, at least one of the following: sensory impairment, immunodeficiency/cancer, mental illness, or dysmorphic features. It is unclear if these would meet the ACOG criteria of a well-defined phenotype, a detrimental effect on quality of life, cause cognitive or physical impairment, require surgical or medical intervention, or have an onset early in life.

Haque (2016) modeled the potential impact that ECS adoption might have had for a cohort of individuals undergoing testing between January 2012 and July 2015.^[24] Data were derived from 346,790 individuals undergoing routine ECS. Tests were performed using genotyping (n=308,668) and next-generation sequencing (n=38,122). The severity of the 94 conditions included in the ECS panel was considered profound according to literature review and algorithm devised by Lazarin (2014).^[28] The incremental increase in the rate of potentially affected fetuses identified with ECS varied according to self-reported ethnicity. Out of 100,000 screened, the model predicted ECS would identify 392 (95% confidence interval, 366 to 420) affected fetuses vs 175 (95% confidence interval [CI] 164 to 186) with guideline-directed screening in Ashkenazi Jews – a difference of 217. Among African Americans, the incremental increase was 47 in 100,000 (364 vs 317) and for those of Northern European descent, 104 in 100,000 (159 vs 55). The authors concluded that ECS "may increase the detection of carrier status for a variety of potentially serious genetic conditions compared with current recommendations from professional societies. Prospective studies comparing current standard-of-care carrier screening with expanded carrier screening in at-risk populations are warranted before expanded screening is adopted."

A subsequent report by this group (Beauchamp [2018]) compared the detection rate of an ECS sequencing panel (Counsyl) with a targeted family screen.^[25] The ECS panel was designed for maximizing per-disease sensitivity for diseases categorized as severe or profound. Specificity of variant classification was maximized by comparison of variant classification with at least two other labs. In the model, the targeted panel detected approximately half the maximal disease risk while the ECS panel was projected to determine 92% of the total risk, with 183 affected conceptions per 100,000 U.S. births.

Although the results of these studies are consistent with ECS being able to identify more fetuses potentially affected by conditions than guideline-directed targeted screening, there are caveats to consider, as discussed in the accompanying editorial and subsequent correspondence on the Haque study.^[29 30] Specifically:

- There may be limited genotype-phenotype data for the additional disorders included.
- The severity of some conditions is variable and accurately informing reproductive decisions potentially problematic (short-chain acyl CoA dehydrogenase deficiency provided as an example).

- A disorder such as phenylketonuria is treatable and detected by newborn screening yet included in the panel.
- It was also noted that fragile X syndrome screening in the absence of a family history (i.e., risk-based) is not recommended by professional guidelines. Widespread screening could have unintended consequences, including unnecessary invasive prenatal testing, labeling of newborns, and for some effectively screening for diseases of adult-onset (e.g., premature ovarian failure and tremor-ataxia dementia syndrome among males), which is contrary to accepted ethical convention.

Assessing the pathogenicity of sequence variants for rare disorders can be challenging, even when guidelines are followed, because laboratories may not provide the same interpretations. For example, Amendola (2016) compared interpretations of nine variants (pathogenic to benign associated with Mendelian disorders) among nine diagnostic laboratories and 90 variants in three of them.^[31] They found good concordance between the laboratory's methods for determining pathogenicity and the ACMG-AMP criteria (Krippendorff's $\alpha=0.91$; concordance, 79%). However, across laboratories, there was only 34% concordance of either classification system, and for 22% there were differences could have affected medical management.

Strom (2011) reported on an example of inclusion of a “nonclassical” CF variant (p.L997F) in a carrier screening panel.^[32] In a database of approximately 2,500 CF sequencing analyses, four compound heterozygous patients carrying a pathogenic CF allele and the p.L997F variant were identified. Of these, three were asymptomatic at ages between 28 and 60 months. The remaining patient was 10 years old with atypical CF. Another compound heterozygous patient having an allele with the p.L997F variant and another deletion had classical CF. The authors concluded that including the variant in a screening panel could lead to “poorly informed reproductive decisions based on incorrect assumptions.”

As noted by Henneman (2016) "There is no general agreement on classification of genetic disorders based on the severity of disease."^[1]

Clinical Utility

In addition to clinical validity—a well-defined predictable risk that the offspring will be affected by severe phenotype—to offer greater clinical utility than recommended risk-based approaches, ECS must:

1. Correctly identify more carrier couples of those conditions than recommended risk-based screening (higher clinical sensitivity while maintaining specificity [no change in false positives]);
2. Inform reproductive decisions more effectively than recommended risk-based carrier screening.

Several surveys studies evaluated patients' perspectives and reproductive behaviors concerning ECS (see Table 1). Populations among the studies differed, with some studies including only women known to be carriers and some studies included all pregnant woman, regardless of carrier status. Due to the heterogeneity of the populations and outcomes, combining and summarizing results would not be appropriate.

