

Chromosome Microarray Testing (Non-Oncology Conditions) (for Kentucky Only)

Policy Number: CS017KY.11
Effective Date: November 1, 2025

[Instructions for Use](#)

| Table of Contents | Page |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Application | 1 |
| Coverage Rationale | 1 |
| Definitions | 2 |
| Applicable Codes | 2 |
| Description of Services | 13 |
| Clinical Evidence | 14 |
| U.S. Food and Drug Administration | 23 |
| References | 23 |
| Policy History/Revision Information | 27 |
| Instructions for Use | 27 |

Related Policies

- [FDA Cleared or Approved Companion Diagnostic Testing \(for Kentucky Only\)](#)
- [Molecular Oncology Testing for Hematologic Cancer Diagnosis, Prognosis, and Treatment Decisions \(for Kentucky Only\)](#)
- [Molecular Oncology Testing for Solid Tumor Cancer Diagnosis, Prognosis, and Treatment Decisions \(for Kentucky Only\)](#)
- [Preimplantation Genetic Testing and Related Services \(for Kentucky Only\)](#)
- [Whole Exome and Whole Genome Sequencing \(Non-Oncology Conditions\) \(for Kentucky Only\)](#)

Application

This Medical Policy only applies to the state of Kentucky.

Coverage Rationale

Pre-test genetic counseling is strongly recommended in order to inform persons being tested about the advantages and limitations of the test as applied to a unique person.

Chromosome microarray testing using array comparative genomic hybridization (aCGH) and/or single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) array is proven and medically necessary for the following:

- Evaluation of an embryo/fetus in the following cases:
 - [Intrauterine Fetal Demise or Stillbirth](#)
 - Testing the products of conception following pregnancy loss
 - Individuals undergoing invasive prenatal testing (i.e., amniocentesis, chorionic villus sampling, or fetal tissue sampling)
- Evaluation of individuals with one or more of the following:
 - Autism spectrum disorder (ASD)
 - Isolated severe congenital heart disease
 - Multiple anomalies that are not specific to a [Well-Delineated Genetic Syndrome](#) and cannot be identified by a clinical evaluation alone
 - [Developmental Delay/Intellectual Disability](#) where a specific syndrome is not suspected
- Evaluation of biological parent or sibling of a fetus or child with an abnormal or equivocal finding on chromosome microarray testing results

Chromosome microarray testing using aCGH or SNP array is unproven and not medically necessary for all other populations and conditions due to insufficient evidence of efficacy.

Note: Preimplantation genetic testing (PGT) is addressed in the Medical Policy titled [Preimplantation Genetic Testing and Related Services \(for Kentucky Only\)](#).

Definitions

Developmental Delay: Developmental Delay may be used to describe children younger than 5 years of age who present with delays in the attainment of developmental milestones at the expected age (Moeschler and Shevell, 2014, reaffirmed 2019).

Intellectual Disability: A condition diagnosed before age 18 that includes below-average intellectual function and a lack of skills necessary for daily living (MedlinePlus, 2020).

Intrauterine Fetal Demise or Stillbirth: Fetal death at or after 20 weeks' gestation [American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG), Society of Maternal Fetal Medicine (SMFM), 2020, reaffirmed 2021].

Prenatal Diagnosis: A laboratory test performed on fetal deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) or chromosomes before birth to determine if a fetus has a genetic or chromosomal disorder (ACOG, 2016a, reaffirmed 2023).

Well-Delineated Genetic Syndrome: A syndrome is a collection of recognizable traits or abnormalities that tend to occur together and are associated with a specific disease. Distinguishing characteristics, such as specific facial features or other physical traits, lab tests, or family history can be used to identify a genetic syndrome. (Talking Glossary of Genomic and Genetic Terms, National Human Genome Research Institute, 2024). Examples of Well-Delineated Genetic Syndromes include but are not limited to: Down syndrome, Klinefelter syndrome, Marfan syndrome, neurofibromatosis type 1, osteogenesis imperfecta, Prader-Willi syndrome, Rett syndrome, trisomy 13 (Patau syndrome), Trisomy 18 (Edwards syndrome), Turner syndrome, and Williams syndrome.

Applicable Codes

The following list(s) of procedure and/or diagnosis codes is provided for reference purposes only and may not be all inclusive. Listing of a code in this policy does not imply that the service described by the code is a covered or non-covered health service. Benefit coverage for health services is determined by federal, state, or contractual requirements and applicable laws that may require coverage for a specific service. The inclusion of a code does not imply any right to reimbursement or guarantee claim payment. Other Policies and Guidelines may apply.

| CPT Code | Description |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 0156U | Copy number (e.g., intellectual disability, dysmorphology), sequence analysis |
| 0209U | Cytogenomic constitutional (genome-wide) analysis, interrogation of genomic regions for copy number, structural changes and areas of homozygosity for chromosomal abnormalities |
| 81228 | Cytogenomic (genome-wide) analysis for constitutional chromosomal abnormalities; interrogation of genomic regions for copy number variants, comparative genomic hybridization [CGH] microarray analysis |
| 81229 | Cytogenomic (genome-wide) analysis for constitutional chromosomal abnormalities; interrogation of genomic regions for copy number and single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) variants, comparative genomic hybridization (CGH) microarray analysis |
| 81349 | Cytogenomic (genome-wide) analysis for constitutional chromosomal abnormalities; interrogation of genomic regions for copy number and loss-of-heterozygosity variants, low-pass sequencing analysis |
| 81479 | Unlisted molecular pathology procedure |

CPT® is a registered trademark of the American Medical Association

| HCPCS Code | Description |
|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| S3870 | Comparative genomic hybridization (CGH) microarray testing for developmental delay, autism spectrum disorder and/or intellectual disability |

| Diagnosis Code | Description |
|----------------|--------------------------------|
| F70 | Mild intellectual disabilities |

| Diagnosis Code | Description |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| F71 | Moderate intellectual disabilities |
| F72 | Severe intellectual disabilities |
| F73 | Profound intellectual disabilities |
| F78.A1 | SYNGAP1-related intellectual disability |
| F78.A9 | Other genetic related intellectual disability |
| F79 | Unspecified intellectual disabilities |
| F80.0 | Phonological disorder |
| F80.1 | Expressive language disorder |
| F80.2 | Mixed receptive-expressive language disorder |
| F80.4 | Speech and language development delay due to hearing loss |
| F80.81 | Childhood onset fluency disorder |
| F80.82 | Social pragmatic communication disorder |
| F80.89 | Other developmental disorders of speech and language |
| F80.9 | Developmental disorder of speech and language, unspecified |
| F81.0 | Specific reading disorder |
| F81.2 | Mathematics disorder |
| F81.81 | Disorder of written expression |
| F81.89 | Other developmental disorders of scholastic skills |
| F81.9 | Developmental disorder of scholastic skills, unspecified |
| F82 | Specific developmental disorder of motor function |
| F84.0 | Autistic disorder |
| F84.3 | Other childhood disintegrative disorder |
| F84.5 | Asperger's syndrome |
| F84.8 | Other pervasive developmental disorders |
| F84.9 | Pervasive developmental disorder, unspecified |
| F88 | Other disorders of psychological development |
| F89 | Unspecified disorder of psychological development |
| H93.25 | Central auditory processing disorder |
| N96 | Recurrent pregnancy loss |
| O02.1 | Missed abortion |
| O02.89 | Other abnormal products of conception |
| O03.4 | Incomplete spontaneous abortion without complication |
| O03.9 | Complete or unspecified spontaneous abortion without complication |
| O09.511 | Supervision of elderly primigravida, first trimester |
| O09.512 | Supervision of elderly primigravida, second trimester |
| O09.513 | Supervision of elderly primigravida, third trimester |
| O09.519 | Supervision of elderly primigravida, unspecified trimester |
| O09.521 | Supervision of elderly multigravida, first trimester |
| O09.522 | Supervision of elderly multigravida, second trimester |
| O09.523 | Supervision of elderly multigravida, third trimester |
| O09.529 | Supervision of elderly multigravida, unspecified trimester |
| O26.20 | Pregnancy care for patient with recurrent pregnancy loss, unspecified trimester |
| O26.21 | Pregnancy care for patient with recurrent pregnancy loss, first trimester |
| O26.22 | Pregnancy care for patient with recurrent pregnancy loss, second trimester |
| O26.23 | Pregnancy care for patient with recurrent pregnancy loss, third trimester |

| Diagnosis Code | Description |
|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| O28.0 | Abnormal hematological finding on antenatal screening of mother |
| O28.1 | Abnormal biochemical finding on antenatal screening of mother |
| O28.2 | Abnormal cytological finding on antenatal screening of mother |
| O28.3 | Abnormal ultrasonic finding on antenatal screening of mother |
| O28.4 | Abnormal radiological finding on antenatal screening of mother |
| O28.5 | Abnormal chromosomal and genetic finding on antenatal screening of mother |
| O28.8 | Other abnormal findings on antenatal screening of mother |
| O28.9 | Unspecified abnormal findings on antenatal screening of mother |
| O35.00X0 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, unspecified, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.00X1 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, unspecified, fetus 1 |
| O35.00X2 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, unspecified, fetus 2 |
| O35.00X3 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, unspecified, fetus 3 |
| O35.00X4 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, unspecified, fetus 4 |
| O35.00X5 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, unspecified, fetus 5 |
| O35.00X9 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, unspecified, other fetus |
| O35.01X0 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, agenesis of the corpus callosum, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.01X1 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, agenesis of the corpus callosum, fetus 1 |
| O35.01X2 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, agenesis of the corpus callosum, fetus 2 |
| O35.01X3 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, agenesis of the corpus callosum, fetus 3 |
| O35.01X4 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, agenesis of the corpus callosum, fetus 4 |
| O35.01X5 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, agenesis of the corpus callosum, fetus 5 |
| O35.01X9 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, agenesis of the corpus callosum, other fetus |
| O35.02X0 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, anencephaly, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.02X1 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, anencephaly, fetus 1 |
| O35.02X2 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, anencephaly, fetus 2 |
| O35.02X3 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, anencephaly, fetus 3 |
| O35.02X4 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, anencephaly, fetus 4 |
| O35.02X5 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, anencephaly, fetus 5 |
| O35.02X9 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, anencephaly, other fetus |

| Diagnosis Code | Description |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| O35.03X0 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, choroid plexus cysts, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.03X1 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, choroid plexus cysts, fetus 1 |
| O35.03X2 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, choroid plexus cysts, fetus 2 |
| O35.03X3 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, choroid plexus cysts, fetus 3 |
| O35.03X4 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, choroid plexus cysts, fetus 4 |
| O35.03X5 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, choroid plexus cysts, fetus 5 |
| O35.03X9 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, choroid plexus cysts, other fetus |
| O35.04X0 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, encephalocele, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.04X1 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, encephalocele, fetus 1 |
| O35.04X2 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, encephalocele, fetus 2 |
| O35.04X3 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, encephalocele, fetus 3 |
| O35.04X4 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, encephalocele, fetus 4 |
| O35.04X5 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, encephalocele, fetus 5 |
| O35.04X9 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, encephalocele, other fetus |
| O35.05X0 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, holoprosencephaly, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.05X1 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, holoprosencephaly, fetus 1 |
| O35.05X2 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, holoprosencephaly, fetus 2 |
| O35.05X3 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, holoprosencephaly, fetus 3 |
| O35.05X4 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, holoprosencephaly, fetus 4 |
| O35.05X5 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, holoprosencephaly, fetus 5 |
| O35.05X9 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, holoprosencephaly, other fetus |
| O35.06X0 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, hydrocephaly, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.06X1 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, hydrocephaly, fetus 1 |
| O35.06X2 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, hydrocephaly, fetus 2 |
| O35.06X3 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, hydrocephaly, fetus 3 |

