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Related Policies

- Acquired Rare Disease Drug Therapy Exception Process
- Injectable Chemotherapy Drugs: Application of NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines
- Preventative Care Services
- Vaccines

CONDITIONS OF COVERAGE

Applicable Lines of Business/Products

This policy applies to Oxford Commercial plan membership.

Benefit Type

General Benefits Package

Referral Required

(Does not apply to non-gatekeeper products)

No

Authorization Required

(Precertification always required for inpatient admission)

Yes¹,²

Precertification with Medical Director Review Required

Yes²

Applicable Site(s) of Service

(If site of service is not listed, Medical Director review is required)

Other

¹Providers must call Oxford's Medical Management Department to obtain precertification.
²Precertification with review by a Medical Director or their designee is required.

COVERAGE RATIONALE

Description

This policy provides parameters for coverage of off-label and unproven indications of FDA-approved medications covered under the medical benefit for one of the following:

- Provider administered injectable specialty drug with a corresponding Oxford Health Plans policy that does not address the requested indication
- Provider administered injectable specialty drug with a corresponding Oxford Health Plans policy that lists the drug as unproven for the requested indication
- Provider administered injectable specialty drug without an Oxford Health Plans drug policy

This policy does not address coverage for self-administered medications covered under the pharmacy benefit.

Please refer to pharmacy benefit coverage.

This policy does not address coverage of injectable oncology medications (J9000 - J9999) and select other medications used for oncology conditions [including, but not limited to octreotide acetate (J2353 and J2354) and...
leuprolide acetate (J1950)] covered under the medical benefit based upon the National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) Drugs & Biologics Compendium™. Please refer to the Clinical Policy titled Injectable Chemotherapy Drugs: Application of NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines for more information.

This policy does not address coverage of vaccines. Refer to the Clinical Policies titled Vaccines and Preventative Care Services for additional information on vaccines covered as preventive services.

Indications of Coverage

A specialty drug may be determined medically necessary for the requested off-label or unproven indication when ALL of the following criteria are met:

- The drug is approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration; and
- The requested drug has not been excluded from coverage by Oxford Health Plans due to lack of efficacy, clinical benefit, or administrative program (e.g., exclusion at launch, plan document); and
- One of the following:
  - The requested drug is considered 'unproven or not medically necessary' per Oxford Health Plans drug policy, where applicable
  - The indication for the requested drug is not addressed by an Oxford Health Plans drug policy, where applicable
  - An Oxford Health Plans drug policy does not exist for the requested drug.
- The drug is prescribed and requires administration by a licensed health care professional; and
- The requested drug is intended to treat a chronic and seriously debilitating condition; and
- Documented history of failure, contraindication, or intolerance to standard, conventional therapies to treat or manage the disease or condition, where available; and
- Diagnosis is clinically supported as a use by at least one of the following:
  - The American Hospital Formulary Service Drug Information (AHFS-DI) under the Therapeutic Uses section⁴; or
  - The Elsevier Gold Standard’s Clinical Pharmacology under the Indications section⁵; or
  - DRUGDEX System by Micromedex® has a Strength of Recommendation rating of Class I, Class IIA, or Class IIB under the Therapeutic Uses section⁶ or
  - MCG™ Care Guidelines, Ambulatory Care;⁷ or
  - Two (2) articles from major peer reviewed medical journals that present data supporting the proposed off-label use or uses as generally safe and effective unless there is validated and uncontested contradictory evidence presented in a major peer-reviewed medical journal.

[Examples of accepted journals include, but are not limited to, Journal of American Medical Association, New England Journal of Medicine, and Lancet. Accepted study designs may include, but are not limited to, randomized, double blind, placebo controlled clinical trials.]

BACKGROUND

An off-label/unlabeled use of a drug is defined as a use for a non-FDA approved indication, that is, one that is not listed on the drug's official label/prescribing information. An indication is defined as a diagnosis, illness, injury, syndrome, condition, or other clinical parameter for which a drug may be given. Off-label use is further defined as giving the drug in a way that deviates significantly from the labeled prescribing information for a particular indication.