Table 1. Relevant Clinical Utility Studies

Study	Participants	Number	Outcomes	Results
Ghioffi (2018) ^[33]	Couples in which both partners carry genes for the same recessive disease who had received ECS	537 eligible couples 64 (12%) completed survey	Action (defined as IVF with PDG or prenatal diagnosis) No action	60% reported taking action following ECS results 40% reported taking no action following results
Propst (2018) ^[34]	Pregnant women undergoing prenatal counseling prior to an aneuploidy screening	80 women: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40 elected ECS • 40 declined ECS 	Reasons for declining or electing ECS Reproductive planning	Reasons for declining: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not at risk (77%) • Small chance that both in couple are carriers (60%) • Results would not change reproductive planning (37%) • Too anxious if carrier test was positive (27%) Reasons for electing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want to know risk (90%) • Want all information available about genetic risk (72%) • Want to make informed reproductive decisions (61%) • Want to prepare for special needs child (33%)
Johansen Taber (2018) ^[35]	Women in couples where both partners carry genes for the same recessive condition, who had received ECS 54% were for IVF	1,701 eligible couples 391 women completed survey	Reproductive planning	77% of patients screened prior to pregnancy planned or pursued actions to avoid having affected offspring 37% of patients screened during pregnancy pursued prenatal diagnostic testing Reasons for declining prenatal testing were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fear of miscarriage • Belief that termination would not be pursued for a positive diagnosis • Perception that risk of an affected pregnancy was low

ECS: expanded carrier screening; IVF: in vitro fertilization; PGD: preimplantation genetic diagnosis

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

For individuals who are asymptomatic but at risk for having offspring with inherited single-gene disorders who receive risk-based carrier screening, the evidence includes studies supporting analytic validity, clinical validity, and clinical utility. Relevant outcomes are test accuracy, test validity, and changes in reproductive decision making. Results of carrier testing can be used to inform reproductive decisions such as preimplantation genetic diagnosis, in vitro fertilization, not having a child, invasive prenatal testing, adoption, or pregnancy termination.

For individuals who are either at increased risk or population risk for having offspring with an inherited recessive genetic disorder who receive ECS, the evidence includes studies supporting clinical validity and clinical utility. Relevant outcomes are test validity and changes in reproductive decision making. Studies have found that ECS identifies more carriers and more potentially affected fetuses. Many of the genes in ECS do not meet the ACOG consensus-driven criteria of at least 1% carrier rate for all ethnic groups. However, pan-ethnic testing can address the discrepancies between self-reported ethnicity and genetic ancestry in an ethnically mixed population. As panels become larger the likelihood of being identified as a carrier of a rare genetic disorder increases, leading to an at-risk couple rate of nearly 2% for having an offspring with a recessive or X-linked disorder. Many, though notably not all, of these rare genetic disorders are associated with severe or profound symptoms including shortened lifespan and intellectual or physical disability. With adequate genetic counseling ECS can inform reproductive choices, and observational studies have shown that a majority of couples would consider intervention that depends on the severity of the condition. Pan-ethnic carrier screening for severe recessive and X-linked genetic disorders with a 1% carrier rate in specific populations can have a significant clinical impact.

However, the evidence to support the clinical validity of ECS beyond risk-based recommendations is limited and accompanied by some concerns regarding interlaboratory agreement of variant pathogenicity assessment, the validity of disease severity classifications for rare disorders, and uncertainty that the offspring will be affected by a severe phenotype for all the disorders included in a panel.

PRACTICE GUIDELINE SUMMARY

RISK-BASED CONDITION-SPECIFIC SCREENING RECOMMENDATIONS

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) and American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG) have issued numerous guidelines on conditions discussed herein. Table 2 provides the recommendations by indication for risk-based screening.

Table 2. ACOG and ACMG Recommendations for Risk-Based Screening

Society	Recommendation	Year
Cystic fibrosis^a		
ACOG	“Cystic fibrosis carrier screening should be offered to all women considering pregnancy or are pregnant.” ^[36]	2017
ACMG	Current ACMG guidelines use a 23-variant panel and were developed after assessing the initial experiences on implementation of cystic fibrosis screening into clinical practice. Using the 23-variant panel, the detection rate is 94% in the Ashkenazi Jewish population and 88% in the non-Hispanic white general population. ^[37]	2013
Spinal muscular atrophy^b		
ACOG	“Screening for spinal muscular atrophy should be offered to all women considering pregnancy or are pregnant. In patients with a family history of spinal muscular atrophy, molecular testing reports of the affected individual and carrier testing of the related parent should be reviewed, if possible, before testing. If the reports are not available, SMN1 deletion testing should be recommended for the low-risk partner.” ^[36]	2017
ACMG	Because spinal muscular atrophy is present in all populations, carrier testing should be offered to all couples regardless of race or ethnicity. ^[38]	2013
Tay-Sachs disease		

Society	Recommendation	Year
ACOG	“Screening for Tay-Sachs disease should be offered when considering pregnancy or during pregnancy if either member of a couple is of Ashkenazi Jewish, French-Canadian, or Cajun descent. Those with a family history consistent with Tay-Sachs disease should also be screened.” ^[36]	2017
Hemoglobinopathies (sickle cell disease, α- and β-thalassemia)		
ACOG	“A complete blood count with red blood cell indices should be performed in all women who are currently pregnant to assess not only their risk of anemia but also to allow assessment for risk of a hemoglobinopathy. Ideally, this testing also should be offered to women before pregnancy. A hemoglobin electrophoresis should be performed in addition to a complete blood count if there is suspicion of hemoglobinopathy based on ethnicity (African, Mediterranean, Middle Eastern, Southeast Asian, or West Indian descent). If red blood cell indices indicate a low mean corpuscular hemoglobin or mean corpuscular volume, hemoglobin electrophoresis also should be performed.” ^[36]	2017
Fragile X syndrome		
ACOG	“Fragile X premutation carrier screening is recommended for women with a family history of fragile X-related disorders or intellectual disability suggestive of fragile X syndrome and who are considering pregnancy or are currently pregnant. If a woman has unexplained ovarian insufficiency or failure or an elevated follicle-stimulating hormone level before age 40 years, fragile X carrier screening is recommended to determine whether she has an FMR1 premutation.” ^[36]	2017

ACMG: American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics; ACOG: American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

^a Carrier rates: Ashkenazi Jews 1/24, non-Hispanic white 1/25, Hispanic white 1/58, African American 1/61, Asian American 1/94.

