

Discogenic Pain Treatment (for Tennessee Only)

Policy Number: CS031TN.M
Effective Date: February 1, 2021

[Instructions for Use](#)

Table of Contents	Page
Application	1
Coverage Rationale	1
Applicable Codes	1
Description of Services	2
Clinical Evidence	3
U.S. Food and Drug Administration	14
Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services	14
References	14
Policy History/Revision Information	17
Instructions for Use	18

Related Community Plan Policies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ablative Treatment for Spinal Pain (for Tennessee Only) Surgical Treatment for Spine Pain (for Tennessee Only)
Commercial Policy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discogenic Pain Treatment

Application

This Medical Policy applies to Medicaid only plans in the state of Tennessee.

Coverage Rationale

The following procedures are unproven and not medically necessary due to insufficient evidence of efficacy:

- Annulus fibrosus repair following spinal surgery
- Percutaneous discectomy and decompression procedures for treating discogenic pain
- Thermal intradiscal procedures (TIPs) for treating discogenic pain

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
22526	Percutaneous intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty, unilateral or bilateral including fluoroscopic guidance; single level
22527	Percutaneous intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty, unilateral or bilateral including fluoroscopic guidance; 1 or more additional levels (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
22899	Unlisted procedure, spine

CPT Code	Description
62287	Decompression procedure, percutaneous, of nucleus pulposus of intervertebral disc, any method utilizing needle based technique to remove disc material under fluoroscopic imaging or other form of indirect visualization, with discography and/or epidural injection(s) at the treated level(s), when performed, single or multiple levels, lumbar
62380	Endoscopic decompression of spinal cord, nerve root(s), including laminotomy, partial facetectomy, foraminotomy, discectomy and/or excision of herniated intervertebral disc, 1 interspace, lumbar

CPT® is a registered trademark of the American Medical Association

HCPCS Code	Description
S2348	Decompression procedure, percutaneous, of nucleus pulposus of intervertebral disc, using radiofrequency energy, single or multiple levels, lumbar

Description of Services

Annulus Fibrosus Repair

The annulus fibrosus is a ring of fibrocartilage and fibrous tissue around the intervertebral disc, surrounding the nucleus pulposus of the spine. During a surgical discectomy or some other spine surgeries, an open pathway or hole (defect) is made in the annulus fibrosus, which is then left to heal. Annulus fibrosus repair systems are designed to reinforce or bridge material to form a strong flexible wall between the annulus and nucleus of the herniated region to close the defect and repair the annulus fibrosus of the intervertebral disc. Current annulus fibrosus repair strategies include sutures, plugs, adhesives and hydrogels (Long et al., 2016).

Percutaneous Discectomy Procedures

A discectomy is a procedure in which part of a herniated disc is removed. The goal of the surgery is to make the herniated disc stop pressing on and irritating the nerves which cause pain and weakness (North American Spine Society [NASS], 2018). There are a number of techniques described as “percutaneous discectomy,” including nucleoplasty, laser discectomy, Yeung Endoscopic Spinal Surgery (YESS), Transforaminal (TESSYS®) and Interlaminar (iLESSYS®) Endoscopic Surgical Systems, Variations on each of these techniques are numerous.

Nucleoplasty

Nucleoplasty [also known as percutaneous disc decompression (PDD) or percutaneous plasma discectomy] uses x-ray images (fluoroscopy) for guidance to insert a specialized catheter to reach the disc nucleus. Radiofrequency energy is used to ablate (coablate) nuclear material and create small channels within the disc. This is thought to decompress the disc, reducing the pressure both inside the disc and on nerve roots. Typically, individuals are awake during the procedure. Nucleoplasty is performed on an outpatient basis with minimal anesthesia requirements.

Laser Discectomy

Laser discectomy [also known as laser disc decompression (PLDD), laser assisted disc decompression (LADD) or percutaneous endoscopic discectomy, with or without laser (PELD)] is a minimally invasive procedure proposed as an alternative to discectomy or microdiscectomy. This procedure is performed under local anesthesia since an individual’s cooperation is required during the procedure. The disc space is punctured with a cannula and the tip of the needle is placed into the center of the disc. A second cannula is placed on the opposite lateral side of the disc. Parts of the nucleus pulposus are removed to allow for examination. The remaining disc material is vaporized using a laser.

Yeung Endoscopic Spinal Surgery (YESS)

Yeung endoscopic spinal surgery (YESS) [also known as arthroscopic microdiscectomy (AMD) or percutaneous endoscopic discectomy (PELD)], is a minimally invasive discectomy procedure designed to relieve symptoms caused by herniated discs pressing on nerves. The YESS system uses an endoscopic approach to selectively remove the nucleus pulposus within annular tears. This is an outpatient procedure utilizing either sedative or local anesthesia. The Yeung Endoscopic Spine System (Richard Wolf Instruments Corporation, IL) is a specialized endoscope developed for percutaneous spinal endoscopy and

discectomy. This endoscope has multichannel inflow and outflow ports, allowing visualization through one port and suction or other therapeutic services through the working port.

Transforaminal (TESSYS®) and Interlaminar® Endoscopic Surgical Systems

The TESSYS® approach focuses on the endoscopic visualization of the foramen and a transforaminal approach in order to resect the herniated disc. The surgeon performs a foraminoplasty through which neural elements can be decompressed. Disc material is removed completely and directly through the foramen, which is gradually widened using specialized reamers and instruments. The iLESSYS® method uses endoscopic interlaminar access for the removal of herniated discs or the treatment of lumbar spinal stenosis. Generally, all lumbar levels can be treated with either approach.

Thermal Intradiscal Procedures (TIPs)

In general, percutaneous thermal intradiscal procedures (TIPs) involve the insertion of a catheter or probe into the spinal disc, under fluoroscopic guidance, to produce or apply heat within the disc to relieve low back pain (LBP). TIPs is thought to remove unwanted tissue, such as herniated discs; create a seal to limit expression of matrix components; shrink collagen tissue; and destroy nociceptors. To date, three types of TIPs have been used: Intradiscal Electrothermal Therapy (IDET), Intradiscal Biacuplasty (IDB) or Biacuplasty, and Percutaneous Intradiscal Radiofrequency Thermocoagulation (PIRFT).

Intradiscal Electrothermal Therapy (IDET)

Intradiscal electrothermal therapy (IDET) is one type of TIP. Since degeneration of the intervertebral disc can be the source of severe LBP, IDET has been proposed as an alternative treatment to spinal fusion for those individuals with symptomatic internal disc disruption, who are nonresponsive to conservative medical care. IDET is a minimally invasive, outpatient procedure, during which individuals are administered local anesthesia and mild sedation. Under x-ray imaging (fluoroscopy), a disposable flexible catheter and a heating element are inserted into the spinal disc, directly to the annulus fibrosus, the outer component of the intervertebral discs. IDET destroys the nerve fibers and “toughens” the disc tissue, sealing any small tears. The heating of the electrode denatures the collagen of the annulus and coagulates the nerve endings with the goal of alleviating pain.

Intradiscal Biacuplasty (IDB) or Biacuplasty

Intradiscal biacuplasty (IDB) or biacuplasty is a modification of IDET that aims to destroy the nerve fibers that generate pain sensations. IDB is a minimally invasive outpatient procedure that requires local anesthesia or mild sedation. IDB uses radiofrequency energy to heat the tissue, while circulating water is used to cool the tissue near the disc. This bilateral approach is intended to facilitate controlled lesioning between the electrodes in the disc.

Percutaneous Intradiscal Radiofrequency Thermocoagulation (PIRFT)

Percutaneous intradiscal radiofrequency thermocoagulation (PIRFT) is a minimally invasive method similar to IDET. PIRFT is also known as intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty (IEA), intradiscal radiofrequency thermomodulation, radiofrequency (RF) annuloplasty, or radiofrequency posterior annuloplasty. Compared with IDET, PIRFT uses a radiofrequency probe that is placed into the center of the disc, rather than around the annulus. The device is activated for 90 seconds at a temperature of 70° Celsius. PIRFT does not ablate the disc material, but instead alters the biomechanics of the disc or destroys nociceptive pain fibers.

Clinical Evidence

Annulus Fibrosus Repair

There is insufficient quality evidence to support annulus fibrosus repair for treating discogenic pain. Further research with randomized controlled studies, larger patient sample sizes and long-term outcomes are required to demonstrate its safety and efficacy.