BENEFIT CONSIDERATIONS

If the coverage review using the NCCN Compendium determines that the drug is unproven, then further review is indicated. Some Certificates of Coverage allow for coverage of experimental/investigational/unproven treatments for life-threatening illnesses when certain conditions are met. The member specific benefit plan document must be consulted to make coverage decisions for this service. Some states mandate benefit coverage for off-label use of medications for some diagnoses or under some circumstances. Some states also mandate usage of other Compendium references. Where such mandates apply, they supersede language in the benefit document or in the drug policy. Benefit coverage for an otherwise unproven service for the treatment of serious rare diseases may occur when certain conditions are met. See the Administrative Policy titled Acquired Rare Disease Drug Therapy Exception Process.

CLINICAL EVIDENCE

In order to meet the requirement that the use of the drug is medically necessary for the treatment of disease, the drugs must be safe and effective relative to other available treatments. Off-label drug prescribing may be determined
medically necessary if scientific evidence and/or compendia support the regimen. A compendium is defined “as a comprehensive listing of FDA-approved drugs and biologicals (or a comprehensive listing of a specific subset of drugs and biologicals in a specialty compendium, for example, a compendium of anti-cancer treatment).”

**American Hospital Formulary Service Drug Information (AHFS-DI)**

AHFS-DI utilizes the following *levels of evidence rating system*:¹

**Level 1**
- **High Strength/Quality** as defined by at least one of the following:
  - Evidence consists of at least one randomized, double-blind trial without important limitations (i.e., large treatment effect); intent-to-treat analysis used, confidence intervals reported. If more than one trial is available, these trials have consistent results.
  - Evidence consisting of a meta-analysis of such trials with consistent results (i.e., low heterogeneity).
- Evidence consisting of a non-blinded or single-blinded trial that meets study objective end points may be considered as Level 1 evidence in some cancer-related cases (e.g., NCI-sponsored cooperative group study or a multicenter trial).

**Level 2**
- **Moderate Strength/Quality** as defined by at least one of the following:
  - Evidence consists of at least one non-blinded or single-blinded, randomized clinical trial.
  - Evidence consists of at least one non-blinded or single-blinded, non-randomized clinical trial.
  - Evidence consists of a meta-analysis of randomized, controlled clinical trials with heterogeneous results if reasons for heterogeneity in individual trials are adequately discussed.
  - Evidence consists of at least one randomized, controlled clinical trial, but with important methodological limitations (e.g., large number of patients lost to follow-up and/or no intent-to-treat analysis and/or important data not recorded).
  - Evidence is inconsistent (i.e., two or more randomized controlled trials with unexplained, widely varying estimates of treatment effects, even if results of individual trials would constitute strong Level 1 evidence when considered alone).
- Evidence consisting of a non-blinded, non-randomized trial (e.g., a phase II study) may be considered as Level 2 evidence in some cancer-related cases (e.g., rare cancers or cancers with limited available treatment options).

**Level 3**
- **Low Strength/Quality** is defined as: Evidence consists of observational studies, case reports, or case series; may also include randomized clinical trials with multiple serious deficiencies or study limitations.

**Level 4**
- **Opinion/Experience** is defined as: Evidence consists of expert consensus panel reports or expert reviewers’ comments.

AHFS-DI utilizes the following *grades of recommendation*:
- **Recommended (Accepted)**: The drug or biologic should be used, is recommended/indicated, or is useful/effective/beneficial in most cases.
- **Reasonable Choice (Accepted, with Possible Conditions)** (e.g., treatment option): The drug or biologic is reasonable to use under certain conditions (e.g., in certain patient groups), can be useful/effective/beneficial, or is probably recommended or indicated.
- **Not Fully Established (Unclear Risk/Benefit, Equivocal Evidence, Inadequate Data and/or Experience)**: Usefulness and/or effectiveness is unknown, unclear, or uncertain or is not well established relative to the standard of care.
- **Not Recommended (Unaccepted)**: The drug or biologic is considered inappropriate, obsolete, or unproven; is not recommended, is not indicated, or is not useful/effective/beneficial; or may be harmful.