^b General population carrier rate: 1/40 to 1/60.

Ashkenazi Jewish Populations

Individuals of Ashkenazi Jewish descent have high carrier rates for multiple conditions—cumulatively between one in four and one in five when all disorders are considered.^[39]

Recommendations for carrier screening for Ashkenazi Jewish individuals by ACOG^[36] and ACMG^[39] are summarized in Table 3. According to ACMG, if only one member of the couple is Jewish, ideally, that individual should be tested first. If the Jewish partner has a positive carrier test result, the other partner (regardless of ethnic background) should be screened for that particular disorder. One Jewish grandparent is sufficient to offer testing.

Table 3. ACMG (2008, 2013) and ACOG (2017) Carrier Screening Recommendations for Individuals of Ashkenazi Jewish Descent^[36 39]

Condition	Incidence (Lifetime)	Carrier Rate	ACMG (2008, 2013)	ACOG (2017)
Tay-Sachs disease	1/3000	1/30	R	R
Canavan disease	1/6400	1/40	R	R
Cystic fibrosis	1/2500-3000	1/29	R	R
Familial dysautonomia	1/3600	1/32	R	R
Fanconi anemia (group C)	1/32,000	1/89	R	C
Niemann-Pick disease type A	1/32,000	1/90	R	C
Bloom syndrome	1/40,000	1/100	R	C
Mucopolysaccharidosis IV	1/62,500	1/127	R	C
Gaucher disease	1/900	1/15	R	C
Familial hyperinsulinism		1/52		C
Glycogen storage disease type I		1/71		C
Joubert syndrome		1/92		C
Maple syrup urine disease		1/81		C

Condition	Incidence (Lifetime)	Carrier Rate	ACMG (2008, 2013)	ACOG (2017)
Usher syndrome		≤ 1/40		C

ACMG: American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics; ACOG: American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; C: should be considered; R: recommended.

EXPANDED CARRIER SCREENING RECOMMENDATIONS

American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists

In 2017, ACOG made the following recommendations on expanded carrier screening (ECS)^[40]:

“Ethnic-specific, pan-ethnic, and expanded carrier screening are acceptable strategies for prepregnancy and prenatal carrier screening. Each obstetrician-gynecologist or other health care provider or practice should establish a standard approach that is consistently offered to and discussed with each patient, ideally before pregnancy. After counseling, a patient may decline any or all carrier screening.”

“Expanded carrier screening does not replace previous risk-based screening recommendations.”

Based on “consensus,” characteristics of included disorders should meet the following criteria:

- carrier frequency $\geq 1/100$
- “well-defined phenotype”
- “detrimental effect on quality of life, cause cognitive or physical impairment, require surgical or medical intervention, or have an onset early in life”
- not be primarily associated with a disease of adult onset.

ACOG also noted that ECS panels may not offer the most sensitive detection method for some conditions such as Tay-Sachs disease (i.e., they will miss carrier state in up to 10% of low-risk populations) or hemoglobinopathies.

ACOG also provided a detailed example of an ECS panel that includes testing for 22 conditions: α -thalassemia, β -thalassemia, Bloom syndrome, Canavan disease, cystic fibrosis, familial dysautonomia, familial hyperinsulinism, Fanconi anemia C, fragile X syndrome, galactosemia, Gaucher disease, glycogen storage disease type 1A, Joubert syndrome, medium-chain acyl-CoA dehydrogenase deficiency, maple syrup urine disease types 1A and 1B, mucopolidosis IV, Niemann-Pick disease type A, phenylketonuria, sickle cell anemia, Smith-Lemli-Opitz syndrome, spinal muscular atrophy, and Tay-Sachs disease.

In 2015, a joint statement on ECS was issued by ACOG, ACMG, the National Society of Genetic Counselors, the Perinatal Quality Foundation, and the Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine.^[2] The statement was not intended to replace current screening guidelines but to demonstrate an approach for health care providers and laboratories seeking to or currently offering ECS panels. Some points considered included the following:

- “Expanded carrier screening panels include most of the conditions recommended in current guidelines. However, molecular methods used in expanded carrier screening are not as accurate as methods recommended in current guidelines for the following conditions:
 - a. Screening for hemoglobinopathies requires use of mean corpuscular volume and hemoglobin electrophoresis.