Thomé, et al. (2018) reported the findings of an RCT testing whether bone-anchored annular closure device, in addition to lumbar microdiscectomy, resulted in lower reherniation and reoperation rates plus increased overall success compared with lumbar microdiscectomy alone. Participants with symptoms of lumbar disc herniation for at least 6 weeks and a large annular defect (6–10 mm width) after lumbar microdiscectomy were included in the study and randomized to bone-anchored annular closure device (n=276) or lumbar microdiscectomy only (control; n=278). Based on modified intention-to-treat analyses,

participants in the annular closure device treatment arm were less likely to have recurrent herniation (50% vs. 70%, $P < .001$) and more likely to meet the composite end point success (27% vs. 18%, $P = .02$). The frequency of reoperations to address recurrent herniation was 5% with annular closure device and 13% in controls ($P = .001$). Scores for back pain, leg pain, Oswestry Disability Index, and health-related quality of life at regular visits were comparable between groups over 2-year follow-up. The findings are limited by lack of masking of the participants and investigators to the intervention, which could have introduced biases in the findings, and possible conflicts of interest in this industry-sponsored study.

Kuršumović et al. (2018) conducted a retrospective analysis of the RCT described above (Thomé, et al., 2018) to characterize the morphology and clinical relevance of vertebral endplate changes (VEPC) following limited lumbar discectomy with or without implantation of a bone-anchored annular closure device (ACD). Of 554 randomized patients, the as-treated population consisted of 550 patients (267 ACD, 283 Controls). VEPC were preoperatively identified in 18% of patients in the ACD group and in 15% of Controls. At 2 years, VEPC frequency increased to 85% with ACD and 33% in Controls. Device- or procedure-related serious AEs (8% vs. 17%, $P = 0.001$) and secondary surgical intervention (5% vs. 13%, $P < 0.001$) favored the ACD group over Controls. In the ACD group, clinical outcomes were comparable in patients with and without VEPC at 2 years follow-up. In the Control group, patients with VEPC at 2 years had higher risk of symptomatic reherniation versus patients without VEPC (35% vs. 19%, $P < 0.01$). The authors concluded that in patients with large annular defects following limited lumbar discectomy, additional implantation with a bone-anchored ACD reduces risk of postoperative complications despite a greater frequency of VEPC. VEPC were associated with higher risk of symptomatic reherniation in patients treated with limited lumbar discectomy, but not in those who received additional ACD implantation. Additional RCTs are needed to validate these findings.

Parker et al. (2016) conducted a prospective cohort study to evaluate whether an annular closure device (Barricaid®) could be implanted safely to reduce same-level recurrent disk herniation, or attenuate disk height loss and improve the outcome after lumbar discectomy. Forty-six consecutive patients undergoing lumbar discectomy for single-level herniated disk at 2 institutions were followed prospectively with clinical and radiographic evaluations at 6 weeks, and 3, 6, 12, and 24 months (control cohort). A second consecutive cohort of 30 patients undergoing 31 lumbar discectomies with implantation of an annular closure device was followed similarly. Incidence of recurrent disk herniation, disk height loss, the leg and back pain VAS, and the ODI were assessed at each follow-up. By 2 years of follow-up, symptomatic recurrent same-level disk herniation occurred in 3 (6.5%) patients in the control cohort versus 0 (0%) patients in the annular repair cohort ($P = 0.27$). A trend of greater preservation of disk height was observed in the annular repair versus the control cohort 3 months (7.9 vs. 7.27 mm, $P = 0.08$), 6 months (7.81 vs. 7.18 mm, $P = 0.09$), and 12 months (7.63 vs. 6.9 mm, $P = 0.06$) postoperatively. The annular closure cohort reported less leg pain (VAS-LP: 5 vs. 16, $P < 0.01$), back pain (VAS-BP: 13 vs. 22, $P < 0.05$), and disability (ODI: 16 vs. 22, $P < 0.05$) 1 year postoperatively. The authors conclude that closure of annular defect after lumbar discectomy may help preserve the physiological disk function and prevent long-term disk height loss and associated back and leg pain. The study is limited by the lack of randomization between interventions, which could have introduced a bias. RCTs with larger patient populations and longer-term follow-up are needed to further evaluate Barricaid.

A prospective, multicenter, single-blind, RCT by Bailey et al. (2013) compared outcomes associated with repairing the annulus fibrosus after lumbar discectomy for the surgical management of herniated nucleus pulposus. A total of 750 patients were treated for LDH and randomly assigned in a 2:1 ratio to discectomy with the Xclose Tissue Repair System (Anulex Technologies, Minnetonka, MN) for annular repair or discectomy without annular repair. Patient self-reported measures included VAS for leg and back pain, ODI, and SF-12 Health Survey. AEs and subsequent reherniation surgical procedures were documented. Preoperative outcome measures were compared with follow-up visits at 2 weeks, 6 months, 1 year, and 2 years. The study failed to show any group difference in patient-reported outcome, but a non-statistically significant reduction in need for subsequent reherniation surgery with annulus repair. The authors concluded that the addition of annulus fibrosus repair did not induce a significant reduction in reoperation for recurrent herniation.

Ledic et al. (2015) reported two-year outcomes from two prospective case series of patients treated with limited discectomy and an annular closure device. A total of 75 patients were included in this study consisting of 40 men and 35 women with an average age of 40 years. Disk height maintenance within the group overall was 90% at 24 months. Overall, 97% of the treated disks demonstrated disk height maintenance of at least 75% of preoperative levels at 12 months and 92% at 24 months. Disk height maintenance was correlated with less nucleus removal. Patient disability, back pain, and leg pain were significantly improved from preoperative levels at 6 weeks and maintained over the course of study. There was a single symptomatic reherniation requiring surgical intervention within this series. According to the authors, limited lumbar discectomy combined with the use of an annular closure device provided very low rates of disk reherniation and exhibited excellent disk height maintenance and

sustained disability, leg pain, and back pain improvement within a 24-month postoperative study period. Study limitations include lack of comparison group and small patient population.

Percutaneous Discectomy and Disc Decompression Procedures

There is insufficient quality evidence to support the use of percutaneous discectomy and disc compression procedures for treating discogenic pain. Further research with randomized controlled studies, larger patient sample sizes and long-term outcomes are required to demonstrate their safety and efficacy.

Nucleoplasty

Klessinger (2018) conducted a retrospective case series to investigate the frequency of an additional open surgery after percutaneous cervical nucleoplasty (PCN) up to 10 years. The follow-up time was longer than 5 years in 31.6% of patients and longer than 10 years in 6.0% of patients. One hundred thirty-three patients who underwent PCN between 2005 and 2007 were included. Patient satisfaction was evaluated using McNab's outcome criteria. The necessity of an additional open surgery at the cervical spine, the period between PCN and the fusion, and the treated levels were analyzed. The results showed a short-term success rate (1 month) of 70.7%; however, subsequent surgery was performed in 19.5% of patients. Overall, 57.7 % of reoperations were performed during the first year after PCN. In patients with a good result after PCN, subsequent surgery was less frequent, and the interval between PCN and additional surgery was longer. The data from this study suggest that PCN is a poor replacement for conventional open surgery. Degeneration of the disc is progressive despite or because of PCN. Findings are limited by the lack of comparison group.

Nie et al. (2018) reported in a retrospective cohort study 5-year outcomes from a comparison of therapeutic efficacy of radiofrequency target disc decompression and nucleoplasty for LDH. Two hundred sixty patients with LDH were divided into two groups: target disc decompression group (group T, n=147) and nucleoplasty group (group N, n=113). VAS and functional rating index (FRI) were measured at one, three, six, 12, 24, and 60 months after the surgery. Hospitalization time, operation time, complications, and recurrence/invalid were compared between the two groups. Compared with the pre-operation, the VAS and FRI in both groups were significantly decreased in post-operation ($P < 0.01$). There was no significant difference of the occurrence of complications and disease recurrence/invalid during the follow-up between the two groups. Logistic regression analysis showed that operation time was an independent factor in the prognosis. The authors concluded there was no significant difference between the two methods used and that both can significantly alleviate pain and improve quality of life. The study is limited by lack of randomization and a retrospective design.

Wu et al. (2015) conducted a RCT to compare CT-guided nucleoplasty, CT-guided nucleoplasty combined with nerve root injection, and CT-guided transforaminal lumbar epidural injections in 97 patients with lumbar disk herniation and leg pain. Results of the study demonstrated that the combination of nucleoplasty with nerve root injection produced a significantly greater reduction in the pain score and disability score when compared with only nucleoplasty in the short term, at 1 week, as well as at 1 month. The study limitations included lack of blinding and relatively small patient populations.

Ren et al. (2015) evaluated the efficacy of percutaneous nucleoplasty using coblation technique for the treatment of chronic nonspecific LBP, after 5 years of follow-up. Forty-one patients who underwent percutaneous nucleoplasty for chronic LBP were assessed preoperatively and at 1 week, 1 year, 3 years, and 5 years postoperatively in this case series. Pain was graded using a 10-cm VAS and the percentage reduction in pain score was calculated at each postoperative visit. The ODI was used to assess disability related to lumbar spine degeneration, and patient satisfaction was assessed using the modified MacNab criteria. There were significant differences between the preoperative, 1-week postoperative, and 3-year postoperative VAS and ODI scores, but not between the 3- and 5-year postoperative scores. Excellent or good patient satisfaction was achieved in 87.9% of patients after 1 week, 72.4% after 1 year, 67.7% after 3 years, and 63.4% at the last follow-up. The authors concluded although previously published short and medium-term outcomes after percutaneous nucleoplasty appeared to be satisfactory, the long-term follow-up results showed a significant decline in patient satisfaction over time. This is an uncontrolled study with a small sample size.