| Diagnosis Code | Description |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| O35.06X4 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, hydrocephaly, fetus 4 |
| O35.06X5 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, hydrocephaly, fetus 5 |
| O35.06X9 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, hydrocephaly, other fetus |
| O35.07X0 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, microcephaly, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.07X1 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, microcephaly, fetus 1 |
| O35.07X2 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, microcephaly, fetus 2 |
| O35.07X3 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, microcephaly, fetus 3 |
| O35.07X4 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, microcephaly, fetus 4 |
| O35.07X5 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, microcephaly, fetus 5 |
| O35.07X9 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, microcephaly, other fetus |
| O35.08X0 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, spina bifida, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.08X1 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, spina bifida, fetus 1 |
| O35.08X2 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, spina bifida, fetus 2 |
| O35.08X3 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, spina bifida, fetus 3 |
| O35.08X4 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, spina bifida, fetus 4 |
| O35.08X5 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, spina bifida, fetus 5 |
| O35.08X9 | Maternal care for (suspected) central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, spina bifida, other fetus |
| O35.09X0 | Maternal care for (suspected) other central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.09X1 | Maternal care for (suspected) other central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, fetus 1 |
| O35.09X2 | Maternal care for (suspected) other central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, fetus 2 |
| O35.09X3 | Maternal care for (suspected) other central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, fetus 3 |
| O35.09X4 | Maternal care for (suspected) other central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, fetus 4 |
| O35.09X5 | Maternal care for (suspected) other central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, fetus 5 |
| O35.09X9 | Maternal care for (suspected) other central nervous system malformation or damage in fetus, other fetus |
| O35.10X0 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, unspecified, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.10X1 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, unspecified, fetus 1 |

| Diagnosis Code | Description |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| O35.10X2 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, unspecified, fetus 2 |
| O35.10X3 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, unspecified, fetus 3 |
| O35.10X4 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, unspecified, fetus 4 |
| O35.10X5 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, unspecified, fetus 5 |
| O35.10X9 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, unspecified, other fetus |
| O35.11X0 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 13, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.11X1 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 13, fetus 1 |
| O35.11X2 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 13, fetus 2 |
| O35.11X3 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 13, fetus 3 |
| O35.11X4 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 13, fetus 4 |
| O35.11X5 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 13, fetus 5 |
| O35.11X9 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 13, other fetus |
| O35.12X0 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 18, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.12X1 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 18, fetus 1 |
| O35.12X2 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 18, fetus 2 |
| O35.12X3 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 18, fetus 3 |
| O35.12X4 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 18, fetus 4 |
| O35.12X5 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 18, fetus 5 |
| O35.12X9 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 18, other fetus |
| O35.13X0 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 21, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.13X1 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 21, fetus 1 |
| O35.13X2 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 21, fetus 2 |
| O35.13X3 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 21, fetus 3 |
| O35.13X4 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 21, fetus 4 |
| O35.13X5 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 21, fetus 5 |
| O35.13X9 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Trisomy 21, other fetus |
| O35.14X0 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Turner Syndrome, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.14X1 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Turner Syndrome, fetus 1 |
| O35.14X2 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Turner Syndrome, fetus 2 |
| O35.14X3 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Turner Syndrome, fetus 3 |
| O35.14X4 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Turner Syndrome, fetus 4 |
| O35.14X5 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Turner Syndrome, fetus 5 |
| O35.14X9 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, Turner Syndrome, other fetus |
| O35.15X0 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, sex chromosome abnormality, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.15X1 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, sex chromosome abnormality, fetus 1 |
| O35.15X2 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, sex chromosome abnormality, fetus 2 |
| O35.15X3 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, sex chromosome abnormality, fetus 3 |
| O35.15X4 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, sex chromosome abnormality, fetus 4 |

| Diagnosis Code | Description |
|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| O35.15X5 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, sex chromosome abnormality, fetus 5 |
| O35.15X9 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, sex chromosome abnormality, other fetus |
| O35.19X0 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, other chromosomal abnormality, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.19X1 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, other chromosomal abnormality, fetus 1 |
| O35.19X2 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, other chromosomal abnormality, fetus 2 |
| O35.19X3 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, other chromosomal abnormality, fetus 3 |
| O35.19X4 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, other chromosomal abnormality, fetus 4 |
| O35.19X5 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, other chromosomal abnormality, fetus 5 |
| O35.19X9 | Maternal care for (suspected) chromosomal abnormality in fetus, other chromosomal abnormality, other fetus |
| O35.2XX0 | Maternal care for (suspected) hereditary disease in fetus, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.2XX1 | Maternal care for (suspected) hereditary disease in fetus, fetus 1 |
| O35.2XX2 | Maternal care for (suspected) hereditary disease in fetus, fetus 2 |
| O35.2XX3 | Maternal care for (suspected) hereditary disease in fetus, fetus 3 |
| O35.2XX4 | Maternal care for (suspected) hereditary disease in fetus, fetus 4 |
| O35.2XX5 | Maternal care for (suspected) hereditary disease in fetus, fetus 5 |
| O35.2XX9 | Maternal care for (suspected) hereditary disease in fetus, other fetus |
| O35.8XX0 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.8XX1 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetus 1 |
| O35.8XX2 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetus 2 |
| O35.8XX3 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetus 3 |
| O35.8XX4 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetus 4 |
| O35.8XX5 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetus 5 |
| O35.8XX9 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, other fetus |
| O35.AXX0 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal facial anomalies, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.AXX1 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal facial anomalies, fetus 1 |
| O35.AXX2 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal facial anomalies, fetus 2 |
| O35.AXX3 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal facial anomalies, fetus 3 |
| O35.AXX4 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal facial anomalies, fetus 4 |
| O35.AXX5 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal facial anomalies, fetus 5 |
| O35.AXX9 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal facial anomalies, other fetus |
| O35.BXX0 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal cardiac anomalies, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.BXX1 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal cardiac anomalies, fetus 1 |
| O35.BXX2 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal cardiac anomalies, fetus 2 |
| O35.BXX3 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal cardiac anomalies, fetus 3 |
| O35.BXX4 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal cardiac anomalies, fetus 4 |
| O35.BXX5 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal cardiac anomalies, fetus 5 |

| Diagnosis Code | Description |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| O35.BXX9 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal cardiac anomalies, other fetus |
| O35.CXX0 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal pulmonary anomalies, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.CXX1 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal pulmonary anomalies, fetus 1 |
| O35.CXX2 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal pulmonary anomalies, fetus 2 |
| O35.CXX3 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal pulmonary anomalies, fetus 3 |
| O35.CXX4 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal pulmonary anomalies, fetus 4 |
| O35.CXX5 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal pulmonary anomalies, fetus 5 |
| O35.CXX9 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal pulmonary anomalies, other fetus |
| O35.DXX0 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal gastrointestinal anomalies, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.DXX1 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal gastrointestinal anomalies, fetus 1 |
| O35.DXX2 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal gastrointestinal anomalies, fetus 2 |
| O35.DXX3 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal gastrointestinal anomalies, fetus 3 |
| O35.DXX4 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal gastrointestinal anomalies, fetus 4 |
| O35.DXX5 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal gastrointestinal anomalies, fetus 5 |
| O35.DXX9 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal gastrointestinal anomalies, other fetus |
| O35.EXX0 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal genitourinary anomalies, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.EXX1 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal genitourinary anomalies, fetus 1 |
| O35.EXX2 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal genitourinary anomalies, fetus 2 |
| O35.EXX3 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal genitourinary anomalies, fetus 3 |
| O35.EXX4 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal genitourinary anomalies, fetus 4 |
| O35.EXX5 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal genitourinary anomalies, fetus 5 |
| O35.EXX9 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal genitourinary anomalies, other fetus |
| O35.FXX0 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal musculoskeletal anomalies of trunk, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.FXX1 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal musculoskeletal anomalies of trunk, fetus 1 |
| O35.FXX2 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal musculoskeletal anomalies of trunk, fetus 2 |

| Diagnosis Code | Description |
|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| O35.FXX3 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal musculoskeletal anomalies of trunk, fetus 3 |
| O35.FXX4 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal musculoskeletal anomalies of trunk, fetus 4 |
| O35.FXX5 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal musculoskeletal anomalies of trunk, fetus 5 |
| O35.FXX9 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal musculoskeletal anomalies of trunk, other fetus |
| O35.GXX0 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal upper extremities anomalies, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.GXX1 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal upper extremities anomalies, fetus 1 |
| O35.GXX2 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal upper extremities anomalies, fetus 2 |
| O35.GXX3 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal upper extremities anomalies, fetus 3 |
| O35.GXX4 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal upper extremities anomalies, fetus 4 |
| O35.GXX5 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal upper extremities anomalies, fetus 5 |
| O35.GXX9 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal upper extremities anomalies, other fetus |
| O35.HXX0 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal lower extremities anomalies, not applicable or unspecified |
| O35.HXX1 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal lower extremities anomalies, fetus 1 |
| O35.HXX2 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal lower extremities anomalies, fetus 2 |
| O35.HXX3 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal lower extremities anomalies, fetus 3 |
| O35.HXX4 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal lower extremities anomalies, fetus 4 |
| O35.HXX5 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal lower extremities anomalies, fetus 5 |
| O35.HXX9 | Maternal care for other (suspected) fetal abnormality and damage, fetal lower extremities anomalies, other fetus |
| O36.4XX0 | Maternal care for intrauterine death, not applicable or unspecified |
| O36.4XX1 | Maternal care for intrauterine death, fetus 1 |
| O36.4XX2 | Maternal care for intrauterine death, fetus 2 |
| O36.4XX3 | Maternal care for intrauterine death, fetus 3 |
| O36.4XX4 | Maternal care for intrauterine death, fetus 4 |
| O36.4XX5 | Maternal care for intrauterine death, fetus 5 |
| O36.4XX9 | Maternal care for intrauterine death, other fetus |
| P02.9 | Newborn affected by abnormality of membranes, unspecified |
| P95 | Stillbirth |
| Q20.1 | Double outlet right ventricle |
| Q20.2 | Double outlet left ventricle |
| Q20.3 | Discordant ventriculoarterial connection |
| Q20.4 | Double inlet ventricle |

| Diagnosis Code | Description |
|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Q20.5 | Discordant atrioventricular connection |
| Q20.6 | Isomerism of atrial appendages |
| Q20.8 | Other congenital malformations of cardiac chambers and connections |
| Q20.9 | Congenital malformation of cardiac chambers and connections, unspecified |
| Q21.0 | Ventricular septal defect |
| Q21.10 | Atrial septal defect, unspecified |
| Q21.11 | Secundum atrial septal defect |
| Q21.12 | Patent foramen ovale |
| Q21.13 | Coronary sinus atrial septal defect |
| Q21.14 | Superior sinus venosus atrial septal defect |
| Q21.15 | Inferior sinus venosus atrial septal defect |
| Q21.16 | Sinus venosus atrial septal defect, unspecified |
| Q21.19 | Other specified atrial septal defect |
| Q21.20 | Atrioventricular septal defect, unspecified as to partial or complete |
| Q21.21 | Partial atrioventricular septal defect |
| Q21.22 | Transitional atrioventricular septal defect |
| Q21.23 | Complete atrioventricular septal defect |
| Q21.3 | Tetralogy of Fallot |
| Q21.4 | Aortopulmonary septal defect |
| Q21.8 | Other congenital malformations of cardiac septa |
| Q21.9 | Congenital malformation of cardiac septum, unspecified |
| Q22.0 | Pulmonary valve atresia |
| Q22.1 | Congenital pulmonary valve stenosis |
| Q22.2 | Congenital pulmonary valve insufficiency |
| Q22.3 | Other congenital malformations of pulmonary valve |
| Q22.4 | Congenital tricuspid stenosis |
| Q22.5 | Ebstein's anomaly |
| Q22.6 | Hypoplastic right heart syndrome |
| Q22.8 | Other congenital malformations of tricuspid valve |
| Q22.9 | Congenital malformation of tricuspid valve, unspecified |
| Q23.0 | Congenital stenosis of aortic valve |
| Q23.1 | Congenital insufficiency of aortic valve |
| Q23.2 | Congenital mitral stenosis |
| Q23.3 | Congenital mitral insufficiency |
| Q23.4 | Hypoplastic left heart syndrome |
| Q23.81 | Bicuspid aortic valve |
| Q23.82 | Congenital mitral valve cleft leaflet |
| Q23.88 | Other congenital malformations of aortic and mitral valves |
| Q23.9 | Congenital malformation of aortic and mitral valves, unspecified |
| Q24.0 | Dextrocardia |
| Q24.1 | Levocardia |
| Q24.2 | Cor triatriatum |
| Q24.3 | Pulmonary infundibular stenosis |
| Q24.4 | Congenital subaortic stenosis |
| Q24.5 | Malformation of coronary vessels |