- b. Tay-Sachs disease carrier testing has a low detection rate in non-Ashkenazi populations using molecular testing for the three common Ashkenazi mutations. Currently, hexosaminidase A enzyme analysis on blood is the best method to identify carriers in all ethnicities.”
- “Patients should be aware that newborn screening is mandated by all states and can identify some genetic conditions in the newborn. However, newborn screening may include a different panel of conditions than ECS. Newborn screening does not usually detect children who are carriers for the conditions being screened so will not necessarily identify carrier parents at increased risk.”
 - “Expanded carrier screening can be performed by genotyping or by DNA sequencing. Genotyping searches for known pathogenic and likely pathogenic variants. Sequencing analyzes the entire coding region of the gene and identifies alterations from the normal sequence. Although genotyping includes only selected variants, sequencing has the potential to identify not only benign, but also likely benign variants. Sequencing also can identify variants of uncertain significance....
 - ECS panels should only include “genes and variants” with “a well-understood relationship with a phenotype.... When the carrier frequency and detection rate are both known, residual risk estimation should be provided in laboratory reports.”
 - Conditions with unclear value on preconception and prenatal screening panels include α ₁-antitrypsin, methylene tetrahydrofolate reductase, and hereditary hemochromatosis.

The statement also included a set of recommendations for screened conditions^[2]:

1. “The condition being screened for should be a health problem that encompasses one or more of the following:
 - a. Cognitive disability.
 - b. Need for surgical or medical intervention.
 - c. Effect on quality of life.
 - d. Conditions for which a prenatal diagnosis may result in:
 - i. Prenatal intervention to improve perinatal outcome and immediate care of the neonate.
 - ii. Delivery management to optimize newborn and infant outcomes such as immediate, specialized neonatal care.
 - iii. Prenatal education of parents regarding special needs care after birth; this often may be accomplished most effectively before birth.”

American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics

In 2013, ACMG issued a position statement on prenatal/preconception expanded carrier testing.^[41] For a particular disorder to be included in carrier screening, the following criteria should be met:

1. “Disorders should be of a nature that most at-risk patients and their partners identified in the screening program would consider having a prenatal diagnosis to facilitate making decisions surrounding reproduction.
 - The inclusion of disorders characterized by variable expressivity or incomplete penetrance and those known to be associated with a mild phenotype should be optional and made transparent when using these technologies for screening. This recommendation is guided by the ethical principle of nonmaleficence.

2. When adult-onset disorders (disorders that could affect offspring of the individual undergoing carrier screening once offspring reach adult life) are included in screening panels, patients must provide consent to screening for these conditions, especially when there may be implications for the health of the individual being screened or for other family members.
 - This recommendation follows the ethical principles of autonomy and nonmaleficence.
3. For each disorder, the causative gene(s), mutations, and mutation frequencies should be known in the population being tested, so that meaningful residual risk in individuals who test negative can be assessed.
 - Laboratories should specify in their marketing literature and test results how residual risk was calculated using pan-ethnic population data or a specific race/ethnic group.
 - The calculation of residual risk requires knowledge of 2 factors: one is the carrier frequency within a population, the other is the proportion of disease-causing alleles detected using the specific testing platform. Laboratories using multiplex platforms often have limited knowledge of one or both factors. Laboratories offering expanded carrier screening should keep data prospectively and regularly report findings that allow computation of residual risk estimates for all disorders being offered. When data are inadequate, patient materials must stress that negative results should not be overinterpreted.
4. There must be validated clinical association between the mutation(s) detected and the severity of the disorder.
 - Patient and provider materials must include specific citations that support inclusion of the mutations for which screening is being performed.
5. ECS tests must comply with the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics Standards and Guidelines for Clinical Genetics Laboratories, including quality control and proficiency testing.
 - Quality control should include the entire test process, including preanalytical, analytical, and postanalytical phases. Test performance characteristics should be available to patients and providers accessing testing.

A highly multiplexed approach will require a more generic consent process than is typically used for single-disease screening because it may be impractical for a clinician to discuss each disease included in a multidisease carrier screening panel. An appropriately tailored informational pamphlet or Web site, containing a brief description of each disorder included in a test panel, should be available to patients undergoing or considering an expanded prenatal/preconception carrier screening panel. Genetic counseling before testing should be available to those who desire this, and posttest genetic counseling for those with positive screening results is recommended.”

SUMMARY

Reproductive carrier screening is performed to identify people at risk of having children with inherited single-gene disorders. Carriers are usually not at risk of developing the disease but can pass disease-causing gene variants to their offspring. There is enough research to show that targeted, risk-based carrier screening can help patients make informed reproductive decisions and improve health outcomes. Many clinical guidelines based on research

recommend carrier screening for certain disorders in patients at risk. Therefore, carrier screening may be considered medically necessary for patients that meet the policy criteria.

There is enough research to show that targeted carrier testing is unlikely to improve health outcomes and inform reproductive decision making in individuals that are not at increased risk of being carriers for a disorder. Therefore, targeted carrier screening is considered not medically necessary for patients that do not meet the policy criteria.

There is not enough research to show that expanded carrier screening (ECS) can improve overall health outcomes for patients and their children. While ECS panels can analyze many genes simultaneously, the results ECS may provide information on genetic variants that are of unclear clinical significance or which would not be helpful for patients making reproductive decisions. These results may potentially cause harm by leading to additional unnecessary interventions and anxiety. Therefore, ECS is considered investigational.