In a retrospective review, Liliang et al. (2016) reported outcomes from a case series of 47 patients who underwent nucleoplasty for degenerative LBP using VAS scores. At 10-months, 21 patients (67.7%) experienced substantial pain relief. The most common side effects following nucleoplasty were soreness at the needle puncture site (64.5%), numbness in the lower leg (12.9%), and increased intensity of back pain (9.7%). All side effects were transient. Multivariate analysis revealed that the discography results were the most critical predictor for substantial pain relief of nucleoplasty ($P=0.03$). The sensitivity and

specificity of discography were 92.8% and 62.5%, respectively. Limitations of this study include lack of comparison to a different intervention, non-randomization, small sample size, and short follow-up period.

Kuman et al. (2014) evaluated the safety and efficacy of annulo-nucleoplasty using Disc-FX for the treatment of lumbar disc pathology (n=24). All patients in this case series were non-responsive to non-operative treatment measures. A total of 12 patients had degenerative disc disease and 12 patients had contained LDH. Health outcomes included the VAS, ODI, and the SF-36 scores evaluated before and after the procedure. Study authors reported significant improvement in outcomes relative to baseline. The overall rate of re-intervention for symptoms that continued to persist was about 18%; in the group of patients with LDH, the rate was about 36%. The study was limited by lack of appropriate comparator groups, lack of randomization, and relatively limited follow-up.

Zhu et al. (2011) evaluated longer-term efficacy over a 2-year follow-up of coblation nucleoplasty treatment for protruded lumbar intervertebral disc in a case series. A total of 42 cases of protruded lumbar intervertebral disc treated by coblation nucleoplasty followed-up for 2 years were analyzed. Relief of LBP, leg pain and numbness after the operation were assessed by VAS. Function of lower limb and daily living of patients were evaluated by the ODI. The authors concluded that coblation nucleoplasty may have satisfactory clinical outcomes for treatment of protruded lumbar intervertebral disc for as long as 2-year follow-up, but longer-term benefit still needs verification. The findings are limited by lack of relevant comparison group.

In a case series, Masala et al. (2007) treated 72 patients affected by lumbar disk herniation with nucleoplasty coblation. Average preprocedural pain level for all patients was 8.2, while the average pain level at 12 months follow-up was 4.1. At the 1 year evaluation, 79% of patients demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in numeric pain scores: 17% (12 patients) were completely satisfied with complete resolution of symptoms, and 62% (43 patients) obtained a good result with a decrease from 8.2 at baseline to 4.1 (4.1 points). The study is limited by lack of comparison group and subjective outcomes with only a 50% decrease in pain and no documentation of improvement in functional status.

Mirzai et al. (2007) evaluated outcomes 2 weeks, 6 months, and 1 year after nucleoplasty in a case series of 52 consecutive patients with leg pain and MRI evidence of small and medium-sized herniated discs. Thirty-four patients had one and 18 had two discs treated; a total of 70 procedures were performed. Mean VAS reduced from preprocedure 7.5 to 3.1 at post procedure 6 months and to 2.1 at the latest follow-up. Mean ODI decreased from 42.2 to 24.8 at 6 months and to 20.5 at the latest examination. Analgesic consumption was stopped or reduced in 42 patients (85%) at 6 months and in 46 patients (94%) 1 year after the procedure. Overall patient satisfaction was 81% at 2 weeks, 85% at 6 months, and 88% at the latest follow-up. The study is limited by subjective outcomes.

A prospective case series, Gerszten et al. (2006) assessed pain, functioning, and QOL in 67 patients with radicular leg and back pain who underwent nucleoplasty-based percutaneous disc decompression. Pain relief, functioning, and QOL were evaluated. Patients completed the SF-36 Health Survey, EuroQoL 5D (EQ5D), and a VAS for pain preoperatively, and at 3 and 6 months after surgery. Compared with pre-operative QOL, there was a statistically significant improvement in QOL at 3 months as measured using the SF-36 Physical Component Summary (PCS) scale, the EQ5D and the VAS for pain. Six-month results in 36 patients continued to reflect improvement as measured using the SF-36 PCS and the EQ5D. The authors concluded that nucleoplasty-based percutaneous disc decompression in patients with symptomatic contained disc herniations is safe and improves QOL as measured by the SF-36, EQ5D, and VAS for pain, three generic QOL outcome instruments. They also concluded that nucleoplasty is an effective minimally invasive surgical treatment alternative in patients with symptomatic contained disc herniations. They noted that further follow-up evaluation is underway to determine the durability of QOL improvement after nucleoplasty. The study is however limited by lack of relevant comparison group.

Bhagia et al. (2006) reported the short-term side effects and complications after percutaneous disc decompression utilizing coblation technology (nucleoplasty) in a retrospective study on 53 patients. The authors reported statistically significant reductions in VAS scores for both back and leg pain. The procedure was associated at 24 hours with short-term increased pain at the needle insertion site (76%), new numbness or tingling (26%), increased preprocedure back pain (15%) and new areas of back pain (15%). By 2 weeks no patients had soreness at injection site or new areas of back pain, and only 2 had increased intensity of preprocedure back pain, while new numbness or tingling was present in 15% of patients. The study is limited by retrospective study design, subjective outcomes and new symptoms in 15% of study participants.

NICE (2016a) evaluated percutaneous coblation of the intervertebral disc for LBP and concluded that this procedure may be used for patients with pain caused by contained herniated discs that have not responded to conservative treatment, when open surgery is not suitable.

Professional Societies

American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians (ASIPP)

The ASIPP performed a systematic assessment of mechanical lumbar disc decompression with nucleoplasty. They concluded that the clinical effectiveness of nucleoplasty is limited to fair and is recommended only in select cases (Manchikanti et al., 2013b).

North American Spine Society (NASS)

In their clinical guideline on the diagnosis and treatment of lumbar disc herniation and radiculopathy, NASS (Kreiner et al., 2014) concluded that there is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation for or against the use of plasma disc decompression/nucleoplasty in the treatment of patients with LDH with radiculopathy.

Percutaneous Endoscopic Transforaminal Discectomy (PETD)

Tacconi et al. (2020) compared surgical invasiveness between two procedures: transforaminal full endoscopic lumbar discectomy (FELD) and open discectomy (OD). 50 patients with a single-level lumbar foraminal herniation were randomly assigned to either have a FELD or OD procedure. Pre- and postoperative leg and back pain data were collected using a visual analog scale (VAS). A satisfactory postoperative outcome was defined by a decrease in the leg pain score by ≥ 3 points from the preoperative leg VAS score. The VAS scores for back pain were recorded ≥ 6 hours after the procedure or at mobilization. Additional assessment of back pain was not performed later during follow-up period due to potential risk of back pain occurring secondarily to spinal instability or a degenerative disc. There were no intraoperative or postoperative surgical complications. For the OD group, the median VAS score for leg pain had decreased from 7 preoperatively to 2 at six months postoperatively. In the FELD group, the median VAS score for leg pain had decreased from 8 preoperatively to 2 at six months postoperatively. The authors concluded even though the VAS scores for leg pain were not significantly different between the two groups, the period for patient mobilization along with the VAS scores for back pain immediately postoperatively were significantly lower for the FELD group. Limitations included a relatively small number of participants.

In a 2019 meta-analysis, Huang et al. sought to systematically review and compare the safety and effectiveness of PETD versus percutaneous endoscopic interlaminar discectomy (PEID) for the treatment of LDH. A total of 13 studies with 974 cases consisting of 3 RCTs, 3 prospective studies and 7 retrospective studies were included. The aggregate results, based on observational studies and randomized controlled trials, suggest that patients treated with PEID experienced significant advantages with shorter operation time, less intraoperative blood loss and less intraoperative fluoroscopy times but more complications than those treated with PETD; however, the two operative approaches did not significantly differ in terms of LDH recurrence, hospital stay, ODI scores, VAS scores, Japanese Orthopaedic Association (JOA) scores and MacNab criteria at the final follow-up. The authors concluded that PEID may be superior to PETD in certain ways, some of its advantages have yet to be verified and the two interventions were not significantly different in terms of relief of symptoms and functional recovery. They also concluded that PEID would be recommended for treating LDH especially at L5/S1 under certain conditions, but a prudent attitude is necessary to choose between the two operative approaches before a large sample and high quality RCTs have been performed. Limitations included lack of separation between randomized and non-randomized studies in the aggregate estimates, which could introduce biases, clinical heterogeneity and short-term follow-up.