| Diagnosis Code | Description |
|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Q24.6 | Congenital heart block |
| Q24.8 | Other specified congenital malformations of heart |
| Q24.9 | Congenital malformation of heart, unspecified |
| Q87.86 | Kleefstra syndrome |
| Q89.7 | Multiple congenital malformations, not elsewhere classified |
| Q89.89 | Other specified congenital malformations |
| Q89.9 | Congenital malformation, unspecified |
| Q90.0 | Trisomy 21, nonmosaicism (meiotic nondisjunction) |
| Q90.1 | Trisomy 21, mosaicism (mitotic nondisjunction) |
| Q90.2 | Trisomy 21, translocation |
| Q90.9 | Down syndrome, unspecified |
| Q91.0 | Trisomy 18, nonmosaicism (meiotic nondisjunction) |
| Q91.1 | Trisomy 18, mosaicism (mitotic nondisjunction) |
| Q91.2 | Trisomy 18, translocation |
| Q91.3 | Trisomy 18, unspecified |
| Q91.4 | Trisomy 13, nonmosaicism (meiotic nondisjunction) |
| Q91.5 | Trisomy 13, mosaicism (mitotic nondisjunction) |
| Q91.6 | Trisomy 13, translocation |
| Q91.7 | Trisomy 13, unspecified |
| Q92.0 | Whole chromosome trisomy, nonmosaicism (meiotic nondisjunction) |
| Q92.1 | Whole chromosome trisomy, mosaicism (mitotic nondisjunction) |
| Q92.2 | Partial trisomy |
| Q92.5 | Duplications with other complex rearrangements |
| Q92.61 | Marker chromosomes in normal individual |
| Q92.62 | Marker chromosomes in abnormal individual |
| Q92.7 | Triploidy and polyploidy |
| Q92.8 | Other specified trisomies and partial trisomies of autosomes |
| Q92.9 | Trisomy and partial trisomy of autosomes, unspecified |
| Q93.0 | Whole chromosome monosomy, nonmosaicism (meiotic nondisjunction) |
| Q93.1 | Whole chromosome monosomy, mosaicism (mitotic nondisjunction) |
| Q93.2 | Chromosome replaced with ring, dicentric or isochromosome |
| Q93.3 | Deletion of short arm of chromosome 4 |
| Q93.4 | Deletion of short arm of chromosome 5 |
| Q93.51 | Angelman syndrome |
| Q93.52 | Phelan-McDermid syndrome |
| Q93.59 | Other deletions of part of a chromosome |
| Q93.7 | Deletions with other complex rearrangements |
| Q93.81 | Velo-cardio-facial syndrome |
| Q93.82 | Williams syndrome |
| Q93.88 | Other microdeletions |
| Q93.89 | Other deletions from the autosomes |
| Q93.9 | Deletion from autosomes, unspecified |
| Q95.2 | Balanced autosomal rearrangement in abnormal individual |
| Q95.3 | Balanced sex/autosomal rearrangement in abnormal individual |
| Q99.89 | Other specified chromosome abnormalities |

| Diagnosis Code | Description |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Q99.9 | Chromosomal abnormality, unspecified |
| QA0.0159 | Neurodevelopmental disorder, related to other genes associated with transcription and gene expression |
| QA0.8 | Other neurodevelopmental disorders related to pathogenic variants in other specific genes |
| R48.0 | Dyslexia and alexia |
| R62.0 | Delayed milestone in childhood |
| R62.50 | Unspecified lack of expected normal physiological development in childhood |
| R62.51 | Failure to thrive (child) |
| R62.59 | Other lack of expected normal physiological development in childhood |
| R89.8 | Other abnormal findings in specimens from other organs, systems and tissues |
| Z14.1 | Cystic fibrosis carrier |
| Z14.8 | Genetic carrier of other disease |
| Z36.0 | Encounter for antenatal screening for chromosomal anomalies |
| Z37.1 | Single stillbirth |
| Z37.3 | Twins, one liveborn and one stillborn |
| Z37.4 | Twins, both stillborn |
| Z37.60 | Multiple births, unspecified, some liveborn |
| Z37.61 | Triples, some liveborn |
| Z37.62 | Quadruplets, some liveborn |
| Z37.63 | Quintuplets, some liveborn |
| Z37.64 | Sextuplets, some liveborn |
| Z37.69 | Other multiple births, some liveborn |
| Z37.7 | Other multiple births, all stillborn |
| Z87.74 | Personal history of (corrected) congenital malformations of heart and circulatory system |

Description of Services

Genetic counseling is strongly recommended prior to chromosome microarray testing [also called chromosome microarray analysis (CMA)] in order to inform persons being tested about the advantages and limitations of the test as applied to their unique situation. CMA includes array comparative genomic hybridization (aCGH) and/or single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) array (Levy and Wapner, 2018).

Chromosome abnormalities are a well-established cause of congenital anomalies, dysmorphic features, Developmental Delay (DD), Intellectual Disability (ID), and other neurodevelopmental disorders. There are two types of CMA that are used for the detection of chromosomal abnormalities: aCGH and SNP array. These tests analyze multiple sequences of deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) by identifying deletions and duplications across the genome simultaneously. The chromosomal microarray may be targeted in nature, assaying certain regions of the genome known to be associated with a specific syndrome or phenotype and/or may be genome-wide (Shaffer et al., 2007). Currently, most clinical applications of CMA are being investigated for the diagnosis of chromosomal abnormalities in fetuses and newborns, and in children with developmental disorders. For diagnostic prenatal testing, CMA requires an invasive procedure (e.g., amniocentesis or chorionic villous sampling) to collect fetal cells.

SNP array testing and aCGH are used for the detection of genomic copy number variations (CNVs). CNVs are alterations that include deletion and/or duplication of one or more sections of DNA. This method allows the detection of chromosome imbalances that can provide more information than is detected by conventional chromosome analysis [e.g., standard karyotype or fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH)]. The aCGH approach detects CNVs of a DNA sequence in an individual by comparing it to a control. The SNP array approach detects CNVs by using DNA probes that are specific to a single base pair site in the genome. The copy number is quantified by either hybridization of the individual's DNA and control DNA (aCGH) or comparison of the individual's DNA to a control reference DNA sequence (SNP array). Areas of unequal hybridization (aCGH) or differences between an individual and reference DNA (SNP array) signify a DNA alteration, such as large deletions or duplications. CNVs may be benign, with no effect on clinical phenotype, or may be pathogenic and result in a variety of phenotypic abnormalities (Kearney et al., 2011). If a CNV of unknown clinical

significance is detected, a genomic database is used to determine if the abnormality has been previously reported and if it has been associated with a benign or proposed pathogenic condition. The disadvantages of CMA include the detection of variants of unknown clinical significance, false positive results that will require further testing, and the inability to detect certain chromosomal abnormalities such as balanced rearrangements where there is no net gain or loss of the chromosomal material (Fruhman and Van den Veyver, 2010; Bui et al., 2011).

Clinical Evidence

Use in Obstetrics

A single-center, prospective cohort study was conducted by Li et al. (2025) to explore the impact of the use of chromosome microarray analysis (CMA) to evaluate confirmed cases of fetal growth restriction (FGR). A total of 182 individuals with singleton pregnancies and a diagnosis of FGR were enrolled from a medical center in China. The cohort was divided into three categories: isolated FGR, FGR with ultrasound soft marker anomalies, and FGR with structural malformations. Amniocentesis was performed on all participants and both chromosome karyotyping and CMA were completed for each individual. In the group of participants with FGR and structural malformations, the researchers found the detection rates of pathogenic copy number variations (pCNVs) to be significantly higher than those found in the group with FGR and abnormal ultrasound soft markers and those with isolated FGR. (19% vs 1.5% and 2.1%, respectively, $X^2 = 9.33$, $p = 0.005$). Fetuses with multiple system malformations had a significantly higher diagnostic rate of chromosomal variations than fetuses with single system malformations (60% vs 6.3%; $p = 0.028$). Notably, factors such as advanced maternal age, early-onset FGR, and severity of FGR were not found to impact the diagnostic rates of chromosomal variations in this study. Based on these results, the authors propose that the chromosomal variations associated with FGR plus structural anomalies detected via ultrasound may pose significant risk, especially as the number of organ systems involved increases. They recommend standard genetic assessments in cases of FGR occurring after 32 weeks gestation as well as before, and propose that submicroscopic imbalances at Xp22.33 and Xq28 may be related to the pathogenesis of FGR. This, however, will require further investigation. The study was limited by its small sample size from only one facility; the authors encourage additional study of the value of CMA in cases of FGR with ultrasound soft marker abnormalities and continue to advocate for the use of CMA as a primary tool for prenatal diagnostics in older pregnant individuals and those with severe FGR despite the findings of this study.

Nguyen et al. (2025) used single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP)-based CMA to help identify the genetic variations present in fetuses found to have intrauterine growth restriction (IUGR) with malformations identified on ultrasound. This cross-sectional study enrolled 129 individuals aged 18 to 48 whose fetuses were diagnosed with IUGR. Of the 129 cases of IUGR, one malformation only was detected in 83% of the cases, 16% had two malformations, and 1% had three or more malformations. The majority of malformations were related to the cardiovascular system. Of the 75 cases where amniocentesis with karyotyping and SNP array testing were performed, 26 (35%) had genetic abnormalities identified. When comparing the findings of SNP array testing and karyotyping, SNP testing detected more than twice the number of total cases, identifying genetic anomalies that may have otherwise been missed by karyotyping. Although limited by its small size and observational design, this study's outcomes led the authors to infer that CMA technology is more effective in pinpointing genetic causes of IUGR and to recommend that CMA using array SNP should be used in cases of IUGR and congenital malformations.

In a Chinese single-center study, Lu et al. (2024) assessed the clinical utility of CMA performed in cases of pregnancies where the fetus was found to have congenital heart defects (CHD) identified through standard ultrasound anatomy scans, then confirmed via echocardiography. The prevalence of chromosomal abnormalities in these cases was also ascertained; both standard karyotyping and CMA were performed on all cases. A total of 642 cases of fetal CHD were evaluated over a six year timespan. The researchers determined that, in this study, the diagnostic yield of CMA for fetuses with CHD was 15.3% (98/642), which was substantially higher than the diagnostic yield of standard karyotyping at 8.3% (53/642). Overall, the detection rate of clinically meaningful chromosome anomalies was significantly increased in the group with CHD plus extracardiac structural anomalies when compared with the isolated CHD group (33.1% vs 9.9%, $p < 0.0001$.) Based on their findings, the authors recommend CMA as a first-tier test for fetuses found to have CHD, with special consideration given to cases of CHD with additional structural abnormalities or soft markers. The study was limited by the need for individuals to pay for invasive prenatal testing and the refusal of some participants to engage in further testing, leading to selection bias. In addition, the majority of participants declined follow-up whole exome sequencing (WES), which could have led to more complete genetic diagnoses.