REFERENCES

1. L Henneman, P Borry, D Chokoshvili, et al. Responsible implementation of expanded carrier screening. *Eur J Hum Genet.* 2016;24(6):e1-e12 doi: 10.1038/ejhg.2015.271 published Online First. PMID: 26980105
2. JG Edwards, G Feldman, J Goldberg, et al. Expanded carrier screening in reproductive medicine—points to consider: a joint statement of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, National Society of Genetic Counselors, Perinatal Quality Foundation, and Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine. *Obstetrics and gynecology.* 2015;125(3):653-62 doi: 10.1097/AOG.0000000000000666 published Online First: 2015/03/03]. PMID: 25730230
3. MM Kaback. Population-based genetic screening for reproductive counseling: the Tay-Sachs disease model. *Eur J Pediatr.* 2000;159 Suppl 3:S192-5 Online First. PMID: 11216898
4. Y Banda, MN Kvale, TJ Hoffmann, et al. Characterizing race/ethnicity and genetic ancestry for 100,000 subjects in the Genetic Epidemiology Research on Adult Health and Aging (GERA) Cohort. *Genetics.* 2015;200(4):1285-95 doi: 10.1534/genetics.115.178616 published Online First. PMID: 26092716
5. MD Grant, DS Lauderdale. Cohort effects in a genetically determined trait: eye colour among US whites. *Ann Hum Biol.* 2002;29(6):657-66 doi: 10.1080/03014460210157394 published Online First. PMID: 12573082
6. Committee on Genetics, American College of Obstetricians Gynecologists. ACOG Committee Opinion. Number 325, December 2005. Update on carrier screening for cystic fibrosis. *Obstetrics and gynecology.* 2005;106(6):1465-8 Online First. PMID: 16319281
7. Arup Laboratories. Ashkenazi Jewish Diseases, 16 Genes. [cited 11/3/2020]. Available from: <http://ltd.aruplab.com/Tests/Pub/0051415>.
8. W Burke, B Tarini, NA Press, JP Evans. Genetic screening. *Epidemiol Rev.* 2011;33:148-64 doi: 10.1093/epirev/mxr008 published Online First. PMID: 21709145
9. K Bajaj, SJ Gross. Carrier screening: past, present, and future. *J Clin Med.* 2014;3(3):1033-42 doi: 10.3390/jcm3031033 published Online First. PMID: PMC4449659

10. M Kaback, J Lim-Steele, D Dabholkar, D Brown, N Levy, K Zeiger. Tay-Sachs disease--carrier screening, prenatal diagnosis, and the molecular era. An international perspective, 1970 to 1993. The International TSD Data Collection Network. *JAMA*. 1993;270(19):2307-15 Online First. PMID: 8230592
11. L Ioannou, BJ McClaren, J Massie, et al. Population-based carrier screening for cystic fibrosis: a systematic review of 23 years of research. *Genetics in medicine : official journal of the American College of Medical Genetics*. 2014;16(3):207-16 doi: 10.1038/gim.2013.125published Online First: 2013/09/14]. PMID: 24030436
12. S Hallam, H Nelson, V Greger, et al. Validation for clinical use of, and initial clinical experience with, a novel approach to population-based carrier screening using high-throughput, next-generation DNA sequencing. *The Journal of molecular diagnostics : JMD*. 2014;16(2):180-9 doi: 10.1016/j.jmoldx.2013.10.006published Online First: 2014/01/01]. PMID: 24374108
13. BS Srinivasan, EA Evans, J Flannick, et al. A universal carrier test for the long tail of Mendelian disease. *Reprod Biomed Online*. 2010;21(4):537-51 doi: 10.1016/j.rbmo.2010.05.012published Online First. PMID: 20729146
14. RL Goldfeder, JR Priest, JM Zook, et al. Medical implications of technical accuracy in genome sequencing. *Genome Med*. 2016;8(1):24 doi: 10.1186/s13073-016-0269-0published Online First. PMID: 26932475
15. B Stevens, N Krstic, M Jones, L Murphy, J Hoskovec. Finding Middle Ground in Constructing a Clinically Useful Expanded Carrier Screening Panel. *Obstetrics and gynecology*. 2017;130(2):279-84 doi: 10.1097/aog.0000000000002139published Online First: 2017/07/12]. PMID: 28697118
16. R Shraga, S Yarnall, S Elango, et al. Evaluating genetic ancestry and self-reported ethnicity in the context of carrier screening. *BMC genetics*. 2017;18(1):99 doi: 10.1186/s12863-017-0570-ypublished Online First: 2017/11/29]. PMID: 29179688
17. KE Kaseniit, IS Haque, JD Goldberg, LP Shulman, D Muzzey. Genetic ancestry analysis on >93,000 individuals undergoing expanded carrier screening reveals limitations of ethnicity-based medical guidelines. *Genetics in medicine : official journal of the American College of Medical Genetics*. 2020;22(10):1694-702 doi: 10.1038/s41436-020-0869-3published Online First: 2020/07/01]. PMID: 32595206
18. M Westemeyer, J Saucier, J Wallace, et al. Clinical experience with carrier screening in a general population: support for a comprehensive pan-ethnic approach. *Genetics in medicine : official journal of the American College of Medical Genetics*. 2020;22(8):1320-28 doi: 10.1038/s41436-020-0807-4published Online First: 2020/05/06]. PMID: 32366966
19. MH Guo, AR Gregg. Estimating yields of prenatal carrier screening and implications for design of expanded carrier screening panels. *Genetics in medicine : official journal of the American College of Medical Genetics*. 2019;21(9):1940-47 doi: 10.1038/s41436-019-0472-7published Online First: 2019/03/09]. PMID: 30846881
20. JM Franasiak, M Olcha, PA Bergh, et al. Expanded carrier screening in an infertile population: how often is clinical decision making affected? *Genetics in medicine : official journal of the American College of Medical Genetics*. 2016;18(11):1097-101 doi: 10.1038/gim.2016.8published Online First: 2016/11/01]. PMID: 26938781
21. GA Lazarin, IS Haque, S Nazareth, et al. An empirical estimate of carrier frequencies for 400+ causal Mendelian variants: results from an ethnically diverse clinical sample of 23,453 individuals. *Genetics in medicine : official journal of the American College of Medical Genetics*. 2013;15(3):178-86 doi: 10.1038/gim.2012.114published Online First: 2012/09/15]. PMID: 22975760