Mo et al. (2019) evaluated percutaneous endoscopic transforaminal discectomy (PETD) in comparison with percutaneous endoscopic interlaminar discectomy (PEID) for herniation at L5-S1. 80 participants were recruited and randomly assigned to two different groups - either PETD or PEID. All procedures were performed by the same physician. Even though the operation time in the PEID group was significantly shorter than the PETD group, no significant differences were noticed during the postoperative period. All patients were followed for 9-22 months, with an average follow-up of 16.59 ± 4.10 months in the PETD group and 16.71 ± 3.72 months in the PEID group. The Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) and visual analog scale (VAS) scores were similar with no significant differences between the two groups. The authors concluded PETD has a similar clinical effect to that of PEID. Limitations included single-center study, low number of participants and analysis based on as-treated rather than intent-to-treat approach. Larger sample size and tracking of long-term results are still warranted.

Yu et al. (2019) compared the clinical outcomes for percutaneous transforaminal endoscopic discectomy (PTED) and microendoscopic discectomy (MED) as alternative minimally invasive procedures for lumbar disc herniation. A literature search provided eight studies in the final analysis totaling 805 patients. Only one of these studies was a randomized controlled trial, while the others were observational studies. From the data extracted, visual analog scale (VAS) and Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) were considered the primary outcomes. The author's analysis concluded that PTED resulted in a shorter hospital length of stay, but MED was superior for intraoperative fluoroscopy and total cost. Significant lower back pain was found in the PTED group short term and at one year postoperatively. No differences were found regarding the pain score or ODI. The authors' meta-analysis concluded that both the PTED and MED are safe and effective in treating lumbar disc herniation. Limitations included small number of studies included for review and findings based mainly on observational studies. Furthermore, different methodologies contributed to heterogeneity in the analyses and the surgeon skill level may have introduced bias.

Chen et al (2018) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to compare efficacy and safety between PETD and PEID for L5-S1 LDH. Nine studies involving 621 patients met inclusion criteria. Only three of these studies were reported to be randomized controlled trials. The results indicated that PETD was significantly associated with greater fluoroscopy times (mean difference 9.28 times); and longer operative time (mean difference 16.51 minutes) compared with PEID. However, there were no distinct differences between PETD and PEID in estimated blood loss ($P = 0.24$), bedtime after surgery ($P = 0.32$), hospitalization time ($P = 0.27$), or MacNab evaluation ($P = 0.78$). Similarly, no obvious differences were detected between PETD and PEID regarding VAS, JOA score, or ODI when measured preoperatively, 1 day postoperatively, 3 months postoperatively, or at the last follow up. In addition, no significant difference was found regarding overall incidence of complications between PETD and PEID ($P = 0.14$). Nevertheless, a significantly lower incidence rate of dural tear was observed in PETD compared with PEID ($P = 0.04$). The authors concluded that PETD had comparable clinical efficacy and safety compared with PEID; however, PEID was superior to PETD regarding fluoroscopy times and operative time. Therefore, PEID might be a better surgical procedure for L5-S1 LDH. The findings are limited by lack of separation in the analysis between randomized controlled trials and observational studies.

In a retrospective review, Tacconi et al. (2018) reported outcomes and complications in 270 patients who underwent PETD. All patients have a minimum follow-up of 6 months. Primary study endpoints were evaluation of outcomes using the VAS and ODI pre-operatively and at 3, 6 and 12 months, as well as the complications and the recurrence rates. The authors reported positive outcomes of approximately 93%. In their opinion, the complication rate of 5.5%, and recurrence rate of 4.1% are compare to results from other procedures. The findings are limited by lack of comarison group. RCTs, larger patient populations, and longer-term outcomes are needed to further evaluate PETD.

Liu et al. (2018, included in the Yu systematic review cited above) evaluated the clinical outcomes of PETD, microendoscopic discectomy (MED), and microdiscectomy (MD) for treatment of symptomatic LDH. One hundred ninety-two patients with symptomatic LDH at L3-4 and L4-5 were included in this retrospective cohort study. The patients were divided into groups as follows: group A was treated with PETD and included 60 patients (31 men and 29 women) with a mean age of 36.2 years; group B was treated with MED and included 63 patients (32 men and 31 women) with a mean age of 33.1 years; and group C was treated with MD and included 69 patients (36 men and 33 women) with a mean age of 34.0 years. There were no significant differences in mean preoperative ODI score, and VAS scores for LBP and leg pain among groups A, B, and C. Incision length, duration of the operation, blood loss, creatine phosphokinase, length of hospital stay, and postoperative incision pain according to the VAS were best in the PETD group ($p < 0.05$). Fifty-five (91.6%), 59 (93.7%), and 62 patients (89.9%) had at least 2 years of follow-up in groups A, B, and C, respectively. At the last follow-up, VAS scores of LBP and leg pain, and ODI scores were significantly better than preoperative correlates in all groups. The authors concluded that PETD, MED, and MD were all reliable techniques for the treatment of symptomatic LDH. With a restricted indication, PETD can result in rapid recovery and better clinical results after at least 2 years of follow-up. Findings are limited by the observational and retrospective design of the study. Additional studies with randomization, longer outcomes, and larger patient populations are needed to further evaluate PETD.

Automated Percutaneous Lumbar Discectomy (APLD)/Automated Percutaneous Nucleotomy

A Hayes report concluded that while there is a sufficient amount of evidence published to evaluate APLD for lumbar disc disease, there are a limited number of publications at this time to conclude the safety and efficacy of this technology (Hayes 2020).

Manchikanti et al. (2013c) conducted a systematic review of APLD for the contained herniated disc. Pain relief was the primary outcome measure. Other outcome measures were functional improvement, improvement of psychological status, opioid intake,

and return to work. Short-term effectiveness was defined as one year or less, whereas long-term effectiveness was defined as greater than one year. Nineteen observational studies and no randomized controlled trial were included; and met inclusion criteria for methodological quality assessment. Overall, 5,515 patients were studied with 4,412 patients (80%) showing positive results lasting one year or longer. Based on USPSTF criteria, the indicated evidence for APLD is limited for short- and long-term relief. A study limitation is the paucity of RCTs in the literature describing APLD.

Professional Societies

North American Spine Society (NASS)

In their clinical guideline on the diagnosis and treatment of LDH and radiculopathy, NASS (Kreiner, et al., 2014) recommended that APLD may be considered for the treatment of LDH with radiculopathy (Grade of Recommendation: C). However, they concluded that there is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation for or against the use of APLD compared with open discectomy in the treatment of patients with LDH with radiculopathy (Grade of Recommendation: I [Insufficient Evidence]).

American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians (ASIPP)

In a comprehensive evidence-based guideline for interventional techniques in chronic spinal pain, the ASIPP (Manchikanti et al., 2013a) concludes that the level of evidence for automated percutaneous mechanical lumbar disc decompression is limited for short- and long-term relief based on all observational studies.

Percutaneous Lumbar Discectomy (PLD)

In a prospective cohort study, McCormick et al. (2016) determined long-term outcomes of Dekompressor percutaneous lumbar disc decompression (PLDD) for discogenic radicular pain. Consecutive patients (n=70) with discogenic lumbosacral radicular pain who underwent PLDD with Dekompressor were included in the study. Numerical Rating Scale (NRS) leg pain score and Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) score data were collected at 6 months and 1 year. These 2 measures, 5-point Likert scale patient satisfaction, and surgical rate data were also collected at 8 years when possible. Forty and twenty-five patients were successfully contacted at 1-year and 8-year follow-up, respectively. At 1 year and 8 years, NRS leg pain scores were reduced greater than 50% in 47% and 29% of patients, respectively; ODI score improved greater than 30% in 43% and 26% of patients, respectively. Of the patients who were followed-up at 8 years, 36% had undergone surgery and the median satisfaction was "4" (interquartile range of 2 to 5). The authors concluded that while limited by loss-to-follow-up, the findings of this study suggested that treatment of discogenic lumbosacral radicular pain with Dekompressor resulted in decreased leg pain and disability and favorable satisfaction at long-term follow-up. They stated that further study with adequate follow-up retention is needed to confirm that Dekompressor spares open spinal surgery. The findings are limited by lack of comparison group and large loss to follow up.