**Clinical Pharmacology**

Off-label drug indication data are included within Clinical Pharmacology when identified as a clinically relevant or as emerging treatment that are adequately supported by a systematic review of the evidence. Off-label data are primarily identified for inclusion in the database through a regular and comprehensive review of:²
- Primary published literature
- New or updated national practice guidelines
- Surveillance of other accepted sources of medical information (e.g., FDA, CDC, NIH communications)
- Dialogue with customers or other external reviewers of the compendia content
Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE)
The Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) system is used to evaluate and rate the quality of evidence to determine qualities of evidence levels and recommendations as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade of Recommendation</th>
<th>Clarity of Risk/Benefit</th>
<th>Quality of Supporting Evidence</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1A. Strong recommendation. High quality evidence</strong></td>
<td>Benefits clearly outweigh risk and burdens, or vice versa</td>
<td>Consistent evidence from well performed randomized, controlled trials or overwhelming evidence of some other form. Further research is unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of benefit and risk</td>
<td>Strong recommendation, can apply to most patients in most circumstances without reservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1B. Strong recommendation. Moderate quality evidence</strong></td>
<td>Benefits clearly outweigh risk and burdens, or vice versa</td>
<td>Evidence from randomized, controlled trials with important limitations (inconsistent results, methodologic flaws, indirect or imprecise), or very strong evidence of some other form. Further research (if performed) is likely to have an impact on our confidence in the estimate of benefit and risk and may change the estimate</td>
<td>Strong recommendation, likely to apply to most patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1C. Strong recommendation. Low quality evidence</strong></td>
<td>Benefits appear to outweigh risk and burdens, or vice versa</td>
<td>Evidence from observational studies, unsystematic clinical experience, or from randomized, controlled trials with serious flaws. Any estimate of effect is uncertain</td>
<td>Relatively strong recommendation; might change when higher quality evidence becomes available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2A. Weak recommendation. High quality evidence</strong></td>
<td>Benefits closely balanced with risks and burdens</td>
<td>Consistent evidence from well performed randomized, controlled trials or overwhelming evidence of some other form. Further research is unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of benefit and risk</td>
<td>Weak recommendation, best action may differ depending on circumstances or patients or societal values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2B. Weak recommendation. Moderate quality evidence</strong></td>
<td>Benefits closely balanced with risks and burdens, some uncertainty in the estimates of benefits, risks and burdens</td>
<td>Evidence from randomized, controlled trials with important limitations (inconsistent results, methodologic flaws, indirect or imprecise), or very strong evidence of some other form. Further research (if performed) is likely to have an impact on our confidence in the estimate of benefit and risk and may change the estimate</td>
<td>Weak recommendation, alternative approaches likely to be better for some patients under some circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2C. Weak recommendation. Low quality evidence</strong></td>
<td>Uncertainty in the estimates of benefits, risks, and burdens; benefits may be closely balanced with risks and burdens</td>
<td>Evidence from observational studies, unsystematic clinical experience, or from randomized, controlled trials with serious flaws. Any estimate of effect is uncertain</td>
<td>Very weak recommendation; other alternatives may be equally reasonable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DRUGDEX (Micromedex)**
The DRUGDEX (Micromedex) efficacy, strength of evidence and strength of recommendation definitions are outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DRUGDEX (Micromedex)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strength of Recommendation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class IIa</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class IIb</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class III</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Indeterminate</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Strength of Evidence**

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

No evidence

**Efficacy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Evidence and/or expert opinion suggests that a given drug treatment for a specific indication is effective.</td>
</tr>
<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 IIb</td>
<td>Evidence is Inconclusive</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>Class 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>

