

CMS Adopts Performance-Based Standards for CRC Biomarker Tests

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 14 June 2026 · Edited by William Lopes

The utility of molecular biomarker testing in colorectal cancer (CRC) management has expanded, yet the evidence base for certain assays remains less defined than for others. The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) has now adopted performance-based standards for coverage of these tests, a move that introduces a new layer of scrutiny for their clinical application and reimbursement.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- **The Pivot:** CMS has shifted from broad coverage to performance-based standards for CRC biomarker tests, requiring demonstrated clinical utility for reimbursement.
- **The Data:** Specific performance metrics for various biomarkers are now mandated, influencing test development and clinical adoption.
- **The Action:** Clinicians should be aware that coverage for CRC biomarker tests will increasingly depend on the specific assay's demonstrated clinical validity and utility, impacting test selection and patient access.

Colorectal cancer (CRC) treatment has increasingly relied on molecular profiling to guide therapeutic decisions, particularly in metastatic settings. Biomarkers such as RAS mutations, BRAF V600E mutations, and microsatellite instability (MSI) status are well-established for their prognostic and predictive value, influencing the selection of targeted therapies and immunotherapies. However, the landscape of CRC biomarker testing is continually evolving, with numerous assays emerging that target a broader range of genetic alterations. The clinical utility of some of these newer tests, particularly those with less extensive validation in large prospective trials, has been a subject of ongoing discussion within the oncology community.

Historically, coverage for diagnostic tests, including biomarker assays, has often been determined by a general assessment of medical necessity. The recent decision by CMS to implement performance-based standards for CRC biomarker tests represents a significant policy shift. This new framework mandates that tests must demonstrate not only analytical validity (accuracy and reliability of the test itself) but also clinical validity (the test's ability to accurately predict a clinical outcome) and, critically, clinical utility (the test's ability to improve patient outcomes). This move is intended to ensure that reimbursed tests provide tangible benefits to patients and contribute to evidence-based care.

Implications of the New CMS Standards

The CMS policy outlines specific criteria that CRC biomarker tests must meet to qualify for coverage. These criteria are expected to vary depending on the specific biomarker and its intended use. For example, tests for established biomarkers like RAS and BRAF mutations, which have clear implications for anti-EGFR therapy selection, are likely to meet these

standards more readily due to extensive supporting evidence. In contrast, tests for less common or newly identified biomarkers may face a higher hurdle, requiring robust data from clinical trials demonstrating improved patient outcomes, such as progression-free survival or overall survival, attributable to the test's guidance.

This shift places a greater burden on test developers to generate comprehensive clinical evidence. It necessitates well-designed prospective studies that not only confirm the presence of a biomarker but also demonstrate that acting on the test result leads to superior patient management and outcomes compared to standard care without the test. The policy is anticipated to encourage more rigorous validation of novel biomarker assays before widespread clinical adoption and reimbursement. It also implies that tests lacking sufficient evidence of clinical utility, even if analytically and clinically valid, may not secure CMS coverage.

For clinicians, this means that the selection of CRC biomarker tests will become more nuanced. Prescribing clinicians will need to be increasingly aware of the specific evidence supporting each test and its coverage status. The policy may also influence the availability of certain tests, potentially limiting access to assays that do not meet the new performance standards. While the intent is to promote high-quality, evidence-based care, there are concerns that it could also slow the adoption of innovative tests, particularly those from smaller developers who may lack the resources for extensive clinical utility studies.

The prevalence of CRC varies globally, but it remains a leading cause of cancer-related mortality. Molecular profiling is particularly critical in metastatic CRC, where treatment options are more diverse and often depend on specific genetic alterations. For instance, RAS mutations, present in approximately 50% of mCRC cases, confer resistance to anti-EGFR monoclonal antibodies such as cetuximab and panitumumab. Conversely, patients with wild-type RAS tumors often benefit significantly from these therapies. Similarly, BRAF V600E mutations, found in about 5-10% of mCRC, are associated with a poor prognosis and often require combination targeted therapy regimens. MSI-high status, indicative of a defective mismatch repair system, predicts a favorable response to immune checkpoint inhibitors, regardless of tumor location.

The methodology for demonstrating clinical utility will likely involve comparative effectiveness research. This research will compare patient outcomes in cohorts where treatment decisions were guided by the biomarker test versus cohorts where decisions were made using standard clinical parameters or alternative testing strategies. Endpoints such as overall survival, progression-free survival, objective response rates, and quality of life measures will be critical. The policy emphasizes the need for evidence that the test's use leads to a change in clinical management that directly improves patient outcomes, rather than merely providing prognostic information without actionable therapeutic implications. This focus on actionable results is a key differentiator of the new CMS framework.

A potential limitation of this performance-based approach is the challenge it poses for rare biomarker targets or those found in specific, smaller patient populations. Generating robust clinical utility data for these less common alterations can be difficult due to the limited number of eligible patients for large-scale prospective trials. This could inadvertently disadvantage tests for precision medicine targets that, while highly effective for a small subset of patients, may not meet the same evidence thresholds as tests for more prevalent biomarkers. Ensuring equitable access to innovative tests for all patient populations, including those with rare mutations, will require careful consideration and potentially adaptive evidence requirements from CMS.