Cong et al. (2016) conducted a systematic review to compare the effectiveness and safety of endoscopic discectomy (ED) with open discectomy (OD) for the treatment of symptomatic LDH. A search was used to identify all published RCTs up to August 2014. Cochrane methodology was used for the results of this meta-analysis. Nine relevant RCTs involving 1,092 patients were identified. Compared with OD, ED results in slightly better clinical outcomes which were evaluated by the Macnab criteria without clinical significance (ED group: 95.76%; OD group: 80%; P=0.10), a significantly greater patient satisfaction rate (ED group: 93.21%; OD group: 86.57%; P=0.03), lower intraoperative blood loss volume, and shorter length of hospital stay. The authors concluded that from the existing outcomes, ED surgery could be viewed as a sufficient and safe supplementation and alternative to standard open discectomy. The cost-effectiveness analyses still remain unproved from the existing data. More independent high-quality RCTs using sufficiently large sample sizes are needed.

Percutaneous Laser Disc Decompression (PLDD)

In a health technology assessment, a small body of very limited low quality evidence is were considered insufficient to determine the safety and efficacy of PLDD for lower back disc herniation (Hayes 2020). The assessment also suggests uncertainty regarding the comparative and long-term effectiveness of PLDD and the need for subsequent surgeries.

Brouwer and colleagues (2015, included in Hayes report above) conducted a RCT with non-inferiority study design (n=115) to evaluate PLDD compared with conventional surgery for the treatment of LBP. The non-inferiority analysis showed that PLDD resulted in non-inferior outcomes compared with conventional surgery; however, the number of reoperations required was significantly higher in the PLDD group (38%) compared with conventional surgery group (16%). At the two year follow up, Brower and his colleagues (2017) demonstrated that although the rate of reoperation in the PLDD group was higher than

expected, surgery could be avoided in 48% of those patients that were original candidates for surgery. The authors concluded the results justify the need for additional studies into the value of PLDD as an alternative to conservative treatment

In 2003, NICE evaluated the safety and efficacy of endoscopic laser foraminoplasty and found the evidence inadequate to support the use of this procedure. They recommend that further research to evaluate safety and efficacy to reduce uncertainty of this procedure.

Professional Societies

American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians (ASIPP)

The ASIPP practice guidelines for the management of chronic spinal pain stated that the evidence for percutaneous disc decompression is moderate for short-term relief and limited for long-term relief (Manchikanti et al., 2013b).

North American Spine Society (NASS)

In their evidence-based guideline, NASS states that PELD may be considered as an option for the treatment of LDH and radiculopathy to reduce early postoperative disability and opioid use compared with open discectomy (Grade of Recommendation – B[fair-quality evidence]) (Kreiner et al., 2012).

Yeung Endoscopic Spinal Surgery (YESS)/[Arthroscopic Microdiscectomy or Percutaneous Endoscopic Discectomy (PELD)]

Xu et al. (2020) conducted a meta-analysis on the efficacy of percutaneous endoscopic lumbar discectomy (PELD) versus microendoscopic discectomy (MED); the authors specifically focused on the midterm and long-term outcomes. A total of 487 studies were identified with only 9 articles meeting the inclusion criteria and high-quality standards. Only one of these was a randomized controlled trial, the other were observational studies. In the results analysis, both PELD and MED obtained satisfactory midterm and long-term clinical efficacy, however the PELD group obtained better outcomes in scores for low back pain after 2 years postoperatively compared with the MED group. The authors concluded that the PELD patients exhibited overwhelming superiority in length of incision, postoperative time in bed and hospital length of stay which supported PELD as less invasive and faster rehabilitation. Further well-defined large randomized trials are needed to validate and increase the strength of these findings. Limitations included lack of randomization in most included studies, lack of detailed surgical methods for several studies thus limiting additional subgroup analysis and high heterogeneity.

Ruan et al. (2016) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to compare PELD and open lumbar microdiscectomy (OLM) for the treatment of LDH. A total of 7 studies (1389 patients) were included (2 RCTs and 5 observational studies). The authors concluded that existing evidence indicates that no superiority exists between the two surgical approaches for the treatment of LDH in terms of functional outcome, complication rate and reoperation rate, in spite of the PELD surgical group can achieve shorter operation time and hospital stay than OLM surgical group. This review is limited by a low number of RCTs, and unknown follow-up periods.

Transforaminal (TESSYS®) and Interlaminar Endoscopic Surgical Systems

In a prospective cohort study of 80 patients who underwent TESSYS for LDH, Wu et al. (2018) evaluated outcome predictors in 36 men and 44 women with a mean age of 48.76 ± 15.60 years (range: 24-78 years). The mean follow-up time was 25.15 ± 9.76 months (range: 12-48 months). LDH with older age (odds ratio [OR]: 6.621; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.632-20.846; $p=0.019$), high-intensity zone (HIZ) (OR: 8.152; 95% CI, 0.827-4.380; $p=0.003$), and larger disk herniation (OR: 6.819; 95% CI, 0.113-4.825; $p=0.017$) were the most significant negative outcome predictors. The study is limited by its lack of randomization and small patient population.

In a retrospective case series, Kosztowski et al. (2018) evaluated the risk for reherniation in the first year after transforaminal endoscopic decompression in 46 consecutive male and 38 female patients. Four patients required microdiscectomy due to reherniation at 5 months, 8 months, 9 months, and 10 months postoperatively. All the patients in the series reportedly improved immediately following their endoscopic procedures, and no patients presented with symptoms suggestive of reherniation until 5 months after their initial endoscopic surgery. Patients with reherniation tended to be young: 31, 45, 48, and 49 years of age: all less than the average patient age who underwent endoscopic surgery. The 1-year reherniation rate in this study is 4.7%. According to the authors, this suggests that the benefit of this technique may be that it is ultra-minimally invasive, but it may only be equal, not superior to microdiscectomy in its rate of reherniation. The study was limited by lack of comparison group

and loss to follow up. RCTs with larger patient populations and longer follow-up periods are needed to further evaluate this technique in the treatment of LDH.

Pan et al. (2016) performed a prospective case series to investigate the clinical outcomes of transforaminal endoscopic system (TESSYS) for discogenic ILBP (DLBP). Consecutive patients (N=62) with one-level DLBP underwent TESSYS from January 2010 to December 2013 with a mean follow-up of 26.8 ± 4.2 months. The VAS was used for back pain, the ODI for lumbar function, and the modified MacNab criteria for clinical global outcomes. Twenty-four patients showed only inflammatory granuloma on annulus tear tissues (Group A), 16 patients showed no annulus tear but adhesion and inflammatory granuloma among the intracanal annulus fibrous posterior longitudinal ligament and the abdomen side of the dura sac (Group B) and 22 patients showed both (Group C). The success rate of group C was much higher than A and B. The whole success rate was 75.8%. Of the 4 patients with poor result, 2 refused further surgical treatment and showed either no improvement or worsening. The remaining 2 patients had spinal fusion surgery and achieved better results. VAS and ODI had significantly improved after surgery ($P < 0.01$). No unexpected complications were seen. The authors concluded that TESSYS is an effective method in treating DLBP. The findings of this study need to be validated by well-designed studies and are limited by lack of comparison group.

Sanusi et al. (2015) conducted a two-year retrospective case series of patients (n=201) who underwent transforaminal endoscopic discectomy at a tertiary neurosurgical center in the United Kingdom by a single surgeon. Mean time of onset of symptoms was 5.5 months and the most common level was L4/5 (53%). All endoscopic discectomies were performed under local anesthesia. The VAS of the pain dropped from an average of 7/10 pre-operatively to 0-1/10 in 95% of patients two weeks post operatively. Eighty-seven percent of the patients went back to their normal daily activities within two weeks. There were no cases of cerebrospinal fluid leak, hematoma formation or wound infection. One percent of patients developed a nerve root injury. 6% of patients had recurrent herniation and required microdiscectomy. The authors concluded that endoscopic discectomy can be an alternative approach to microdiscectomy and the data shows that the far lateral endoscopic discectomy using the TESSYS technique has comparable outcomes to microdiscectomy. The study is limited by its retrospective observations and lack of comparison group.

Thermal Intradiscal Procedures (TIPs)

There is insufficient quality evidence to support the use of thermal intradiscal procedures (TIPs) for treating discogenic pain. Further research with randomized controlled studies, larger patient sample sizes and long-term outcomes are required to demonstrate their safety and efficacy.

Intradiscal Electrothermal Therapy (IDET) and Intradiscal Biacuplasty (IDB)

In a retrospective case series of patients undergoing IDET for discogenic back pain, Kircelli et al. (2017) evaluated 12-month pain and functional outcomes and predictors of clinical success (N=120). The degree of disc degeneration was graded using the Dallas discogram score (DDS) during discography, and the presence of a high intensity zone (HIZ) on magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) was noted. The primary outcome measure was assessment of back pain severity based on the VAS; function was assessed by the ODI. Follow-up examinations for ODI and VAS scores were assessed at 1, 6, and 12 months post-treatment. Outcomes were discussed with respect to morphological changes in intervertebral discs on discogram. There was an average 57.39% and 47.16% improvement in VAS and ODI scores, respectively, between pretreatment and 12 months follow-up ($p < 0.0001$ for both comparisons). Predictors of 12-month clinical success was depended on DDS ($p < 0.0001$), a HIZ on MRI ($p < 0.0001$). In the authors' opinion, durable clinical improvements can be realized after IDET in select surgical candidates with mild disc degeneration and HIZ, discography, and low-grade DDS, with more effective treatment results. RCT and longer outcomes are needed to further evaluate IDET. The study is limited by a lack of comparison group undergoing a different therapeutic approach.