Another study assessing the use of SNP-based CMA to identify underlying genetic causes for fetal cardiac ultrasound abnormalities was undertaken by Ye et al. (2024). This study included 2092 pregnant individuals who were divided into groups based on presence or absence of structural abnormalities identified via ultrasound as well as the specific type of abnormality found. Each participant received prenatal invasive diagnostic testing. Similar to Lu et al., above, the authors

found that fetuses with non-isolated CHD had the highest frequency of overall chromosome abnormalities when compared to the isolated CHD group, the non-CHD group, and the control group (42.6% vs 14.1%, 14.9%, and 9.4% respectively). They suggest that SNP-array based CMA is highly effective in boosting the diagnosis of abnormal copy number variations (CNVs) in fetuses with CHD but also emphasize the complexity of the etiologies of CHD, recommending further research that investigates the underlying mechanisms leading to CHD.

To examine diagnostic yields of genomic disorders and syndromic pCNVs associated with pregnancy loss and to approximate the risk of spontaneous abortion (SAB) by comparing the incidence of genomic disorders and syndromic pCNVs between products of conception (POC) and infants, Peng et al. (2023) performed a systematic review and meta-analysis of seven case series where CMA was used to test POC. Based on the meta-analysis of 35,130 results of cytogenomic tests on POC, the estimated diagnostic yields for chromosomal abnormalities and pCNVs were 49.9% ($n = 17,548$) and 2.5% ($n = 957$), respectively. After further refinement of pCNV categories, diagnostic yield was found to be 0.8% ($n = 296$) for genomic disorders and syndromic pCNVs, accounting for approximately 31% of the pCNVs detected overall. Two of the studies were noted to have lower yields of chromosome abnormalities and a higher yield of pCNVs; the authors speculate that this may have been due to the classification of larger terminal and interstitial imbalances, derivative chromosomes, and complex rearrangements into pCNVs. The overall incidence of genomic disorders and syndromic pCNVs in POC was collectively calculated to be 1/150. Newborn incidence was estimated from population genetic studies and a case series of 32,587 children with DD where pCNVs were identified in 2312 individuals (Girirajan et al., 2012). When compared, newborn occurrence of ten genomic disorders and two syndromic pCNVs were significantly lower than that found in POC ($p < 0.05$). An additional five genomic disorders and two syndromic pCNVs were also found to have lower incidence in newborns than in POC, but the differences were statistically insignificant. Altogether, newborn incidence of genomic disorders and syndromic pCNVs was 1/540; substantially less than the corresponding findings of 1/150 in POC ($p < 0.05$). The authors calculated the overall risk of SAB for major genomic disorders and syndromic pCNVs to be 38%; this is significantly lower than the overall risk of SAB for chromosomal abnormalities (94%). They suggest that their results may assist with evidence-based interpretation of genomic disorders and syndromic pCNVs detected via CMA in prenatal diagnosis and provide better understanding of the relationship between genomic disorders and pCNVs and pregnancy loss. Noted limitations include study heterogeneity and gender bias for certain disorders, as well as the potential for impact to newborn incidence from certain genomic anomalies in specific ethnic groups. Additional large, population genetic studies across varying ethnic groups to better refine the evaluation of genomic disorders and syndromic pCNVs in newborns is recommended.

To more accurately assess the risk of chromosome anomalies in fetuses diagnosed with CHD, Wang et al. (2023) performed a meta-analysis of four prospective and 41 retrospective studies including 16,484 fetuses with CHD. A secondary objective was the quantification of the prevalence of various chromosome abnormalities in fetuses with CHD. Results of the meta-analysis revealed a pooled proportion of 23% for overall chromosome abnormalities, 19% for aneuploidies, 2% for 22q11 deletion, and 4% for other CNVs. Of note, the rate of 2% for 22q11 microdeletions was significantly lower than the 4.2-9.6% rate found in other published studies (Hou et al., 2020, Hureauux et al., 2019, Maran et al., 2020). However, many of the incorporated studies did not include comprehensive outcomes and differing detection methods were used across studies, a limitation which may have led to an underestimation of the rate of 22q11 deletion. Pooled proportion of overall chromosome abnormalities in isolated CHD was 16% [95% confidence interval (CI) 13%-20%] and in non-isolated CHD was 37% (95% CI 29%-44%), suggesting that fetuses with CHD along with other structural anomalies are at a higher risk of chromosome abnormalities. In addition, incidence of chromosome abnormalities was higher in septal defects than in conotruncal or other defects [odds ratio (OR) 1.60 and 3.61, respectively]. The authors indicate that their findings add to the evidence demonstrating relationships between CHD subtypes and chromosome abnormalities which will lead to improvements in genetic counseling and clinical decision-making. They recommend CMA for CHD if karyotyping for FISH is normal, especially in cases of non-isolated CHD and septal defects, where the incidence of chromosome abnormalities is higher. The heterogeneity of included studies was high, however, and interpretation processes were not described in most included studies, which limits the application of this meta-analysis. In addition, all but four of the studies were retrospective in design. Further large, high-quality, prospective studies focused on the specific pathogenicity of CNVs and variants of uncertain significance (VUS) in fetuses with diagnoses of CHD are recommended. Publication by Sagi-Dain et al. (2018), previously discussed in evidence, was included in this meta-analysis.

In a systematic review, meta-analysis, and case series, Mastromoro et al. (2022a) studied diagnostic yields of genetic testing in cases where increased nuchal translucency (NT) was identified and compared these with results found in fetuses where cystic hygroma was detected, aiming to identify the differing chromosomal, genomic, and monogenic conditions present in this phenotypic spectrum. In addition, a case series including dicentric fetal findings where karyotyping, CMA and RASopathy panel was performed was gathered. A cohort of 96 fetuses was evaluated. Fetuses with isolated NT of at least 2.5 mm were found to have karyotype anomalies in 22.76% of cases and an incremental detection rate of 2.35% was identified when CMA was used. Those fetuses having isolated NT ≥ 3 mm resulted in an

aneuploidy in 14.36% of cases and an incremental detection rate of 3.89% with CMA. When isolated NT was ≥ 3.5 mm, diagnostic yield of the karyotype was 34.35% with an incremental detection rate for CMA of 4.1%. In this group, the RASopathy panel yielded an incremental diagnostic rate of 1.44% and exome sequencing yielded a 2.44% incremental detection rate. The most frequent finding across the group was karyotype abnormalities regardless of size of NT. Notably CMA resulted in a substantial diagnostic yield in fetuses where NT was found to be at least 3.5mm. The researchers recommend ongoing research to determine the diagnostic rate of CMA at all levels of increased NT with focus on analysis of monogenic conditions where NT measures between 2.5 and 2.9 mm or 2.5 and 3.4 mm in addition to studies which help define the best diagnostic algorithm which may include exome sequencing. Publication by Egloff et al. (2018), previously discussed in this policy, was included in the systematic review and meta-analysis described above.

Mastromoro et al. (2022b) also performed a systematic review and meta-analysis focused on the incremental diagnostic yield of CMA in isolated cardiovascular abnormalities in fetuses and calculation of specific yield based on each category of heart disease. The end goal was to provide insight for genetic counseling for each subgroup of cardiovascular anomaly. Additionally, a comparison to the existing literature was performed with a group of fetuses ($n = 59$) who were found to have isolated cardiovascular malformations but a normal karyotype. After application of exclusion criteria, 18 articles were included in the analysis. The researchers found that in pooled cardiovascular anomalies, the diagnostic incremental yield of CMA was 5.79%; this is higher than the average for structural abnormalities, which verifies the importance of this type of testing. In conotruncal malformations, detection rate was highest at 15.93% and yields for ventricular septal defects and aberrant right subclavian artery were lowest at 2.64% and 0.66%, respectively. The majority of heart conditions evaluated yielded a detection rate in the range of 4.42% to 6.67%, which did not vary greatly from the overall rate for cardiopathic disease. The highest detection rate (11.28%) was found in tetralogy of Fallot (TOF) which is likely due to the relationship with 22q11.2 deletion syndrome. In the group with cardiac anomalies and normal karyotypes, the diagnostic yield was consistent with the existing literature. The authors assert that CMA used to assess the cause of fetal cardiovascular anomalies in the prenatal setting is a helpful tool; information regarding unique risks associated with each type of cardiac malformation is highly valuable when customizing genetic counseling. Publications by Hureau et al. (2019), Fu et al. (2017), and Shaffer et al. (2012), previously discussed in this policy, were included in this systematic review.

In addition to the studies above, Mastromoro et al. (2022c) performed another systematic review of the literature and meta-analysis, this time focused on examining the diagnostic yield and rates of VUS in a group of fetuses who had undergone non-targeted molecular diagnostic testing including CMA, WES or whole genome sequencing (WGS) related to findings on ultrasound evaluation. The researchers aimed to provide additional insights into the primary molecular testing modalities used in prenatal diagnostics and their use as part of a multidisciplinary evaluation. For CMA, the overall diagnostic yield for mixed anomalies was 5.72%. This included 2.15% for single soft markers (such as transient minor ultrasound findings), 3.44% for multiple soft markers, 3.66% for single structural anomalies and 8.57% for multiple structural anomalies. WES demonstrated a high incremental yield, with diagnostic rate of 19.47% including 27.47% for multiple structural abnormalities. Variability was seen related to the characteristics of participants, class of malformations and number of samples available. VUS found for fetuses with structural abnormalities were 2.86% for CMA and 8.32% for WES. Existing data was not able to be used for meta-analysis in WGS. The authors suggest that for structural anomalies in fetuses, CMA is considered a first-tier test and should be used in conjunction with parental segregation and karyotyping. They recommend considering findings of increased NT, short femur and mild ventriculomegaly to be similar to malformations, separate from other soft markers, and an indication for performing assessment with CMA. They further note that WES presents a very high incremental yield and a substantial VUS rate; as such the use of WES is recommended for selected cases. Further research focused on which findings should truly be considered "soft" markers is recommended in order to further refine testing recommendations. Publications by Song et al. (2020), Xia et al. (2020), Hureau et al. (2019), Egloff et al. (2018), Sagi-Dain et al. (2018), Wang et al. (2018), Peng et al. (2017), Papoulidis et al. (2015) and Shaffer et al. (2012), previously discussed in this policy, were included in this systematic review.

In an attempt to identify possible miscarriage-associated submicroscopic CNVs, target regions of large CNVs, and recognize miscarriage candidate genes, Wang et al. (2020) analyzed 5,180 POC samples by quantitative fluorescent-polymerase chain reaction (QF-PCR)/CNV-sequencing and CMA. Significant submicroscopic CNVs were determined by comparing the frequency of recurrent submicroscopic CNVs between cases and a published control cohort. Genes found within critical regions of miscarriage associated CNVs were prioritized by integrating Residual Variance Intolerance Score and the human gene expression data for identification of possible miscarriage candidate genes. A total of 2,955/5,033 (59.1%) showed clinically significant chromosomal abnormalities. Three areas of recurring CNVs (microdeletions of 22q11.21, 2q37.3 and 9p24.3p24.2) were detected and considered to be associated with miscarriage. Forty-four critical regions of large CNV were noted which included 14 deletions and 30 duplications. A total of 209 genes were identified as possible miscarriage candidate genes.

Geffen et al. (2020) examined the prevalence of pathogenic and likely-pathogenic variants detected by CMA in pregnancies with ultrasound findings of fetal short long bones. The cohort included 66 cases of CMA performed

nationwide with the indication of short, long bones; 6% (n = 4) cases had pathogenic/likely pathogenic results. Chromosome anomaly rates were significantly increased compared to the background risk for CNV in pregnancies with no ultrasound abnormalities (p < 0.001). The authors reported that the yield of CMA in their study was significantly higher for both isolated and non-isolated cases, for cases in which the lowest determined bone length percentile was over the 3rd percentile (below 5th percentile) and for cases diagnosed with short bones after 22 weeks but not after 24 weeks. They concluded that CMA should be offered in pregnancies with a diagnosis of fetal short long bone due to the significantly higher likelihood of CMA yield compared to background risk in pregnancies with no ultrasound findings.