**MCG™ Ambulatory Care**

Some MCG guidelines are designated as "Current Role Remains Uncertain". To help clarify the reasoning behind designating a given guideline as "Current Role Remains Uncertain," each area of uncertainty that is discussed (under the heading "Inconclusive or Non-Supportive Evidence") has been assigned a Recommendation Grade summarizing the evidence base for that indication. MCG utilizes the following recommendation grades:

- **RG B**: Evidence is insufficient, conflicting, or poor and demonstrates an incomplete assessment of net benefit versus harm; additional research is recommended.
- **RG C1**: Evidence demonstrates a lack of net benefit; additional research is recommended.
- **RG C2**: Evidence demonstrates potential harm that outweighs benefit; additional research is recommended.

The evidence presented in the Evidence Summary is graded according to level of authoritativeness. The evidence hierarchy is as follows:

- **(EG 1) Evidence Grade 1:**
  - Meta-analyses
  - Randomized controlled trials with meta-analysis
  - Randomized controlled trials
  - Systematic reviews
- **(EG 2) Evidence Grade 2:**
  - Observational studies; examples include:
    - Cohort studies with statistical adjustment for potential confounders
    - Cohort studies without adjustment
    - Case series with historical or literature controls
    - Uncontrolled case series
  - Published guidelines
  - Statements in published articles or textbooks
- **(EG 3) Evidence Grade 3:**
  - Unpublished data; examples include:
    - Large database analyses
    - Written protocols or outcomes reports from large practices
    - Expert practitioner reports
The U.S. FDA released an information sheet entitled ‘Off-Label’ and Investigational Use of Marketed Drugs, Biologics, and Medical Devices which states: "Good medical practice and the best interests of the patient require that physicians use legally available drugs, biologics and devices according to their best knowledge and judgment. If physicians use a product for an indication not in the approved labeling, they have the responsibility to be well informed about the product, to base its use on firm scientific rationale and on sound medical evidence, and to maintain records of the product's use and effects." 

REFERENCES

The foregoing Oxford policy has been adapted from an existing UnitedHealthcare Pharmacy, Clinical Pharmacy Program that was researched, developed and approved by the UnitedHealth Group National Pharmacy & Therapeutics Committee. [2019D0054G]


POLICY HISTORY/REVISION INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2019</td>
<td><strong>Template Update</strong>&lt;br&gt;o Reorganized policy template; relocated FDA section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Coverage Rationale</strong>&lt;br&gt;o Added language to clarify this policy:&lt;br&gt; o Provides parameters for coverage of off-label and unproven indications of FDA-approved medications that are covered under the medical benefit that are provider administered&lt;br&gt; o Does not address self-administered medication covered under the pharmacy benefit&lt;br&gt; o Revised medical necessity criteria for specialty drugs requested for an off-label or unproven indication; replaced criterion requiring &quot;the drug is prescribed by a licensed health care professional&quot; with &quot;the drug is prescribed and requires administration by a licensed health care professional&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Supporting Information</strong>&lt;br&gt;o Updated References section to reflect the most current information&lt;br&gt;• Archived previous policy version PHARMACY 282.7 T2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE

This Clinical Policy provides assistance in interpreting UnitedHealthcare Oxford standard benefit plans. When deciding coverage, the member specific benefit plan document must be referenced as the terms of the member specific benefit plan may differ from the standard plan. In the event of a conflict, the member specific benefit plan document governs. Before using this policy, please check the member specific benefit plan document and any applicable federal or state
mandates. UnitedHealthcare Oxford reserves the right to modify its Policies as necessary. This Clinical Policy is provided for informational purposes. It does not constitute medical advice.

The term Oxford includes Oxford Health Plans, LLC and all of its subsidiaries as appropriate for these policies. Unless otherwise stated, Oxford policies do not apply to Medicare Advantage members.

UnitedHealthcare may also use tools developed by third parties, such as the MCG™ Care Guidelines, to assist us in administering health benefits. UnitedHealthcare Oxford Clinical Policies are intended to be used in connection with the independent professional medical judgment of a qualified health care provider and do not constitute the practice of medicine or medical advice.