Helm et al. (2017) conducted a systematic review of thermal annular procedures in treating discogenic LBP. Four RCTs were included; there were no observational studies which met the inclusion criteria. Based upon 2 RCTs showing efficacy, with no negative trials, the authors identified Level I, or strong, evidence of the efficacy of biacuplasty in the treatment of chronic, refractory discogenic pain. Based upon one high-quality RCT showing efficacy and one moderate-quality RCT interpreted as showing no benefit, Level III, or moderate, evidence supporting the use of intradiscal electrothermal therapy (IDET) in treating chronic, refractory discogenic pain was identified. The evidence supporting the use of discTRODE is level V, or limited. This systematic review is limited by the low number of RCTs that met the inclusion criteria, small sample size, and the lack of clarity on the statistical significance of the findings.

Desai et al. (2017) reported 12 month outcomes on the subjects treated in the Desai et al. (2016) study cited below, including the participants who were allowed to cross-over to the surgery arm of the original RCT after six months of conservative treatment. Study eligibility was restricted to patients with single-level discogenic pain. The VAS mean baseline score was 6.7 and at 12 months the mean score was 4.4. The SF36-PF mean baseline score was 48 and at 12 months 62. The authors concluded that pain reduction at 12 months was statistically significant and clinically meaningful in the original IDB + CMM group compared to baseline. Limitations of this study included lack of comparison groups after the original six months of the study, lack of study subjects' blinding to the study arm within which they were randomized, and lack of sham intervention.

Desai et al. (2016, included in the Helm systematic review cited above) conducted a prospective, randomized, crossover; multicenter trial to evaluate comparative effectiveness of intradiscal biacuplasty (IDB) versus conventional medical management (CMM) in the treatment of lumbar discogenic pain. The primary outcome measure was the change in visual analog scale (VAS) after the initiation of each method from baseline to 6 months. Secondary outcome measures included treatment "responders" (the proportion of subjects with a 2-point or 30% decrease in VAS scores), the short form (SF) 36-Physical Functioning (SF36-PF), Oswestry Disability Index (ODI), Beck's Depression Index (BDI), Patient Global Impression of Change (PGIC) and Quality of Life (QOL) Index (EQ-5D), and back pain related medication usage. CMM included physical therapy, pharmacological management, interventional procedures (lumbar epidural injections, sacroiliac joint injections, and facet interventions), and lifestyle changes such as behavioral therapy, weight loss, and acupuncture. Out of 67 randomized participants who had been treated with IDB and CMM for chronic LBP of discogenic origin, 63-underwent IDB + CMM (N=29) or CMM-alone (N=34). Six months following continuous CMM-alone treatment, participants in this study group were permitted to "cross-over" to IDB + CMM (N=25), and followed for an additional 6 months. The six-month results showed in the IDB cohort, the mean VAS score reduction exceeded that in the CMM cohort (-2.4 vs. -0.56; P=0.02), and the proportion of treatment responders was substantially greater (50% vs. 18%). Differences in secondary measures favored IDB. No differences in opioid utilization were however noted between groups. The authors concluded that the superior performance of IDB with respect to all study outcomes suggests that it is a more effective treatment for discogenic pain than CMM-alone. Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) with larger patient populations are required to validate these results. The findings are limited by a lack of comparison to a sham procedure and, consequently, a possible placebo effect of the invasive procedure, compared to CMM. The findings are also limited by a loss to follow up of more than 20% at six month, which could have introduced a bias, considering the relatively small initial sample size and a possible differential loss to follow up.

Freeman et al. (2005, included in the Helm systematic review cited above) reported results of 57 patients who were randomized to either IDET (N=38) or sham (N=19). The objective of the study was to test the safety of IDET compared with sham treatment for LBP of at least 3 months duration. Study participants were chosen from consecutive patients of 3 spine surgeons if they satisfied eligibility criteria. Randomization occurred after catheter placement via sealed envelope by an independent technician who covertly connected the catheter if the patient was to receive active treatment. All subjects followed a common rehabilitation program. Patient evaluations occurred at 6 weeks and 6 months by an independent investigator. Outcomes measures were recorded at baseline and 6 months and included the VAS, LBP outcome score (LBOS), ODI, SF-36, Zung Depression index, the modified somatic perception questionnaire, sitting tolerance, work tolerance, medication, and the presence of any neurologic deficit. Success was defined a priori as a composite measure: no neurologic deficit resulting from the procedure, an improvement in the LBOS of 7 or more points, and an improvement in the SF-36 subscales of bodily pain and physical functioning of greater than 1 standard deviation from the mean. Sample size was calculated before the study and using a 2:1 allocation with 80 % power, 75 patients were required. The authors reported that no serious adverse events (AEs) occurred in either arm of the study, without defining serious AEs. The authors also reported, that "Transient radiculopathy (less than 6 weeks) was reported in 4 study participants who underwent IDET and in 1 study participant who underwent the sham procedure" and that no subject in either arm met criteria for successful outcome. The authors concluded that IDET was no more effective than placebo for the treatment of chronic discogenic LBP.

The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE, 2016b) recommendation states that the current evidence on percutaneous electrothermal treatment of the intervertebral disc annulus for LBP and sciatica raises no major safety concerns, but the evidence on efficacy is inconsistent and of poor quality.

Professional Societies

American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians (ASIPP)

An ASIPP evidence-based practice guideline in the management of chronic spinal pain (Manchikanti, et al., 2013a) states that the evidence for IDET and biacuplasty is limited to fair.

North American Spine Society (NASS)

In their clinical guideline on the diagnosis and treatment of lumbar disc herniation and radiculopathy, NASS (Kreiner, et al., 2014) concluded that there is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation for or against the use of percutaneous electrothermal disc decompression in the treatment of patients with lumbar disc herniation (LDH) with radiculopathy (Grade of Recommendation: I).

Percutaneous Intradiscal Radiofrequency Thermocoagulation (PIRFT)

Zhang and colleagues (2016) investigated the safety and efficacy of PIRFT for the treatment of discogenic LBP. Twenty-three patients with LBP who were treated with single-level bipolar radiofrequency thermocoagulation (RFTC) were included in this case series. The patients were assessed before the procedure and at 1 week, 1 month, 3 months, 6 months, and 1 year after the procedure. The primary outcome included the VAS score and the ODI score. The secondary outcome included pain relief, reduction of analgesic dose, and patient satisfaction. VAS and ODI scores were reported as significantly decreased after bipolar RFTC treatment at all-time points of follow-up ($p < 0.05$). A significant change was also reported in all secondary measures, such as pain relief, reduction of analgesic dose, and patient satisfaction. Three patients experienced mild short-term post-dural puncture headache, but the symptom disappeared within 1 week. No serious complications, such as nerve injuries, discitis, and hematoma, or neurological sequelae occurred in any of the patients. The authors concluded that bipolar RFTC treatment can significantly reduce pain and improve the function of patients with discogenic LBP. Limitations of this study include lack of a control group and the small sample size.

Lee et al. (2015) conducted a small pilot study to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of the L'DISQ device in patients with lumbar discogenic pain ($N=20$). Preliminary results of the L'DISQ device showed that at 48 weeks, the VAS improved, while the disability index, range of motion, and QOL index decreased significantly when compared with baseline values. However, the study was limited by the before-and-after study design, lack of randomization, and blinding, as well as lack of a comparator group. Additional studies are necessary to definitively evaluate the safety and efficacy of the L'DISQ device for treatment of lumbar discogenic pain.

In a prospective, parallel, gender stratified, double-blind placebo RCT, Kvarstein et al. (2009) evaluated the long-term effect and safety aspects of PIRFT with the discTRODE probe. A total of 20 patients with chronic LBP and a positive 1-level pressure-controlled provocation discography were randomized to either intra-annular PIRFT or intra-annular sham treatment. A blinded interim analysis was performed when 20 patients had been followed for 6 months. The 6-month analysis did not reveal any trend towards overall effect or difference between active and sham treatment for the primary endpoint: change in pain intensity (0 to 10). The inclusion of patients was therefore discontinued. After 12 months, the overall reduction from baseline pain had reached statistical significance, but there was no significant difference between the groups. The functional outcome measures (ODI, and SF 36 subscales and the relative change in pain) appeared more promising but did not reach statistical significance when compared with sham treatment. Two actively treated and 2 sham-treated patients reported increased pain levels, and in both groups a higher number was unemployed after 12 months. The study did not find evidence for a benefit of PIRFT, although it cannot rule out a moderate effect. The authors stated that considering the high number reporting increased pain in this study, they would not recommend intra-annular thermal therapy with the discTRODE probe.