22. A Peyser, T Singer, C Mullin, et al. Comparing ethnicity-based and expanded carrier screening methods at a single fertility center reveals significant differences in carrier rates and carrier couple rates. *Genetics in medicine : official journal of the American College of Medical Genetics*. 2019;21(6):1400-06 doi: 10.1038/s41436-018-0331-y published Online First: 2018/10/18]. PMID: 30327537
23. C Terhaar, N Teed, R Allen, et al. Clinical experience with multigene carrier panels in the reproductive setting. *Prenatal diagnosis*. 2018 doi: 10.1002/pd.5272 published Online First: 2018/04/24]. PMID: 29683194
24. IS Haque, GA Lazarin, HP Kang, EA Evans, JD Goldberg, RJ Wapner. Modeled fetal risk of genetic diseases identified by expanded carrier screening. *JAMA*. 2016;316(7):734-42 doi: 10.1001/jama.2016.11139 published Online First: 2016/08/18]. PMID: 27533158
25. KA Beauchamp, D Muzzey, KK Wong, et al. Systematic design and comparison of expanded carrier screening panels. *Genetics in medicine : official journal of the American College of Medical Genetics*. 2018;20(1):55-63 doi: 10.1038/gim.2017.69 published Online First: 2017/06/24]. PMID: 28640244
26. R Ben-Shachar, A Svenson, JD Goldberg, D Muzzey. A data-driven evaluation of the size and content of expanded carrier screening panels. *Genetics in medicine : official journal of the American College of Medical Genetics*. 2019;21(9):1931-39 doi: 10.1038/s41436-019-0466-5 published Online First: 2019/03/01]. PMID: 30816298
27. A Arjunan, H Bellerose, R Torres, et al. Evaluation and classification of severity for 176 genes on an expanded carrier screening panel. *Prenatal diagnosis*. 2020;40(10):1246-57 doi: 10.1002/pd.5762 published Online First: 2020/06/01]. PMID: 32474937
28. GA Lazarin, F Hawthorne, NS Collins, EA Platt, EA Evans, IS Haque. Systematic classification of disease severity for evaluation of expanded carrier screening panels. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(12):e114391 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0114391 published Online First. PMID: 25494330
29. WW Grody. Where to draw the boundaries for prenatal carrier screening. *JAMA*. 2016;316(7):717-9 doi: 10.1001/jama.2016.10888 published Online First. PMID: 27533155
30. WW Grody. Prenatal carrier screening-Reply. *JAMA*. 2016;316(24):2676-77 doi: 10.1001/jama.2016.17404 published Online First. PMID: 28027361
31. LM Amendola, GP Jarvik, MC Leo, et al. Performance of ACMG-AMP variant-interpretation guidelines among nine laboratories in the clinical sequencing exploratory research consortium. *Am J Hum Genet*. 2016;98(6):1067-76 doi: 10.1016/j.ajhg.2016.03.024 published Online First. PMID: 27181684
32. CM Strom, JB Redman, M Peng. The dangers of including nonclassical cystic fibrosis variants in population-based screening panels: p.L997F, further genotype/phenotype correlation data. *Genetics in medicine : official journal of the American College of Medical Genetics*. 2011;13(12):1042-4 doi: 10.1097/GIM.0b013e318228efb2 published Online First. PMID: 21804385
33. CE Ghiossi, JD Goldberg, IS Haque, GA Lazarin, KK Wong. Clinical Utility of Expanded Carrier Screening: Reproductive Behaviors of At-Risk Couples. *Journal of genetic counseling*. 2018;27(3):616-25 doi: 10.1007/s10897-017-0160-1 published Online First: 2017/09/29]. PMID: 28956228
34. L Propst, G Connor, M Hinton, T Poorvu, J Dungan. Pregnant Women's Perspectives on Expanded Carrier Screening. *Journal of genetic counseling*. 2018;27(5):1148-56 doi: 10.1007/s10897-018-0232-x published Online First: 2018/02/25]. PMID: 29476298