The University of California-San Francisco performed a retrospective study of prenatally diagnosed non-immune hydrops fetalis (NIHF) from 2008-2018. Mardy et al. (2020) reported on 131 cases which revealed 43/44 cases had CMA performed and results were categorized as normal or likely benign. One case had a large, pathogenic duplication. The authors stated that these results demonstrated the low diagnostic utility of CMA for NIHF.

Pasternak et al. (2020) analyzed the diagnostic yield of CMA among pregnancies terminated for fetal malformations detected on ultrasound. CMA was performed for 71 pregnancies using fetal or placental deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA). The authors reported that “findings were abnormal in 17 cases (23.9%), 13 of which were detectable by karyotype. The incremental yield of CMA was 4/71 (5.6%); 1/32 (3.1%) for cases with an isolated anomaly and 3/39 (7.7%) for cases with non-isolated anomalies.”

A systematic review and meta-analysis was performed by Srebniak et al. (2017). In the initial analysis, 10,614 fetal CMA results were reviewed from ten large studies; 1/119 (0.84%) of cases referred for advanced maternal age (AMA) and/or anxiety revealed a clinically significant CNV (95% CI). An analysis of a subset including eight of the initial ten studies (10,314 fetuses) demonstrated CNVs associated with early onset syndromes in 1/270 (0.37%) pregnancies (95% CI). A total of 1/909 (0.11%) revealed late onset diseases, and CNV susceptibility was found in 1/333 (0.3%). By combining the individual risk for CNVs with individual risk for chromosome abnormalities detectable by karyotype, the authors reported an overall risk of greater than 1/180 for a significant cytogenetic abnormality. Because women less than 36 years of age have a higher risk for CNV than for Down syndrome, the authors surmised that all women should be advised of these overall individual risks and not just of individual trisomic risks. Studies by Papoulidis et al. (2015) and Shaffer et al. (2012), previously discussed in this policy, were included in the 2017 Srebniak publication.

In a large cohort study, Maya et al. (2018) evaluated the frequency of penetrance of CNVs in low and high risk prenatal and postnatal samples. The cohort was grouped according to CMA indication with group I including low-risk, prenatal women as the control group; group II including high risk prenatal women with fetuses that had congenital malformations; and group III including post-natal individuals with a variety of genetic based conditions. Within this cohort, 21,594 CMAs were performed and the frequency of high penetrance CNVs was 0.1% in group I, 0.9% in group II, and 2.6% in group III. CNV frequency of moderate penetrance was 0.3%, 0.6%, and 1.2%, respectively, and these differences were statistically significant. The frequency of low-penetrance CNVs was not significantly different among groups: 0.6%, 0.9%, and 1.0%, respectively. The study concluded that high penetrance CNVs may be a factor in heritability of various anomalies, however low penetrance CNVs do not seem to contribute.

Pauta et al. (2017) performed a systemic review of the literature and meta-analysis to determine the utility of CMA by either aCGH or SNP-microarray, when compared to traditional karyotyping in early pregnancy loss. In twenty-three studies, 5520 pregnancy losses up to 20 weeks gestational age were reviewed. CMA provided informative results on 95% of cases compared to 67% with karyotyping, and CMA provided a 2% greater yield of pCNVs. The authors concluded that CMA resulted in diagnostic information in early pregnancy loss in significantly more cases when compared to conventional chromosome analysis.

Clinical Practice Guidelines

American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG)

The 2018 ACMG clinical practice report on genetic testing after CMA for the diagnosis of neurodevelopmental disability and congenital anomalies (Waggoner et al.) states that “chromosomal microarray (CMA) is recommended as the first-tier test in evaluation of individuals with neurodevelopmental disability and congenital anomalies. CMA may not detect balanced cytogenomic abnormalities or uniparental disomy (UPD), and deletion/duplications and regions of homozygosity may require additional testing to clarify the mechanism and inform accurate counseling.”

The ACMG (Cherry et al., 2017) published a practice resource guideline for laboratories addressing diagnostic testing following positive noninvasive prenatal screening (NIPS) which made the following recommendations:

- CMA on CVS or amniocentesis may be used for confirmatory diagnosis for abnormal NIPS results or as a reflex to normal karyotype analysis.

- CMA testing should be utilized for follow-up when small copy number changes are reported as positive on NIPS.
- Testing of POC and/or fetus by karyotype or CMA should be considered on a case basis when prenatal diagnosis is not possible.
- For neonates with abnormal physical findings which are not suggestive of the trisomy suggested by original screening, CMA is recommended.
- CMA is recommended when NIPS sex determination is not concordant with physical examination or other clinical evidence reveals possible disorder of sexual differentiation.

American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG)/Society for Maternal Fetal Medicine (SMFM)

In a 2020 (reaffirmed 2021) Obstetric Care Consensus, ACOG and SMFM address microarray analysis as it relates to the management of stillbirth. Microarray analysis is noted to be the preferred method for evaluating stillbirth as it not only detects aneuploidy but correspondingly detects CNVs that are not measurable by karyotype. Microarray analysis is also more likely to offer a genetic diagnosis due to its success with nonviable tissue, making it particularly valuable in analysis of stillbirths with congenital anomalies or when karyotype outcomes cannot be obtained. The consensus document concludes that incorporating microarray analysis into stillbirth work up results in improvements in test success rates and detection of genetic anomalies compared with conventional testing with karyotype.

In a 2016 Committee Opinion on Microarrays and Next-Generation Sequencing Technology (ACOG, 2016a, reaffirmed 2023), ACOG and SMFM make the following recommendations for the use of chromosomal microarray analysis and newer genetic technologies in prenatal diagnosis:

- Most genetic changes identified by CMA that typically are not identified on standard karyotype are not associated with increasing maternal age; therefore, the use of this test can be considered for all women, regardless of age, who undergo prenatal diagnostic testing.
- Prenatal CMA is recommended for a patient with a fetus with one or more major structural abnormalities identified on ultrasonographic examination and who is undergoing invasive prenatal diagnosis. This test typically can replace the need for fetal karyotype.
- In a patient with a structurally normal fetus who is undergoing invasive prenatal diagnostic testing, either fetal karyotyping or a CMA can be performed.
- CMA of fetal tissue (i.e., amniotic fluid, placenta, or POC) is recommended in the evaluation of intrauterine fetal death or stillbirth when further cytogenetic analysis is desired because of the test's increased likelihood of obtaining results and improved detection of causative abnormalities.
- Comprehensive patient pretest and posttest genetic counseling from an obstetrician–gynecologist or other health care provider with genetics expertise regarding the benefits, limitations, and results of chromosomal microarray analysis is essential. CMA should not be ordered without informed consent, which should include discussion of the potential to identify findings of uncertain significance, non-paternity, consanguinity, and adult-onset disease.

In Practice Bulletin number 162 (ACOG, 2016b) which addresses prenatal diagnostic testing for genetic disorders, ACOG and SMFM recommend the following:

- CMA should be made available to any patient choosing to undergo invasive diagnostic testing (based on good/consistent scientific evidence: Level A).
- CMA should be the primary test (replacing conventional karyotype) for patients undergoing prenatal diagnosis for the indication of a fetal structural abnormality detected by ultrasound (based on good/consistent scientific evidence: Level A).
- Chromosomal microarray analysis may be used to confirm an abnormal FISH test (based on limited or inconsistent scientific evidence: Level B).

Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine (SMFM)

SMFM Consult Series Number 52 (Martins et al., 2020): Diagnosis and management of FGR recommends:

- Pregnant women should be offered fetal diagnostic testing, including CMA, when FGR is detected and a fetal malformation, polyhydramnios, or both are present, regardless of gestational age.
- Pregnant women should be offered prenatal diagnosis testing with CMA when unexplained isolated FGR is diagnosed < 32 weeks of gestation.

In an SMFM Consult Series publication (2016) on the use of CMA for prenatal diagnosis, SMFM makes the following recommendations:

- CMA should be offered when genetic analysis is performed in cases with fetal structural anomalies and/or stillbirth and replaces the need for fetal karyotype in these cases (GRADE 1A).

- Providers should discuss the benefits and limitations of CMA and conventional karyotype with patients who are considering amniocentesis and chorionic villus sampling (CVS) and that both options be available to women who choose to undergo diagnostic testing (GRADE 1B).
- The use of CMA is not recommended as a first-line test to evaluate first trimester pregnancy losses due to limited data (GRADE 1C).
- Pre- and post-test counseling should be performed by trained genetic counselors, geneticists, or other providers with expertise in the complexities of interpreting CMA results (Best practice).

Society of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists of Canada (SOGC)

In guideline number 442, the SOGC addressed the use of CMA in their recommendations regarding screening, diagnosis, and management of FGR in singleton pregnancies (Kingdom et al., 2023). The SOGC indicates that genetic consultation and amniocentesis with CMA of fetal DNA and molecular analysis for congenital infections should be offered to pregnant individuals with suspected early-onset FGR, especially if there is evidence of structural abnormalities, polyhydramnios, or multiple soft markers, when there is no indication of a placental basis for FGR. (Strong recommendation, high quality of evidence)

Society of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists of Canada (SOGC)/Canadian College of Medical Geneticists (CCMG)

A Joint Clinical Practice Guideline of the SOGC and CCMG recommended offering CMA in cases of multiple congenital anomalies revealed on ultrasound (II-1A) or fetal MRI. In addition, CMA was also recommended when single congenital defects in conjunction with other findings (e.g., IUGR, oligohydramnios) are detected. Prenatal CMA should be considered for certain malformations that have a high association with abnormal results. CMA is not recommended for pregnancies that are at low risk for a structural anomaly (Audibert et al., 2017).

An SOGC/CCMG Practice Guideline for the use of CMA for prenatal diagnosis and assessment of fetal loss in Canada (Armour et al., 2018) recommends the following:

- CMA may be offered following normal aneuploidy screen results when multiple fetal malformations are detected (II-1A) or NT \geq 3.5MM (II-2B).
- Genetic counseling should be provided to obtain informed consent; parental decisions for reporting of incidental findings (II-2A); and for post-test results reporting counseling (III-A).
- CMA resolution should be similar to postnatal CMA panels for the detection of small pathogenic variants.
- VUS smaller than 500 Kb deletion or 1 Mb duplication should not be reported in prenatal setting.
- VUS above such cut-offs should only be reported if there is significant evidence that deletion or duplication or the region may be pathogenic (III-B).
- Secondary findings associated with significant childhood onset conditions should be reported; variants associated with adult-onset conditions should only be reported if previously requested by parents or if disclosure could prevent harm to family members (III-A).

Use in Pediatrics

In 2023, Hayes published a Clinical Utility Evaluation addressing the use of genetic testing in individuals with clinically diagnosed autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and their first-degree relatives. The report addresses several types of genetic testing that may be used for the diagnosis of ASD including CMA, which is the most common first-tier test used to help diagnose ASD (Hyman et al., 2020). In terms of clinical utility, Hayes found limited evidence from low-quality studies suggesting that genetic testing in individuals diagnosed with ASD may assist with medical management in some individuals, but no studies were found that included outcomes based on long-term follow-up or compared the outcomes of individuals who underwent genetic testing with a group of affected individuals who did not have the testing. Hayes concluded that the existing evidence is therefore insufficient to support clinical utility for use in those affected with ASD and their relatives (Hayes 2023; updated 2024).