Finch et al. (2005) studied 31 patients by heating of their annular tears with a flexible radiofrequency electrode placed across the posterior annulus and compared 15 patients with conservative management in a cohort study. The VAS decreased significantly after the radiofrequency treatment and this decrease persisted at 12 months follow-up. The VAS did not change over 12 months in untreated controlled subjects. The ODI also decreased in treated patients but not in control group subjects. This study is limited by lack of randomization, lack of sham procedure, and small sample size.

The NICE (2016c) guideline on PIRFT of the intervertebral disc nucleus for LBP, states that current evidence raises no major safety concerns. The evidence on its efficacy is limited in quantity and quality. NICE encourages further research into PIRFT of the intervertebral disc nucleus for LBP. Further research should include details of patient selection, the duration of patients'

symptoms, and a precise account of the technique used for treatment. Outcome measures should include pain relief and QOL. Long-term follow-up data should include details of any subsequent procedures.

Professional Societies

American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians (ASIPP)

The ASIPP practice guidelines on interventional techniques in the management of chronic spinal pain concludes that the evidence for radiofrequency posterior annuloplasty was limited for short-term improvement, and indeterminate for long-term improvement in managing chronic discogenic LBP (Boswell et al., 2007).

An updated ASIPP evidence-based practice guideline in the management of chronic spinal pain (Manchikanti, et al., 2013a) states that the evidence is limited for discTRODE (PIRFT). The ASIPP did not address radiofrequency posterior annuloplasty in this updated guideline.

North American Spine Society (NASS)

In their 2020 clinical guideline on the diagnosis and treatment of low back pain, NASS concluded that there is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation for or against the use of percutaneous intradiscal radiofrequency thermocoagulation.

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.

Percutaneous endoscopic lumbar discectomy (PELD) is a procedure and, therefore, not subject to FDA regulation. However, any medical devices, drugs, biologics, or tests used as a part of this procedure may be subject to FDA regulation. Please see the following website for more information on devices used for PELD (search by product code HRX): <http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmn.cfm>. (Accessed September 8, 2020)

Additional information for marketed devices indicated for closure of the annulus fibrosus can be found at <http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmn.cfm> under the following product codes:

- Product code: FTL (surgical mesh, polymeric)
- Product code: FTM (mesh, surgical)
- Product code: GAT (suture, nonabsorbable, synthetic, polyethylene)

(Accessed September 8, 2020)

FDA approved electrosurgical cutting and coagulation devices and accessories can be found (under product codes GEI, GXI, HRX, BSO and BSP) at: <http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmn.cfm>. (Accessed September 8, 2020)

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS)

Medicare does not cover Thermal Intradiscal Procedures (TIPs). Effective for services performed on or after September 29, 2008, CMS has determined that TIPs are not reasonable and necessary for the treatment of low back pain. Refer to the National Coverage Determination (NCD) for [Thermal Intradiscal Procedures \(TIPs\) \(150.11\)](#). Local Coverage Determinations (LCDs)/Local Coverage Articles (LCAs) do not exist at this time.

Medicare does not have an NCD for percutaneous discectomy and decompression procedures used to treat discogenic pain. LCDs/LCAs do not exist at this time.

Medicare does not have an NCD for annulus fibrosus repair following spinal surgery. LCDs/LCAs do not exist at this time. (Accessed September 17, 2020)

References

Bailey A, Araghi A, Blumenthal S, et al. Anular Repair Clinical Study Group. Prospective, multicenter, randomized, controlled study of anular repair in lumbar discectomy: two-year follow-up [published correction appears in Spine (Phila Pa 1976). 2013

Aug 1;38(17):1527]. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2013;38(14):1161-1169.

Bhagia SM, Slipman W, Nirschl M, et al. Side effects and complications after percutaneous disc decompression using coblation technology. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*. 2006;85(1):6-13.

Boswell MV, Trescot AM, Datta S, et al. American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians. Interventional techniques: evidence-based practice guidelines in the management of chronic spinal pain. 2007 Mar;10(2):381.

Brouwer PA, Brand R, van den Akker-van Marle ME, et al. Percutaneous laser disc decompression versus conventional microdiscectomy in sciatica: a randomized controlled trial. *Spine J*. 2015 May 1;15(5):857-65.

Chen J, Jing X, Li C, et al. Percutaneous endoscopic lumbar discectomy for L5/S1 lumbar disc herniation using a transforaminal approach versus an interlaminar approach: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *World Neurosurg*. 2018 Aug;116:412-420.

Cong, L, Zhu, Y, and Tu, G. A meta-analysis of endoscopic discectomy versus open discectomy for symptomatic lumbar disk herniation. *Eur Spine J*. 2015.

Desai MJ, Kapural L, Petersohn JD, et al. A prospective, randomized, multicenter, open-label clinical trial comparing intradiscal biacuplasty to conventional medical management for discogenic lumbar back pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2016 Jul 1;41(13):1065-74.

Desai MJ, Kapural L, Petersohn JD, et al. Twelve-month follow-up of a randomized clinical trial comparing intradiscal biacuplasty to conventional medical management for discogenic lumbar back pain. *Pain Med*. April 1, 2017; 18 (4); 751-763.

Finch PM, Price LM, Drummond PD. Radiofrequency heating of painful annular disruptions: one-year outcomes. *J Spinal Disord Tech* 2005; 18:6-13.

Freeman, B. J., Fraser, Robert D. et al., A randomized, double-blind, controlled trial: intradiscal electrothermal therapy versus placebo for the treatment of chronic discogenic low back pain. *Spine*. November 2005; v30 (21):2369-2377.

Gerszten PC, Welch WC, King JT Jr. Quality of life assessment in patients undergoing nucleoplasty-based percutaneous discectomy. *J Neurosurg Spine*. 2006;4(1):36-42.

Hayes, Inc. Health Technology Brief. Percutaneous Endoscopic Lumbar Discectomy for Primary Lumbar Disc Herniation. Lansdale, PA: Hayes, Inc.; March 2, 2017. Archived April 2020.

Hayes, Inc. Health Technology Brief. Percutaneous Endoscopic Lumbar Discectomy for Recurrent Lumbar Disc Herniation. Lansdale, PA: Hayes, Inc., March 23, 2017. Archived April 2020.

Hayes, Inc. Evidence Analysis Research Brief. Automated Percutaneous Lumbar Discectomy for Lumbar Disc Disease. Lansdale, PA: Hayes, Inc; September 2, 2020.

Hayes, Inc. Health Technology Assessment. Percutaneous Laser Disc Decompression for Lumbar Disc Herniation. Lansdale, PA: Hayes, Inc; March 2018. Updated July 2020.

Helm li S, Simopoulos TT, Stojanovic M, et al. Effectiveness of thermal annular procedures in treating discogenic low back pain. *Pain Physician*. 2017 Sep;20(6):447-470.

Helm li S, Deer TR, Manchikanti L, et al. Effectiveness of thermal annular procedures in treating discogenic low back pain. *Pain Physician*. 2012; 15(3):E279-304.

Helm S, Hayek SM, Benyamin RM, et al. Systematic review of the effectiveness of thermal annular procedures in treating discogenic low back pain. *Pain Physician*. 2009 Jan-Feb;12(1):207-32.

Hirsch JA, Singh V, Falco FJ, et al. Automated percutaneous lumbar discectomy for the contained herniated lumbar disc: a systematic assessment of evidence. *Pain Physician*. 2009 May-Jun; 12(3):601-20.

Huang Y, Yin J, Sun Z, et al. Percutaneous endoscopic lumbar discectomy for LDH via a transforaminal approach versus an interlaminar approach: a meta-analysis. *Orthopade*. 2019 Apr 15.

Kircelli A, Coven I, Cansever T, et al. Patient selection and efficacy of intradiscal electrothermal therapy with respect to the Dallas discogram score. *Turk Neurosurg*. 2017;27(4):623-630.

Klessinger S. The Frequency of Re-Surgery After Cervical Disc Nucleoplasty. *World Neurosurg*. 2018 Sep;117:e552-e556.

Kosztowski TA, Choi D, Fridley J, et al. Lumbar disc reherniation after transforaminal lumbar endoscopic discectomy. *Ann Transl Med*. 2018 Mar;6(6):106.

Kreiner DS, Hwang S, Easa J, et al. North American Spine Society (NASS). Evidence-Based Clinical guidelines for multidisciplinary spine care. Diagnosis and treatment of lumbar disc herniation and radiculopathy. 2014.

Kumar N, Kumar A, Siddharth M S, et al. Annulo-nucleoplasty using Disc-FX in the management of lumbar disc pathology: early results. *Int J Spine Surg*. 2014; 8:18. Published 2014 Dec 1.