35. KA Johansen Taber, KA Beauchamp, GA Lazarin, D Muzzey, A Arjunan, JD Goldberg. Clinical utility of expanded carrier screening: results-guided actionability and outcomes. *Genetics in medicine : official journal of the American College of Medical Genetics*. 2019;21(5):1041-48 doi: 10.1038/s41436-018-0321-0published Online First: 2018/10/13]. PMID: 30310157
36. Committee Opinion No. 691: Carrier screening for genetic conditions. *Obstetrics and gynecology*. 2017;129(3):e41-e55 doi: 10.1097/AOG.0000000000001952published Online First. PMID: 28225426
37. MS Watson, GR Cutting, RJ Desnick, et al. Cystic fibrosis population carrier screening: 2004 revision of American College of Medical Genetics mutation panel. *Genetics in medicine : official journal of the American College of Medical Genetics*. 2004;6(5):387-91 doi: 10.109701.gim.0000139506.11694.7cpublished Online First: 2004/09/17]. PMID: 15371902
38. TW Prior. Carrier screening for spinal muscular atrophy. *Genetics in medicine : official journal of the American College of Medical Genetics*. 2008;10(11):840-2 doi: 10.1097/GIM.0b013e318188d069published Online First: 2008/10/23]. PMID: 18941424
39. SJ Gross, BA Pletcher, KG Monaghan. Carrier screening in individuals of Ashkenazi Jewish descent. *Genetics in medicine : official journal of the American College of Medical Genetics*. 2008;10(1):54-6 doi: 10.1097/GIM.0b013e31815f247cpublished Online First: 2008/01/17]. PMID: 18197057
40. Committee Opinion No. 690: Carrier screening in the age of genomic medicine. *Obstetrics and gynecology*. 2017;129(3):e35-e40 doi: 10.1097/AOG.0000000000001951published Online First. PMID: 28225425
41. WW Grody, BH Thompson, AR Gregg, et al. ACMG position statement on prenatal/preconception expanded carrier screening. *Genetics in medicine : official journal of the American College of Medical Genetics*. 2013;15(6):482-3 doi: 10.1038/gim.2013.47published Online First: 2013/04/27]. PMID: 23619275
42. BlueCross BlueShield Association Medical Policy Reference Manual "Carrier Screening for Genetic Diseases." Policy No. 2.04.107

CODES

NOTE: If CPT tier 1 or tier 2 molecular pathology codes are available for the specific test, they should be used. If the test has not been codified by CPT, the unlisted molecular pathology code 81479 would be used.

Codes	Number	Description
CPT	0236U	SMN1 (survival of motor neuron 1, telomeric) and SMN2 (survival of motor neuron 2, centromeric) (eg, spinal muscular atrophy) full gene analysis, including small sequence changes in exonic and intronic regions, duplications and deletions, and mobile element insertions
	81200	ASPA (aspartoacylase) (eg, Canavan disease) gene analysis, common variants (eg, E285A, Y231X)
	81205	BCKDHB (branched-chain keto acid dehydrogenase E1, beta polypeptide) (eg, maple syrup urine disease) gene analysis, common variants (eg, R183P, G278S, E422X)
	81209	BLM (Bloom syndrome, RecQ helicase-like) (eg, Bloom syndrome) gene analysis, 2281del6ins7 variant

Codes	Number	Description
	81220	CFTR (cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator) (eg, cystic fibrosis) gene analysis; common variants (eg, ACMG/ACOG guidelines)
	81221	;known familial variants
	81222	;duplication/deletion variants
	81223	;full gene sequence
	81224	;intron 8 poly-T analysis (eg, male infertility)
	81242	FANCC (Fanconi anemia, complementation group C) (eg, Fanconi anemia, type C) gene analysis, common variant (eg, IVS4+4A>T)
	81243	FMR1 (Fragile X mental retardation 1) (eg, fragile X mental retardation) gene analysis; evaluation to detect abnormal (eg, expanded) alleles
	81244	FMR1 (fragile X mental retardation 1) (eg, fragile X mental retardation) gene analysis; characterization of alleles (eg, expanded size and promoter methylation status)
	81250	G6PC (glucose-6-phosphatase, catalytic subunit) (eg, Glycogen storage disease, type 1a, von Gierke disease) gene analysis, common variants (eg, R83C, Q347X)
	81251	GBA (glucosidase, beta, acid) (eg, Gaucher disease) gene analysis, common variants (eg, N370S, 84GG, L444P, IVS2+1G>A)
	81252	GJB2 (gap junction protein, beta 2, 26kDa, connexin 26) (eg, nonsyndromic hearing loss) gene analysis; full gene sequence
	81253	;known familial variants
	81254	GJB6 (gap junction protein, beta 6, 30kDa, connexin 30) (eg, nonsyndromic hearing loss) gene analysis, common variants (eg, 309kb [del(GJB6-D13S1830)] and 232kb [del(GJB6-D13S1854)])
	81255	HEXA (hexosaminidase A [alpha polypeptide]) (eg, Tay-Sachs disease) gene analysis, common variants (eg, 1278insTATC, 1421+1G>C, G269S)
	81257	HBA1/HBA2 (alpha globin 1 and alpha globin 2) (eg, alpha thalassemia, Hb Bart hydrops fetalis syndrome, HbH disease), gene analysis, for common deletions or variant (eg, Southeast Asian, Thai, Filipino, Mediterranean, alpha3.7, alpha4.2, alpha20.5, and Constant Spring)
	81260	IKBKAP (inhibitor of kappa light polypeptide gene enhancer in B-cells, kinase complex-associated protein) (eg, familial dysautonomia) gene analysis, common variants (eg, 2507+6T>C, R696P)
	81290	MCOLN1 (mucolipin 1) (eg, Mucopolipidosis, type IV) gene analysis, common variants (eg, IVS3-2A>G, del6.4kb)
	81329	SMN1 (survival of motor neuron 1, telomeric) (eg, spinal muscular atrophy) gene analysis; dosage/deletion analysis (eg, carrier testing), includes SMN2 (survival of motor neuron 2, centromeric) analysis, if performed
	81330	SMPD1(sphingomyelin phosphodiesterase 1, acid lysosomal) (eg, Niemann-Pick disease, Type A) gene analysis, common variants (eg, R496L, L302P, fsP330)
	81336	SMN1 (survival of motor neuron 1, telomeric) (eg, spinal muscular atrophy) gene analysis; full gene sequence
	81337	SMN1 (survival of motor neuron 1, telomeric) (eg, spinal muscular atrophy) gene analysis; known familial sequence variant(s)
	81400	MOLECULAR PATHOLOGY PROCEDURE LEVEL 1
	81401	MOLECULAR PATHOLOGY PROCEDURE LEVEL 2
	81402	MOLECULAR PATHOLOGY PROCEDURE LEVEL 3
	81403	MOLECULAR PATHOLOGY PROCEDURE LEVEL 4
	81404	MOLECULAR PATHOLOGY PROCEDURE LEVEL 5
	81405	MOLECULAR PATHOLOGY PROCEDURE LEVEL 6
	81406	MOLECULAR PATHOLOGY PROCEDURE LEVEL 7