Landis et al. (2023) evaluated the association of CHD diagnoses with abnormal CMA findings in a study of 1363 children with CHD from nine pediatric cardiac centers in the U.S. Each participant had both CHD (per abnormal findings on echocardiogram) and at least one abnormal clinical finding on CMA. Cardiac phenotypes were described in detail and analytically grouped according to their relationship with abnormal CMA results. Overall, 28% of the 1363 participants had genomic disorders with a well-known CHD association, 67% had clinical results indicating CNVs with rare/no prior CHD association, and 5% had areas of homozygosity without evidence of CNV. Both expected categories of CHD in genomic disorders, as well as those that were unexpected, were identified. Of the CNVs with rare/no prior association with CHD, submicroscopic CNVs included more complex types of CHD when compared with large CNVs. Through their analysis, the researchers identified potential new cardiogenomic associations, expanded CHD phenotypes in genomic disorders,

detected new candidate genes, and stratified phenotypes associated with CHD based on gene/CNV size. They conclude that these findings may help to fill current gaps in the interpretation of CMA results for individuals with CHD, which may in turn lead to better clinical management.

In a comprehensive 2022 systematic review and meta-analysis, Sheidley et al. evaluated the diagnostic yield of genetic tests commonly used for individuals with epilepsy as well as other, non-yield outcomes, including such items as changes in treatment or management, recurrence risk determination, prognostic information, and genetic counseling. One hundred fifty-four articles describing diagnostic yield for 39,094 individuals were included. Of those, 43 were used for assessment of outcomes other than yield. Overall, the diagnostic yield for all test types was 17%. Genome sequencing had the highest yield at 48%, followed by exome sequencing at 24%. Multigene panels had a yield of 19% and CMA had the lowest yield at 9%. Phenotypic factors that were significantly associated with increased yield included presence of developmental and epileptic encephalopathy and/or the presence of comorbid neurodevelopmental conditions. The authors call out the need for prospective evaluation of clinical utility of commonly used genetic tests for epilepsy to help to standardize reporting of clinical characteristics and support clinician decision making. Publications by Coppola et al. (2019), Berg et al. (2017) and d'Orsi et al. (2017), previously discussed in this policy, were included in the Sheidley (2022) systematic review and meta-analysis.

Miclea et al. (2022) sought to identify clinically relevant CNVs in children with a diagnosis of global developmental delay (GDD)/intellectual disability (ID) using CMA. The study included 189 Romanian children (3-18 years of age) who had been diagnosed with GDD/ID. The average age of participants was 11.17 years. A complete clinical evaluation was performed which included examination for dysmorphic and internal malformations, neuropsychological and psychiatric assessment, metabolic evaluation, standard karyotyping, and genomic testing using CMA. Individuals determined to have trisomy 21 as confirmed by karyotype were excluded. Pathogenic findings, [which included pCNVs and uniparental disomy (UPD)] and VUS were found in 28% of participants. pCNVs/UPD were seen in 18.5% of the participants. UPD for chromosome 15 was found in two individuals, one of whom showed a clinical phenotype consistent with Prader-Willi syndrome and the other with clinical phenotype of Angelman syndrome. Recurrent CNVs were observed in 60% of participants. The authors concluded the high percentage of pathogenic structural variations found via CMA in children with GDD/ID lends support to the use of CMA in individuals with a non-specific phenotype.

Harris et al. (2020) reported on the diagnostic yield of genetic testing in toddlers with a Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition, diagnosis of ASD. A retrospective chart review including 500 toddlers with ASD was conducted; genetic testing results were divided into normal and negative results, VUS, and pathogenic. In total, 59.8% (n = 299) of subjects completed genetic testing and 12.0% (n = 36) had pathogenic results. No significant differences in Bayley Scales of Infant Development cognitive (p = .112), language (p = .898), or motor scores (p = .488) among toddlers with negative or normal findings compared to VUS versus pathogenic findings were reported. Medical recommendations following the genetic findings were made in 72.2% of those with pathogenic results. The authors concluded that these results confirm the importance of genetic testing in toddlers diagnosed with ASD due to the 12% yield and lack of phenotypic differences between subjects with and without pathogenic findings.

Jang et al. (2019) studied the impact of CMA analysis on clinical management by conducting a multicenter, prospective study in Korea on individuals with DD/ID, ASD, and multiple congenital anomalies (MCA). G-banding karyotype and CMA were both performed simultaneously on 617 participants in an attempt to determine if results affect treatment recommendations. 122/617 (19.8%) had abnormal CMA findings; 65 were pathogenic and 57 were variants of possible significance. Thirty-five known disorders were detected with the most common being 16p11.2 microdeletion, followed by 15q11-q13 duplication, Down syndrome, and Duchenne muscular dystrophy. VUS were seen in 51 (8.3%) of participants. CMA test results influenced clinical management decisions including imaging studies, referrals to specialists, and laboratory testing recommendations in 71.4% of those tested. Clinical management was also impacted in 86%, 83.3%, 75% and 67.3% of participants that had variants of possible significance, pathogenic variants, VUS, and benign variants, respectively. More than 1,500 new medical management protocols were recommended based on the CMA results with an average of 2.9 new recommendations per individual. The final conclusion by the authors was that CMA as a first-tier test improves diagnostic yields and the overall quality of clinical management in individuals with DD/ID, ASD, and MCA.

A pediatric CMA study was performed to identify recurrent pCNVs in children with idiopathic short stature (Homma et al., 2018). The study researchers selected 229 children that did not have a well-recognized syndrome but had short stature and dysmorphic features, DD, and/or ID. CMA was used for evaluation of the participants and the study targeted pCNVs that were associated with short stature. In the 229 participants, 32 pathogenic or likely pathogenic CNVs were identified. The study also reviewed the literature and selected additional cohorts of individuals with short stature to create a larger cohort of 671 participants. In total, CNVs were identified in 87 (13%) of participants with seven recurrent CNVs (22q11.21, 15q26, 1p36.33, Xp22.33, 17p13.3, 1q21.1, 2q24.2) that were identified as responsible for 40% of all genomic imbalances

in this population. The authors recommend additional investigation of the role of novel candidate genes identified by CMA testing that may be involved in growth disorders.

Sys et al. (2018) evaluated CMA as a diagnostic tool for individuals with ASD with a variety of clinical characteristics. The researchers stated that this tool may be restricted to individuals that have specific characteristics or comorbidities. A retrospective review of the files of 311 children diagnosed with ASD was performed and the following clinical characteristics were captured: ID, major congenital anomalies, epilepsy, prematurity, familial history of ASD, electroencephalography, and brain MRI findings. Next, the results of any genetic analyses were evaluated in conjunction with the clinical data. CMA had been performed in 79 individuals and was normal in 55 (group 1) and abnormal in 23 (group 2). There was no significant difference between the two groups regarding the presence of clinical characteristics. Additionally, the researchers determined that the diagnostic yield of CMA (8.9%) was higher than karyotyping (1.6%) and other genetic tests (3.8%).

Hussein et al. (2018) studied the role of CMA for diagnosis of CHDs in neonates. The researchers investigated 94 subjects with CHDs that were associated with DD or other malformations. They used a high-density array-CGH 2 x 400K for 41 subjects and CGH/SNP microarray 2 x 400k for 53 subjects. In certain cases, confirmation was performed using Fluorescent in situ hybridization (FISH) or qPCR. In 21 of 94 individuals (22%) using both conventional cytogenetics and CMA, chromosomal abnormalities such as trisomy 18, 13, 21, and microdeletions: del22q11.2, del7q11.23, del18 (p11.32; p11.21), tetrasomy 18p, trisomy 9p, del11q24-q25, add 15p, add (18) (q21.3), and der 9, 15 (q34.2; q11.2) were identified. In 15 of 73 cases (20.5%), cryptic chromosomal abnormalities and pathogenic variants were detected. CMA was able to detect loss of heterozygosity in chromosomes in 10 of 25 individuals. Cryptic chromosomal anomalies and pathogenic variants were detected in 15/73 (20.5%) cases.

Fan et al. (2018) performed a retrospective review of CMA results from a Chinese population with DD/ID in order to determine genotypes, diagnostic yields, and phenotypes among a diverse group with varying manifestations. A total of 710 individuals were evaluated and 247 CNVs were reported in 201 subjects (28%). The authors reported that the diagnostic yields were significantly higher with co-existing CHDs (55%), facial dysmorphism (39%), microcephaly (34%), or hypotonia (35%). Co-existing skeletal malformations (26%), brain malformations (24%) or epilepsy (24%) did not affect the diagnostic yield. ID severity correlated positively with CMA (mild: 19%, moderate: 22, severe: 33%); however, the correlation was not statistically significant ($p = 0.08$). Coexistence of CHD was the strongest phenotype associated with CNV (OR 5.52). The presence of facial dysmorphism with CHD increased the diagnostic yield to 62% (OR 10.81). The results showed that diagnostic yields vary based on phenotypic presentation. CHD, microcephaly, hypotonia and facial dysmorphism co-existing with DD/ID are associated with an increased likelihood of CNVs.

McCormack et al. (2016) examined the utility of aCGH to replace karyotype in 5369 pre- and post-natal subjects with an unexplained phenotype. In this cohort, 28% of those tested had a deletion or duplication. Ninety-seven percent of cases with a CNV that was less than five kilobases in size would not have been detected by routine chromosome analysis. Eight hundred forty-two (15.7%) had a VUS. About 5% of the cohort met the criteria for a known syndrome. Using microarray as a primary analysis tool significantly increased the detection of CNV abnormalities, with one syndromic case identified per 20 referrals.

Clinical Practice Guidelines

American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP)

The AAP National Coordinating Center for Epilepsy (2022) states that “the genetic tests most commonly used in the evaluation of children with epilepsy include CMA, epilepsy gene panels and whole-exome sequencing.” Individual test type have specific benefits and limitations, and the utility of various tests may be different depending on individual circumstances. Decisions regarding testing may be influenced by factors including symptoms, turn-around time, insurance coverage, and cost. Due to the complex nature of genetic testing and potential implications it may have (e.g., impact on eligibility for life insurance, reproductive decisions, medical decisions), incorporating genetic counseling is encouraged.

A clinical report addressing the identification of infants/children with DD (Lipkin & Macias, 2020) recommends that children with suspected GDD or ID have genetic testing including chromosomal microarray and fragile-X testing. In addition, the preliminary genetic work-up of children with suspected ASD should also include chromosomal microarray and fragile-X testing.

In 2020, the AAP (Hyman et al.) published a clinical report addressing the identification, evaluation, and management of children with ASD. The report indicates that in the last ten years the development of CMA and other technologies has led to evolution and understanding of the multifaceted genetics of ASD. The identification of genetic etiology provides clinicians additional evidence for families about the prognosis and recurring risk which contributes to identifying, treating,

and avoiding co-occurring medical situations. Additionally, the genetic etiology identification permits clinicians the information to guide patients and families to disorder specific resources and supports and avoid the collection of unnecessary tests. CMA recognizes CNVs, therefore, it is the suggested testing if the etiology for developmental disability is unknown. The development of CMA and next-generation sequencing have given rise to identification of large-effect rare variants, including CNVs, that may be related to ASD.

In a 2014 clinical report, the Committee on Genetics for AAP stated that CMA is designated as a first-line test and replaces the standard karyotype and FISH subtelomere tests for the child with ID of unknown etiology. The authors recommend that CMA should be performed in all children with ID or GDDs (Moeschler and Shevell, 2014, reaffirmed 2019).

American Academy of Neurology (AAN)

In a model coverage policy for chromosomal microarray analysis for ID, the AAN recommends the following inclusion criteria for microarray testing:

- In children with DD/ID or ASD according to accepted Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders-IV criteria.
- If warranted by the clinical situation, biochemical testing for metabolic diseases has been performed and is negative.
- Targeted genetic testing, (for example: FMR1 gene analysis for Fragile X), if or when indicated by the clinical and family history, is negative.
- The results for the testing have the potential to impact the clinical management of the patient.
- Face-to-face genetic counseling with an appropriately trained and experienced healthcare professional has been provided to the patient (or legal guardian(s) if a minor child). Patient or legal guardians have given their consent for testing. Cognitively competent adolescent patients have given their assent for testing as well.