Kuršumović A, Kienzler JC, Bouma GJ, et al. Morphology and clinical relevance of vertebral endplate changes following limited lumbar discectomy with or without bone-anchored annular closure. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2018;43(20):1386-1394.

Kvarstein G, Måwe L, Indahl A, et al. A randomized double-blind controlled trial of intra-annular radiofrequency thermal disc therapy – a 12-month follow-up. *Pain*. 2009; 145(3):279-286.

Ledic D, Vukas D, Grahovac G, et al. Effect of anular closure on disk height maintenance and reoperated recurrent herniation following lumbar discectomy: two-year data. *J Neurol Surg A Cent Eur Neurosurg*. 2015 May;76(3):211-8.

Lee SH, Derby R, Sul D, et al. Effectiveness of a new navigable percutaneous disc decompression device (L'DISQ) in patients with lumbar discogenic pain. *Pain Med*. 2015; 16(2):266-273.

Liliang PC, Lu K, Liang CL, et al. Nucleoplasty for treating lumbar disk degenerative low back pain: an outcome prediction analysis. *J Pain Res*. 2016 Oct 31;9:893-898.

Liu X, Yuan S, Tian Y, et al. Comparison of percutaneous endoscopic transforaminal discectomy, microendoscopic discectomy, and microdiscectomy for symptomatic lumbar disc herniation: minimum 2-year follow-up results. *J Neurosurg Spine*. 2018 Mar;28(3):317-325.

Long RG, Bürki A, Zysset P, et al. Mechanical restoration and failure analyses of a hydrogel and scaffold composite strategy for annulus fibrosus repair. *Acta Biomater*. 2016 Jan;30:116-125.

Manchikanti L, Abdi S, Atluri S, et al. An update of comprehensive evidence-based guidelines for interventional techniques in chronic spinal pain. Part II: guidance and recommendations. *Pain Physician*. 2013a Apr; 16(2Suppl):S49-283.

Manchikanti L, Falco F, Benyamin R, et al. An update of the systematic assessment of mechanical lumbar disc decompression with nucleoplasty. *Pain Physician* 2013b; 16:SE25-SE54.

Manchikanti L, Singh V, Falco FJ, et al. An updated review of automated percutaneous mechanical lumbar discectomy for the contained herniated lumbar disc. *Pain Physician*. 2013c Apr;16(2 Suppl):SE151-84.

Martins, DE, Astur, N, Kanas, M. Quality assessment of systematic reviews for surgical treatment of low back pain: an overview. *The Spine Journal* 16 (2016) 667–675.

Masala S, Massari F, Fabiano S, et al. Nucleoplasty in the treatment of lumbar diskogenic back pain: one year follow-up. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol*. 2007;30(3):426-432.

McCormick ZL, Slipman C, Kotcharian A, et al. Percutaneous lumbar disc decompression using the Dekompressor: A prospective long-term outcome study. *Pain Med*. 2016 Feb 25.

Mirzai H, Tekin I, Yaman O, et al. The results of nucleoplasty in patients with lumbar herniated disc: a prospective clinical study of 52 consecutive patients. *Spine J*. 2007;7(1):88-93.

Mo X, Shen J, Jiang W, et al. Percutaneous endoscopic lumbar discectomy for axillar herniation at L5-S1 via the transforaminal approach versus the interlaminar approach: a prospective clinical trial. *World Neurosurg*. 2019; 125:e508-e514.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Endoscopic laser foraminoplasty IPG31. London, UK: NICE; December 2003.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Percutaneous coblation of the intervertebral disc for low back pain and sciatica (IPG543). London, UK: NICE; January 2016a.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Percutaneous electrothermal treatment of the intervertebral disc annulus for low back pain and sciatica (IPG544). London, UK: NICE; January 2016b.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Percutaneous intradiscal radiofrequency treatment of the intervertebral disc nucleus for low back pain (IPG 545). London, UK: NICE; January 2016c.

Nie HY, Qi YB, Li N, et al. Comprehensive comparison of therapeutic efficacy of radiofrequency target disc decompression and nucleoplasty for lumbar disc herniation: a five-year follow-up. *Int Orthop*. 2018 Apr;42(4):843-849.

North American Spine Society (NASS). Evidence-Based Clinical guidelines for multidisciplinary spine care. Diagnosis and treatment of low back pain. 2020.

North American Spine Society (NASS) website. Spine Definitions.

<https://www.spine.org/KnowYourBack/Resources/Definitions>. Accessed September 8, 2020.

Pan F, Shen B, Chy SK, et al. Transforaminal endoscopic system technique for discogenic low back pain: A prospective Cohort study. *Int J Surg*. 2016 Sep 28;35:134-138.

Parker SL, Grahovac G, Vukas D, et al. Effect of an annular closure device (Barricaid) on same-level recurrent disk herniation and disk height loss after primary lumbar discectomy: two-year results of a multicenter prospective cohort study. *Clin Spine Surg*. 2016 Dec;29(10):454-460.

Ren DJ, Liu XM, Du SY, et al. Percutaneous nucleoplasty using coblation technique for the treatment of chronic nonspecific low back pain: 5-year follow-up results. *Chin Med J (Engl)*. 2015 Jul 20;128(14):1893-7.

Ruan W, Feng F, Liu Z, et al. Comparison of percutaneous endoscopic lumbar discectomy versus open lumbar microdiscectomy for lumbar disc herniation: a meta-analysis. *Int J Surg*. 2016 Jul;31:86-92.

Sanusi T, Davis J, Nicassio N, et al. Endoscopic lumbar discectomy under local anesthesia may be an alternative to microdiscectomy: A single centre's experience using the far lateral approach. *Clin Neurol Neurosurg*. 2015 Dec;139:324-7.

Tacconi L, Baldo S, Merci G, et al. Transforaminal percutaneous endoscopic lumbar discectomy: outcome and complications in 270 cases. *J Neurosurg Sci*. 2018 Mar 26. [Epub ahead of print].

Tacconi L, Signorelli F, Giordan E. Is full endoscopic lumbar discectomy less invasive than conventional surgery? A randomized MRI study. *World Neurosurg*. 2020;138:e867-e875.

Thomé C, Klassen PD, Bouma GJ, et al. Annular Closure RCT Study Group. Annular closure in lumbar microdiscectomy for prevention of reherniation: a randomized clinical trial. *Spine J*. 2018 Dec;18(12):2278-2287.

Wu J, Yu B, He B, et al. Outcome predictors of the transforaminal endoscopic spine system technique for single-level lumbar disk herniation. *J Neurol Surg A Cent Eur Neurosurg*. 2018 Apr 12. [Epub ahead of print].

Wu S, Li X, Lin C, et al. CT-guided nucleoplasty with radiofrequency energy for the treatment of lumbar disk herniation. *J Spinal Disord Tech*. 2015; 28(1):E9-E16.

Xu J, Li Y, Wang B, et al. Minimum 2-Year efficacy of percutaneous endoscopic lumbar discectomy versus microendoscopic discectomy: a meta-analysis. *World Neurosurg*. 2020; 138:19-26.

Yu P, Qiang H, Zhou J, Huang P. Percutaneous transforaminal endoscopic discectomy versus micro-endoscopic discectomy for lumbar disc herniation. *Med Sci Monit*. 2019; 25:2320-2328. Published 2019 Mar 30.

Zhang L, Ding XL, Zhao XL, et al. Fluoroscopy-guided bipolar radiofrequency thermocoagulation treatment for discogenic low back pain. *Chin Med J (Engl)*. 2016; 129(19):2313-2318.

Zhu H, Zhou XZ, Cheng MH, et al. The efficacy of coblation nucleoplasty for protrusion of lumbar intervertebral disc at a two-year follow-up. *Int Orthop*. 2011 Jan 15.

Policy History/Revision Information

Date	Summary of Changes
05/01/2021	Template Update <ul style="list-style-type: none">Replaced reference to “MCG™ Care Guidelines” with “InterQual® criteria” in <i>Instructions for Use</i>
02/01/2021	Template Update <ul style="list-style-type: none">Reformatted policy; transferred content to new template Related Policies <ul style="list-style-type: none">Added reference link to the Medical Policy titled <i>Ablative Treatment for Spinal Pain (for Tennessee Only)</i> Supporting Information <ul style="list-style-type: none">Updated <i>Description of Services</i>, <i>Clinical Evidence</i>, <i>CMS</i>, and <i>References</i> sections to reflect the most current informationArchived previous policy version CS031TN.L

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 may also use tools developed by third parties, such as the InterQual[®] criteria, to assist us in administering health benefits. The UnitedHealthcare Medical Policies are intended to be used in connection with the independent professional medical judgment of a qualified health care provider and do not constitute the practice of medicine or medical advice.