Codes	Number	Description
	81407	MOLECULAR PATHOLOGY PROCEDURE LEVEL 8
	81408	MOLECULAR PATHOLOGY PROCEDURE LEVEL 9
	81412	Ashkenazi Jewish associated disorders (eg, Bloom syndrome, Canavan disease, cystic fibrosis, familial dysautonomia, Fanconi anemia group C, Gaucher disease, Tay-Sachs disease), genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 9 genes, including ASPA, BLM, CFTR, FANCC, GBA, HEXA, IKBKAP, MCOLN1, and SMPD1
	81430	Hearing loss (eg, nonsyndromic hearing loss, Usher syndrome, Pendred syndrome); genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 60 genes, including CDH23, CLRN1, GJB2, GPR98, MTRNR1, MYO7A, MYO15A, PCDH15, OTOF, SLC26A4, TMC1, TMPRSS3, USH1C, USH1G, USH2A, and WFS1
	81431	;duplication/deletion analysis panel, must include copy number analyses for STRC and DFNB1 deletions in GJB2 and GJB6 genes
	81434	Hereditary retinal disorders (eg, retinitis pigmentosa, Leber congenital amaurosis, cone-rod dystrophy), genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 15 genes, including ABCA4, CNGA1, CRB1, EYS, PDE6A, PDE6B, PRPF31, PRPH2, RDH12, RHO, RP1, RP2, RPE65, RPGR, and USH2A
	81443	Genetic testing for severe inherited conditions (eg, cystic fibrosis, Ashkenazi Jewish-associated disorders [eg, Bloom syndrome, Canavan disease, Fanconi anemia type C, mucopolysaccharidosis type VI, Gaucher disease, Tay-Sachs disease], beta hemoglobinopathies, phenylketonuria, galactosemia), genomic sequence analysis panel, must include sequencing of at least 15 genes (eg, ACADM, ARSA, ASPA, ATP7B, BCKDHA, BCKDHB, BLM, CFTR, DHCR7, FANCC, G6PC, GAA, GALT, GBA, GBE1, HBB, HEXA, IKBKAP, MCOLN1, PAH)
	81479	Unlisted molecular pathology procedure
HCPCS	S3844	DNA analysis of the connexin 26 gene (GJB2) for susceptibility to congenital, profound deafness
	S3845	Genetic testing for alpha-thalassemia
	S3846	Genetic testing for hemoglobin E beta-thalassemia
	S3849	Genetic testing for Niemann-Pick disease
	S3850	Genetic testing for sickle cell anemia
	S3853	Genetic testing for myotonic muscular dystrophy

APPENDIX I: GLOSSARY OF TERMS

APPENDIX 1. DEFINITIONS

Carrier Screening

Carrier genetic screening is performed on people who display no symptoms for a genetic disorder but may be at risk for passing it on to their children.

A carrier of a genetic disorder has one abnormal allele for a disorder. When associated with an autosomal recessive or X-linked disorder, carriers of the causative variant are typically unaffected. When associated with an autosomal dominant disorder, the individual has one normal and one mutated copy of the gene and may be affected by the disorder, may be unaffected but at high risk of developing the disorder later in life, or the carrier may remain unaffected because of the sex-limited nature of the disorder. Homozygous-affected offspring (those who inherit the variant from both parents) manifest the disorder.

Compound Heterozygous

The presence of two different mutant alleles at a particular gene locus, one on each chromosome of a pair.

Expressivity/Expression

The degree to which a penetrant gene is expressed within an individual.

Genetic Testing

Genetic testing involves the analysis of chromosomes, DNA, RNA, genes, or gene products to detect inherited (germline) or noninherited (somatic) genetic variants related to disease or health.

Homozygous

Having the same alleles at a particular gene locus on homologous chromosomes (chromosome pairs).

Penetrance

The proportion of individuals with a variant that causes a disorder who exhibit clinical symptoms of that disorder.

Residual Risk

The risk that an individual is a carrier of a disease, but testing for carrier status of the disease is negative (e.g., if the individual carries a pathogenic variant not included in the test assay).

Date of Origin: September 2018