The AAN model coverage policy states that the following circumstances limit the value of microarray testing:

- Absence of an appropriate and informed consent from the patient, a parent (in case of minors) or a guardian (in persons with cognitive impairment) is necessary prior to testing.
- Inadequacy of knowledge about the test and the actions required to address the results of the test.
- A lack of clear value for chromosomal microarray analysis in all instances other than those delineated above. Under these circumstances the test is considered investigational.
- Chromosomal microarray analysis would not be considered medically necessary when a diagnosis of a disorder or syndrome is readily apparent based on clinical evaluation alone.

The AAN model coverage policy further indicates the presence of major and minor congenital malformations and dysmorphic features should be considered evidence that microarray testing will be more likely to yield a diagnosis. However, dysmorphic, and syndromic features are not required for testing (AAN, 2015).

American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (AACAP)

In a 2020 Practice Parameter, the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (Siegel et al.) presented a diagnostic genetic testing algorithm for youth with developmental disorders including ASD, ID, or GDD, indicating that if there is a recognized genetic syndrome (e.g., Fragile X syndrome, PTEN hamartoma syndrome, Rett syndrome, tuberous sclerosis, Prader-Willi syndrome, Angelman syndrome, Down syndrome) after genetic counseling, specific and targeted testing for that syndrome is recommended first. If this testing does not yield a diagnosis, CMA and Fragile X testing are indicated. If findings remain unrevealing, additional testing including WES, karyotyping or mitochondrial DNA testing may be considered. The group states that “microarray is currently the genetic test with the highest diagnostic yield in children with unexplained ID/IDD, with an abnormal result reported in 7.8% of subjects with GDD/ID/IDD and in 10.6% of those with syndromic features, on average.”

American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG)

In a 2021 revision to the technical standard of the ACMG, Shao et al. state that chromosomal microarray technologies are well accepted and used in evaluation of both constitutional and neoplastic disorders. For chromosomal imbalances related to multiple congenital anomalies, autism, and/or ID, CMA (including both array CGH) and SNP array) is considered the first-tier test. In the case of individuals where ultrasound has identified major fetal structural abnormalities and invasive prenatal diagnostic testing will be performed, CMA is the recommended test. This is also true for further workup of intrauterine fetal demise or stillbirth when parents/providers make the decision to pursue potential genetic diagnosis.

The 2013 ACMG guideline for identifying the etiology of ASD lists chromosomal microarray testing (array-CGH or SNP array) as a first-tier diagnostic test for the evaluation of ASDs. According to the ACMG, many recognizable syndromes

(i.e., Fragile X syndrome, Rett syndrome) have a firmly documented association with ASDs. For these conditions, further investigation into the etiology of the ASD is unnecessary (Schaefer & Mendelsohn, 2013).

The ACMG published a resource that focused on when CGH should be used. The specific recommendations listed in the 2010 guideline are as follows (Manning and Hudgins, 2010, reaffirmed 2020):

- Cytogenetic microarray (CMA) testing for CNV is recommended as a first-line test in the initial postnatal evaluation of individuals with the following:
 - Multiple anomalies not specific to a well-delineated genetic syndrome
 - Apparently non-syndromic DD/ID
 - ASD
- Further determination of the use of CMA testing for the evaluation of the child with growth retardation, speech delay, and other less-well studied indications is recommended, particularly via prospective studies and aftermarket analysis.
- Appropriate follow up is recommended in cases of chromosome imbalance identified by CMA, to include cytogenetic/FISH studies of the patient, parental evaluation, and clinical genetic evaluation and counseling.

This guideline did not address testing for prenatal gene mutations. These guidelines also do not specify what type of microarray platform should be used (i.e., microarray based CGH versus SNP microarray), although they do state that any ordering physician should be aware of the information generated and the limitations of the particular test performed.

ACMG Practice Guidelines addressing the interpretation and reporting of microarray results in postnatal clinical settings were published in 2011 and include recommendations regarding how to define the various types of CNVs (pathogenic versus benign versus uncertain significance), the confirmation of abnormal results, the information that should be included in laboratory reports, and how to handle unanticipated or ambiguous results. Of importance, it is noted that if a CNV is identified that has unknown clinical significance, the parents of the proband should be tested to determine if the CNV is de novo or inherited, which may allow the clinician to determine the clinical significance of the result (Kearney et al., 2011).

Canadian College of Medical Genetics (CCMG)

In a 2023 position statement, the CCMG recommends CMA as a first-tier test for individuals with GDD, ID or ASD. Fragile X testing is advised when family history or clinical symptoms are suggestive of this disorder. Further recommendations include the use of WES or comprehensive gene panels as second-tier testing for individuals with GDD/ID. The CCMG does not recommend genetic tests for individuals with neurodevelopmental disorders when GDD, ID or ASD is not present, unless the phenotype is suggestive of a syndromic etiology or an inherited metabolic disease (Carter et al., 2023).

International Standards for Cytogenomic Array (ISCA) Consortium

The ISCA reviewed the literature and meta-analyses on the clinical indications and diagnostic utility of chromosomal microarray testing and issued a consensus statement recommending that CMA be the first-tier clinical diagnostic test for individuals with developmental disabilities or congenital anomalies, followed by specific gene testing for the suspected condition(s) if CMA results are negative (Miller et al., 2010).

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

This section is to be used for informational purposes only. FDA approval alone is not a basis for coverage.

Genetic tests are regulated under the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA) of 1988. Refer to the following website for more information:

<http://www.fda.gov/MedicalDevices/DeviceRegulationandGuidance/IVDRegulatoryAssistance/ucm124105.htm>.

(Accessed February 20, 2025)

Refer to the following website for a list of nucleic acid-based tests/platforms that have been cleared or approved by the FDA's Center for Devices and Radiological Health: <https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/in-vitro-diagnostics/nucleic-acid-based-tests>. (Accessed February 20, 2025)

References

American Academy of Neurology (AAN). Model Coverage Policy. Chromosomal microarray analysis for intellectual disabilities. March 2015. Available at: <https://www.aan.com/siteassets/home-page/tools-and-resources/practicing->

[neurologist--administrators/billing-and-coding/model-coverage-policies/15microarrayanalysismodel_tr.pdf](#). Accessed February 20, 2025.

American Academy of Pediatrics. National Coordinating Center for Epilepsy. Genetic Testing Overview. Updated 2022. Available at: <https://www.aap.org/en/patient-care/epilepsy/diagnosing-pediatric-epilepsy/genetic-testing-for-epilepsy/>. Accessed February 20, 2025.

American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG). ACOG Committee Opinion #682. Microarrays and next-generation sequencing technology: the use of advanced genetic diagnostic tools in obstetrics and gynecology. December 2016a. Reaffirmed 2023. Available at: <https://www.acog.org/clinical/clinical-guidance/committee-opinion/articles/2016/12/microarrays-and-next-generation-sequencing-technology-the-use-of-advanced-genetic-diagnostic-tools-in-obstetrics-and-gynecology>. Accessed February 20, 2025.

American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG). ACOG Practice Bulletin #162. Prenatal diagnostic testing for genetic disorders. May 2016b. Available at: <https://www.acog.org/clinical/clinical-guidance/practice-bulletin/articles/2016/05/prenatal-diagnostic-testing-for-genetic-disorders>. Accessed February 20, 2025.

American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG); Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine (SMFM). Obstetric care consensus #10: management of stillbirth: (Replaces Practice Bulletin Number 102, March 2009). Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2020 Mar;222(3):B2-B20. Reaffirmed 2021. Available at: <https://www.acog.org/clinical/clinical-guidance/obstetric-care-consensus/articles/2020/03/management-of-stillbirth>. Accessed February 20, 2025.

Armour CM, Dougan SD, Brock JA, et al.; On-Behalf-Of the Canadian College of Medical Geneticists. Practice guideline: joint CCMG-SOGC recommendations for the use of chromosomal microarray analysis for prenatal diagnosis and assessment of fetal loss in Canada. J Med Genet. 2018 Apr;55(4):215-221.

Audibert F, De Bie I, Johnson JA, et al. No. 348-Joint SOGC-CCMG guideline: update on prenatal screening for fetal aneuploidy, fetal anomalies, and adverse pregnancy outcomes. J Obstet Gynaecol Can. 2017 Sep;39(9):805-817.

Berg AT, Coryell J, Saneto RP, et al. Early-life epilepsies and the emerging role of genetic testing. JAMA Pediatr. 2017 Sep 1;171(9):863-871.

Bui TH, Vetro A, Zuffardi O, et al. Current controversies in prenatal diagnosis 3: is conventional chromosome analysis necessary in the post-array CGH era? Prenat Diagn. 2011 Mar;31(3):235-43.

Carter MT, Srour M, Au PB, et al.; Canadian College of Medical Geneticists. Genetic and metabolic investigations for neurodevelopmental disorders: position statement of the Canadian College of Medical Geneticists (CCMG). J Med Genet. 2023 Feb 23:jmg-2022-108962.

Cherry A, Akkari Y, Barr K, et al. Diagnostic cytogenetic testing following positive noninvasive prenatal screening results: a clinical laboratory practice resource of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG). Genet Med. 2017; 19(8): 845-850.

Coppola A, Cellini E, Stamberger H, et al. Diagnostic implications of genetic copy number variation in epilepsy plus. Epilepsia. 2019 Apr; 60(4):689-706.

d'Orsi G, Martino T, Palumbo O, et al. The epilepsy phenotype in adult patients with intellectual disability and pathogenic copy number variants. Seizure. 2017 Dec;53:86-93.

Egloff M, Hervé B, Quibel T, et al. Diagnostic yield of chromosomal microarray analysis in fetuses with isolated increased nuchal translucency: a French multicenter study. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. 2018 Dec;52(6):715-721.

Fan Y, Wu Y, Wang L, et al. Chromosomal microarray analysis in developmental delay and intellectual disability with comorbid conditions. BMC Med Genomics. 2018 May 24;11(1):49.

Fruhman G, Van den Veyver IB. Applications of array comparative genomic hybridization in obstetrics. Obstet Gynecol Clin North Am. 2010 Mar;37(1):71-85.

Fu F, Deng Q, Lei TY, et al. Clinical application of SNP array analysis in fetuses with ventricular septal defects and normal karyotypes. Arch Gynecol Obstet. 2017 Nov;296(5):929-940.

Geffen K, Singer A, Maya I, et al. Chromosomal microarray should be performed for cases of fetal short, long bones detected prenatally. Arch Gynecol and Obstet. 2020 Aug; 303: 85-92.

Girirajan S, Rosenfeld JA, Coe BP, et al. Phenotypic heterogeneity of genomic disorders and rare copy-number variants. N Engl J Med. 2012 Oct 4;367(14):1321-31.

Harris HK, Sideridis GD, Barbaresi WJ, et al. Pathogenic yield of genetic testing in autism spectrum disorder. Pediatrics. 2020 Oct;146(4):e20193211.

Hayes, Inc. Clinical Utility Evaluation. Genetic Testing for Patients With Clinically Diagnosed Autism Spectrum Disorder. Hayes, Inc.; September 15, 2023. Updated September 15, 2024.

Homma TK, Krepischi ACV, Furuya TK, et al. Recurrent copy number variants associated with syndromic short stature of unknown cause. *Horm Res Paediatr*. 2018;89(1):13-21.

Hou HT, Chen HX, Wang XL, et al. Genetic characterisation of 22q11.2 variations and prevalence in patients with congenital heart disease. *Arch Dis Child*. 2020 Apr;105(4):367-374.

Hureaux M, Guterman S, Herve B, et al. Chromosomal microarray analysis in fetuses with an isolated congenital heart defect: A retrospective, nationwide, multicenter study in France. *Prenat Diagn*. 2019 May; 39(6): 464-470.