For further insights into the complex landscape of oncology diagnostics and equitable treatment pathways, readers may find the Oxford Handbook of Oncology invaluable.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The CMS decision to adopt performance-based standards for colorectal cancer biomarker tests is a predictable, if somewhat belated, response to the proliferation of molecular diagnostics. While the intent to link reimbursement to demonstrated clinical utility is sound, the practical implications for clinicians and patients warrant careful consideration. Oncologists will now face an additional layer of complexity when ordering biomarker tests, needing to verify not only the medical necessity but also the specific coverage status based on the assay's performance data. This could lead to disparities in access, particularly for patients in rural areas or those treated by practices with limited resources to navigate intricate reimbursement policies.

From an industry perspective, this policy will undoubtedly reshape the diagnostic market. Companies developing novel CRC biomarker tests will be compelled to invest more heavily in large-scale clinical utility studies, moving beyond mere analytical and clinical validity. This may favor larger diagnostic companies with established research infrastructure, potentially stifling innovation from smaller biotech firms. The emphasis on outcomes data will also likely accelerate the consolidation of assays, with only those demonstrating clear patient benefit achieving widespread adoption and reimbursement. This is not inherently negative, but it does raise questions about the speed at which truly innovative, albeit initially less-evidenced, tests can reach patients.

Ultimately, patients stand to benefit from a system that prioritizes tests proven to improve their care. However, the transition period may be challenging. There is a risk that some patients could be denied access to tests that, while not yet meeting the new stringent CMS criteria, might still offer valuable insights for their specific clinical situation, particularly in rare or complex cases. The medical community must remain vigilant to ensure that these performance standards do not inadvertently create barriers to personalized medicine, but instead foster a robust evidence base that genuinely enhances patient outcomes in CRC management.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used solely to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. No AI-generated conclusions appear in The Life Science Feed without editor verification against the primary source.

REFERENCES

1. Biller LH, et al. Diagnosis and Treatment of Metastatic Colorectal Cancer: A Review. JAMA. 2021;325(7):669-685. doi:10.1001/jama.2021.0106
2. Kopetz S, et al. Molecular profiling of BRAF-V600E-mutant metastatic colorectal cancer in the phase 3 BEACON CRC trial. Nat Med. 2024;30(11):3261-3271. doi:10.1038/s41591-024-03235-9
3. Zeng C, et al. Clinical research progress on BRAF V600E-mutant advanced colorectal cancer. J Cancer Res Clin Oncol. 2023;149(17):16111-16121. doi:10.1007/s00432-023-05301-0
4. Corcoran RB, et al. Combined BRAF, EGFR, and MEK Inhibition in Patients with BRAF(V600E)-Mutant Colorectal Cancer. Cancer Discov. 2018;8(4):428-443. doi:10.1158/2159-8290.CD-17-1226

5. Tian J, et al. Combined PD-1, BRAF and MEK inhibition in BRAF(V600E) colorectal cancer: a phase 2 trial. *Nat Med.* 2023;29(2):458-466. doi:10.1038/s41591-022-02181-8
6. Price TJ, et al. Panitumumab versus cetuximab in patients with chemotherapy-refractory wild-type KRAS exon 2 metastatic colorectal cancer (ASPECCT): a randomised, multicentre, open-label, non-inferiority phase 3 study. *Lancet Oncol.* 2014;15(6):569-79. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(14)70118-4
7. Petrelli F, et al. Cetuximab and panitumumab in KRAS wild-type colorectal cancer: a meta-analysis. *Int J Colorectal Dis.* 2011;26(7):823-33. doi:10.1007/s00384-011-1149-0
8. Arnold D, et al. Prognostic and predictive value of primary tumour side in patients with RAS wild-type metastatic colorectal cancer treated with chemotherapy and EGFR directed antibodies in six randomized trials. *Ann Oncol.* 2017;28(8):1713-1729. doi:10.1093/annonc/mdx175
9. Zhou J, et al. Resistance to anti-EGFR therapies in metastatic colorectal cancer: underlying mechanisms and reversal strategies. *J Exp Clin Cancer Res.* 2021;40(1):328. doi:10.1186/s13046-021-02130-2
10. Sartore-Bianchi A, et al. Dual-targeted therapy with trastuzumab and lapatinib in treatment-refractory, KRAS codon 12/13 wild-type, HER2-positive metastatic colorectal cancer (HERACLES): a proof-of-concept, multicentre, open-label, phase 2 trial. *Lancet Oncol.* 2016;17(6):738-746. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(16)00150-9

LICENCE & RIGHTS

© 2026 The Life Science Feed. All rights reserved. This content is produced for medical education purposes. It may not be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted without prior written permission from The Life Science Feed.

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com