Hussein IR, Bader RS, Chaudhary AG, et al. Identification of De Novo and rare inherited copy number variants in children with syndromic congenital heart defects. *Pediatr Cardiol*. 2018 Jun;39(5):924-940.

Hyman SL, Levy SE, Myers SM; Council on Children with Disabilities, Section on Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics. Identification, evaluation, and management of children with autism spectrum disorder. *Pediatrics*. 2020 Jan;145(1):e20193447.

Jang W, Kim Y, Han E, et al. Chromosomal microarray analysis as a first-tier clinical diagnostic test in patients with developmental delay/intellectual disability, autism spectrum disorders, and multiple congenital anomalies: a prospective multicenter study in Korea. *Ann Lab Med*. 2019 May; 39(3):299-310.

Kearney HM, Thorland EC, Brown KK, et al.; Working Group of the American College of Medical Genetics Laboratory Quality Assurance Committee. American College of Medical Genetics standards and guidelines for interpretation and reporting of postnatal constitutional copy number variants. *Genet Med*. 2011;13(7):680-685.

Kingdom J, Ashwal E, Lausman A, et al. Guideline No. 442: Fetal Growth Restriction: Screening, Diagnosis, and Management in Singleton Pregnancies. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can*. 2023 Oct;45(10):102154.

Landis BJ, Helvaty LR, Geddes GC, et al. A multicenter analysis of abnormal chromosomal microarray findings in congenital heart disease. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2023 Sep 19;12(18):e029340.

Levy B, Wapner R. Prenatal diagnosis by chromosomal microarray analysis. *Fertil Steril*. 2018 Feb; 109(2): 201-212.

Li P, Wu W, Zhang X, et al. The assessing of clinical relevance of chromosomal microarray analysis in the prenatal diagnosis of fetal growth restriction. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2025 Feb 24;25(1):198.

Lipkin PH, Macias MM. Promoting optimal development: identifying infants and young children with developmental disorders through developmental surveillance and screening. *Pediatrics*. 2020 Jan;145(1):e20193449.

Lu Q, Luo L, Zeng B, et al. Prenatal chromosomal microarray analysis in a large Chinese cohort of fetuses with congenital heart defects: a single center study. *Orphanet J Rare Dis*. 2024 Aug 22;19(1):307.

Manning M, Hudgins L; American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG) Professional Practice and Guidelines Committee. Addendum: Array-based technology and recommendations for utilization in medical genetics practice for detection of chromosomal abnormalities. *Genet Med*. 2020 Dec;22(12):2126.

Maran S, Faten SA, Lim SE, et al. Screening of 22q11.2DS using multiplex ligation-dependent probe amplification as an alternative diagnostic method. *Biomed Res Int*. 2020 Sep 28;2020:6945730.

Mardy A, Rangwala N, Hernandez-Cruz Y, et al. Utility of chromosomal microarray for diagnosis in cases on non-immune hydrops fetalis. *Prenatal Diagnosis* 2020; 40:492-496.

Martins J, Biggio J, Abuhamad A. Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine (SMFM) Consult Series #52: Diagnosis and management of fetal growth restriction. 2020 Oct. Available at <https://publications.smfm.org/publications/289-society-for-maternal-fetal-medicine-consult-series-52/>. Accessed February 20, 2025.

Mastromoro G, Guadagnolo D, Khaleghi Hashemian N, et al. A pain in the neck: lessons learnt from genetic testing in fetuses detected with nuchal fluid collections, increased nuchal translucency versus cystic hygroma-systematic review of the literature, meta-analysis and case series. *Diagnostics (Basel)*. 2022a Dec 23;13(1):48.

Mastromoro G, Guadagnolo D, Khaleghi Hashemian N, et al. Molecular approaches in fetal malformations, dynamic anomalies and soft markers: diagnostic rates and challenges-systematic review of the literature and meta-analysis. *Diagnostics (Basel)*. 2022c Feb 23;12(3):575.

Mastromoro G, Khaleghi Hashemian N, Guadagnolo D, et al. Chromosomal microarray analysis in fetuses detected with isolated cardiovascular malformation: a multicenter study, systematic review of the literature and meta-analysis. *Diagnostics (Basel)*. 2022b May 27;12(6):1328.

Maya I, Sharony R, Yacobson S, et al. When genotype is not predictive of phenotype: implications for genetic counseling based on 21,594 chromosomal microarray analysis examinations. *Genet Med*. 2018 Jan;20(1):128-131.

McCormack A, Claxton K, Ashton F, et al. Microarray testing in clinical diagnosis: an analysis of 5,300 New Zealand patients. *Molecular Cytogenetics*. 2016;9:29.

MedlinePlus [Internet]. Bethesda, MD: National Library of Medicine (US); updated 2020 Jun 24. Intellectual Disability; reviewed April 2023. Available at: <https://medlineplus.gov/ency/article/001523.htm>. Accessed February 20, 2025.

Miclea D, Osan S, Bucerzan S, et al. Copy number variation analysis in 189 Romanian patients with global developmental delay/intellectual disability. *Ital J Pediatr*. 2022 Dec 30;48(1):207.

Miller DT, Adam MP, Aradhya S, et al. Consensus statement: chromosomal microarray is a first-tier clinical diagnostic test for individuals with developmental disabilities or congenital anomalies. *Am J Hum Genet*. 2010;86(5):749-764.

Moeschler JB, Shevell M; AAP Committee on Genetics. Comprehensive evaluation of the child with intellectual disability or global developmental delays. *Pediatrics*. 2014 Sep;134(3):e903-18. Reaffirmed 2019.

Nguyen PT, Hoang TNL, Tran DC, et al. The yield of using single-nucleotide polymorphism-based chromosomal microarray analysis in diagnosis the genetic etiology of fetal growth restriction. *Clin Ter*. 2025 Jan-Feb;176(1):60-66.

Papoulidis I, Sotiriadis A, Siomou E, et al. Routine use of array comparative genomic hybridization (aCGH) as standard approach for prenatal diagnosis of chromosomal abnormalities. Clinical experience of 1763 prenatal cases. *Prenat Diagn*. 2015 Dec;35(13):1269-77.

Pasternak Y, Daykan Y, Tenne T, et al. The yield of chromosomal microarray analysis among pregnancies terminated due to fetal malformations. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med*. 2020 Jan 23:1-5.

Pauta M, Grande M, Rodriguez-Revenga L, et al. Added value of chromosomal microarray analysis (CMA) over karyotyping in early pregnancy loss - a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2017 Oct 21.

Peng G, Zhou Q, Chai H, et al. Estimation on risk of spontaneous abortions by genomic disorders from a meta-analysis of microarray results on large case series of pregnancy losses. *Mol Genet Genomic Med*. 2023 Aug;11(8):e2181.

Peng R, Yang J, Xie HN, et al. Chromosomal and sub chromosomal anomalies associated to small for gestational age fetuses with no additional structural anomalies. *Prenat Diagn*. 2017 Dec;37(12):1219-1224.

Sagi-Dain L, Maya I, Reches A, et al. Chromosomal microarray analysis results from pregnancies with various ultrasonographic anomalies. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2018 Dec;132(6):1368-1375.

Schaefer GB, Mendelsohn NJ; Professional Practice and Guidelines Committee. Clinical genetics evaluation in identifying the etiology of autism spectrum disorders: 2013 guideline revisions. *Genet Med*. 2013 May;15(5):399-407.

Shaffer LG, Beaudet AL, Brothman AR, et al. Microarray analysis for constitutional cytogenetic abnormalities. *Genet Med*. 2007;9(9):654-662.

Shaffer LG, Rosenfeld JA, Dabell MP, et al. Detection rates of clinically significant genomic alterations by microarray analysis for specific anomalies detected by ultrasound. *Prenat Diagn*. 2012 Oct;32(10):986-95.

Shao L, Akkari Y, Cooley LD et al.; ACMG Laboratory Quality Assurance Committee. Chromosomal microarray analysis, including constitutional and neoplastic disease applications, 2021 revision: a technical standard of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG). *Genet Med*. 2021 Oct;23(10):1818-1829.

Sheidley BR, Malinowski J, Bergner AL, et al. Genetic testing for the epilepsies: A systematic review. *Epilepsia*. 2022 Feb;63(2):375-387.

Siegel M, McGuire K, Veenstra-VanderWeele J, et al.; American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (AACAP) Committee on Quality Issues (CQI); Bellonci C, Hayek M, Keable H, et al. Practice parameter for the assessment and treatment of psychiatric disorders in children and adolescents with intellectual disability (intellectual developmental disorder). *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2020 Apr;59(4):468-496.

Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine (SMFM). Dugoff L, Norton ME, Kuller JA. The use of chromosomal microarray for prenatal diagnosis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2016 Oct;215(4):B2-9.

Song T, Xu Y, Li Y, et al. Detection of submicroscopic chromosomal aberrations by chromosomal microarray analysis for the prenatal diagnosis of central nervous system abnormalities. *J Clin Lab Anal*. 2020 Oct;34(10):e23434.

Srebniak MI, Joosten M, Knapen M, et al. Frequency of submicroscopic chromosome aberrations in pregnancies without increased risk for structural aberrations: a systematic review of literature and meta-analysis. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2017 Sept; 50(51):205-206.

Sys M, van den Bogaert A, Roosens B, et al. Can clinical characteristics be criteria to perform chromosomal microarray analysis in children and adolescents with autism spectrum disorders? *Minerva Pediatr*. 2018 Jun;70(3):225-232.

Talking Glossary of Genetic and Genomic Terms (Syndrome). National Human Genome Research Institute. Updated February 2025. Available at: <https://www.genome.gov/genetics-glossary/Syndrome>. Accessed February 20, 2025.

Waggoner D, Wain K, Dubuc A, et al. Yield of additional genetic testing after chromosomal microarray for diagnosis of neurodevelopmental disability and congenital anomalies: a clinical practice resource of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG). *Genetics in Medicine*. 2018 Oct;20(10):1105-1113.

Wang H, Lin X, Lyu G, He S, Dong B, Yang Y. Chromosomal abnormalities in fetuses with congenital heart disease: a meta-analysis. *Arch Gynecol Obstet*. 2023 Sep;308(3):797-811.

Wang Y, Cao L, Liang D, et al. Prenatal chromosomal microarray analysis in fetuses with congenital heart disease: a prospective cohort study. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2018 Feb;218(2):244.e1-244.e17.

Wang Y, Li Y, Chen Y, et al. Systematic analysis of copy-number variations associated with early pregnancy loss. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2020 Jan;55(1):96-104.

Xia M, Yang X, Fu J, et al. Application of chromosome microarray analysis in prenatal diagnosis. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*. 2020 Nov 16;20(1):696.

Ye F, Xu X, Wang Y, et al. The yield of SNP microarray analysis for fetal ultrasound cardiac abnormalities. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2024 Apr 5;24(1):244.

Policy History/Revision Information

| Date | Summary of Changes |
|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11/01/2025 | <p>Applicable Codes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Updated list of applicable ICD-10 diagnosis codes to reflect annual edits:<ul style="list-style-type: none">Added Q89.89, Q99.89, QA0.0159, and QA0.8Removed Q89.8 and Q99.8 <p>Supporting Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Archived previous policy version CS017KY.10 |

Instructions for Use

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

UnitedHealthcare uses InterQual[®] for the primary medical/surgical criteria, and the American Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM) for substance use, in administering health benefits. If InterQual[®] does not have applicable criteria, UnitedHealthcare may also use UnitedHealthcare Medical Policies, Coverage Determination Guidelines, and/or Utilization Review Guidelines that have been approved by the Kentucky Department for Medicaid Services. The UnitedHealthcare Medical Policies, Coverage Determination Guidelines, and Utilization Review Guidelines 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.