



FEP Medical Policy Manual

FEP 6.01.38 Percutaneous Balloon Kyphoplasty, Radiofrequency Kyphoplasty, and Mechanical Vertebral Augmentation

Effective Policy Date: July 1, 2021

Original Policy Date: December 2011

Related Policies:

6.01.25 - Percutaneous Vertebroplasty and Sacroplasty

Percutaneous Balloon Kyphoplasty, Radiofrequency Kyphoplasty, and Mechanical Vertebral Augmentation

Description

Description

Percutaneous balloon kyphoplasty, radiofrequency kyphoplasty, and mechanical vertebral augmentation are interventional techniques involving the fluoroscopically guided injection of polymethyl methacrylate into a cavity created in the vertebral body with a balloon or mechanical device. These techniques have been investigated as options to provide mechanical support and symptomatic relief in patients with osteoporotic vertebral compression fracture or those with osteolytic lesions of the spine (ie, multiple myeloma, metastatic malignancies).

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this evidence review is to determine whether the use of balloon kyphoplasty, radiofrequency kyphoplasty, or mechanical vertebral augmentation improves the next health outcome for individuals who have osteoporotic vertebral compression fractures or osteolytic vertebral compression fractures.

POLICY STATEMENT

Balloon kyphoplasty may be considered **medically necessary** for the treatment of symptomatic thoracolumbar osteoporotic vertebral compression fractures that have failed to respond to conservative treatment (eg, analgesics, physical therapy, rest) for at least 6 weeks.

Mechanical vertebral augmentation with an FDA cleared device may be considered **medically necessary** for the treatment of symptomatic thoracolumbar osteoporotic vertebral compression fractures that have failed to respond to conservative treatment (eg, analgesics, physical therapy, rest) for at least 6 weeks.

Balloon kyphoplasty may be considered **medically necessary** for the treatment of severe pain due to osteolytic lesions of the spine related to multiple myeloma or metastatic malignancies.

Mechanical vertebral augmentation with an FDA cleared device may be considered **medically necessary** for the treatment of severe pain due to osteolytic lesions of the spine related to multiple myeloma or metastatic malignancies.

Balloon kyphoplasty or mechanical vertebral augmentation with an FDA cleared device are considered **investigational** for all other indications, including use in acute vertebral fractures due to osteoporosis or trauma.

Radiofrequency kyphoplasty is considered **investigational**.

Mechanical vertebral augmentation using any other device is considered **investigational**.

POLICY GUIDELINES

None

BENEFIT APPLICATION

Experimental or investigational procedures, treatments, drugs, or devices are not covered (See General Exclusion Section of brochure).

Percutaneous kyphoplasty may be performed by interventional radiologists or orthopedic surgeons. Percutaneous kyphoplasty is a specialized procedure, and thus some patients may seek an out-of-network referral.

FDA REGULATORY STATUS

Kyphoplasty is a surgical procedure and, as such, is not subject to regulation by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Polymethyl methacrylate bone cement was available as a drug product before enactment of the FDA's device regulation and was at first considered what the FDA termed a "transitional device." It was transitioned to a class III device and then to a class II device, which required future 510(k) submissions to meet "special controls" instead of "general controls" to assure safety and effectiveness. In July 2004, KyphX HV-RTM bone cement was cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process for the treatment of pathologic fractures of the vertebral body due to osteoporosis, cancer, or benign lesions using a balloon kyphoplasty procedure. Subsequently, other products such as Spine-Fix Biomimetic Bone Cement, KYPHON HV-R Bone Cement, and Osteopal V (Heraeus) have received 510(k) marketing clearance for the fixation of pathologic fractures of the vertebral body using vertebroplasty or kyphoplasty procedures.

Balloon kyphoplasty requires the use of an inflatable bone tamp. In July 1998, one such tamp, the KyphX inflatable bone tamp (Medtronic), was cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process. Additional devices for balloon kyphoplasty are listed in Table 1.

There are several mechanical vertebral augmentation devices that have received marketing clearance by the FDA through the 510(k) process; these are listed in Table 1.

StabiliT Vertebral Augmentation System (Merit Medical) for radiofrequency vertebral augmentation was cleared for marketing in 2009.

FDA product code NDN.

Table 1. Kyphoplasty and Mechanical Vertebral Augmentation Devices Cleared by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration

Device	Manufacturer	Date Cleared	510(k) No.	Indication
Balloon Kyphoplasty				
Joline Kyphoplasty System Allevo	Joline GmbH & Co.	5/27/2020	K192449	To repair vertebral compression fractures
TRACKER Kyphoplasty System	GS Medical Co., Ltd	12/4/2019	K192335	Reduction of fractures or creation of a void
Stryker iVAS Elite Inflatable Vertebral Augmentation System (Stryker iVAS Elite Balloon Catheter)	Stryker Corporation	12/21/2018	K181752	To repair vertebral compression fractures
SpineKure Kyphoplasty System	Hanchang Co. Ltd.	5/29/2018	K172871	To repair vertebral compression fractures
Modified Winch Kyphoplasty (15 and 20 mm) 11 Gauge Balloon Catheters	G-21 s.r.l.	8/23/2017	K172214	To repair vertebral compression fractures
13G InterV Kyphoplasty Catheter (Micro) and 11G InterV Kyphoplasty Catheter (Mini-Flex)	Pan Medical Ltd.	11/1/2016	K162453	To repair vertebral compression fractures
MEDINAUT Kyphoplasty System	Imedicom Co. Ltd.	7/29/2016	K153296	To repair vertebral compression fractures
AVAflex Vertebral Balloon System	Carefusion	11/24/2015	K151125	To repair vertebral compression fractures
Osseoflex SB Straight Balloon 10g/4ml Osseoflex SB Straight Balloon 10g/2ml	Osseon LLC	4/9/2015	K150607	To repair vertebral compression fractures
InterV Kyphoplasty Catheter (Balloon Length: 1015 and 20mm) InterV Kyphoplasty Catheter (Mini) (Balloon Length: 10 15 and 20mm)	Pan Medical Ltd.	3/6/2015	K150322	To repair vertebral compression fractures
GUARDIAN-SG Inflatable Bone Expander System	BM Korea Co. Ltd.	1/16/2015	K143006	To repair vertebral compression fractures
ZVPLASTY	Zavation LLC	9/12/2014	K141419	To repair vertebral compression fractures
Mechanical Vertebral Augmentation				
Kiva VCF Treatment System	Benvenue Medical Inc.	8/14/2014	K141141	To repair vertebral compression fractures
SpineJack Expansion Kit	Vexim SA	8/30/2018	K181262	To repair vertebral compression fractures
V-Strut Vertebral Implant	Hyprevention SAS	3/5/2020	K191709	Treatment of vertebral fractures in the thoracic and lumbar spine

RATIONALE

Summary of Evidence

For individuals who have osteoporotic vertebral compression fracture who receive balloon kyphoplasty, or mechanical vertebral augmentation (Kiva), the evidence includes randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and meta-analyses. Relevant outcomes include symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, hospitalizations, and treatment-related morbidity. A meta-analysis and moderately sized unblinded RCT have compared kyphoplasty with conservative care and found short-term benefits in pain and other outcomes. One systematic review of RCTs found no significant difference in subsequent fracture between vertebroplasty and conservative treatment, and another systematic review of prospective and retrospective studies reported improved mortality with either vertebroplasty or balloon kyphoplasty compared with conservative treatment. Other RCTs, summarized in a meta-analysis, have reported similar outcomes for kyphoplasty and vertebroplasty. Three randomized trials that compared mechanical vertebral augmentation (Kiva or SpineJack) with kyphoplasty have reported similar outcomes for both procedures. A major limitation of all these RCTs is the lack of a sham procedure. Due to the possible sham effect observed in the recent trials of vertebroplasty, the validity of the results from non-sham-controlled trials is unclear. Therefore, whether these improvements represent a true treatment effect is uncertain. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have osteolytic vertebral compression fracture who receive balloon kyphoplasty or mechanical vertebral augmentation, the evidence includes RCTs, case series, and a systematic review of these studies. Relevant outcomes include symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, hospitalizations, and treatment-related morbidity. Two RCTs have compared balloon kyphoplasty with conservative management, and another has compared Kiva with balloon kyphoplasty. Results of these trials, along with case series, would suggest a reduction in pain, disability, and analgesic use in patients with cancer-related compression fractures. However, because the results of the comparative studies of vertebroplasty have suggested possible placebo or natural history effects, the evidence these studies provide is insufficient to warrant conclusions about the effect of kyphoplasty on health outcomes. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have osteoporotic or osteolytic vertebral compression fracture who receive radiofrequency kyphoplasty, the evidence includes a systematic review and an RCT. Relevant outcomes include symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, hospitalizations, and treatment-related morbidity. The only RCT (N =80) identified showed similar results between radiofrequency kyphoplasty and balloon kyphoplasty. The systematic review suggested that radiofrequency kyphoplasty is superior to balloon kyphoplasty in pain relief, but the review itself was limited by the inclusion of a small number of studies as well as possible bias. Corroboration of these results in a larger number of patients would be needed to determine with greater certainty whether radiofrequency kyphoplasty provides outcomes similar to balloon kyphoplasty. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

Guidelines or position statements will be considered for inclusion in "Supplemental Information" if they were issued by, or jointly by, a US professional society, an international society with US representation, or National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Priority will be given to guidelines that are informed by a systematic review, include strength of evidence ratings, and include a description of management of conflict of interest.

American College of Radiology et al

The American College of Radiology (2014) and 7 other surgical and radiologic specialty associations published a joint position statement on percutaneous vertebral augmentation.³⁰ This document stated that percutaneous vertebral augmentation, using vertebroplasty or kyphoplasty and performed in a manner consistent with public standards, is a safe, efficacious, and durable procedure in appropriate patients with symptomatic osteoporotic and neoplastic fractures. The statement also indicated that these procedures be offered only when nonoperative medical therapy has not provided adequate pain relief, or pain is significantly altering the patient's quality of life.

A joint practice parameter for the performance of vertebral augmentation was updated in 2017.³¹

Society of Interventional Radiology

In a quality improvement guideline on percutaneous vertebroplasty from the Society of Interventional Radiology (2014) vertebral augmentation was recommended for compression fractures refractory to medical therapy.³⁰ Failure of medical therapy includes the following situations:

1. Patients who are "rendered nonambulatory as a result of pain from a weakened or fractured vertebral body, pain persisting at a level that prevents ambulation despite 24 hours of analgesic therapy";
2. Patients with "sufficient pain from a weakened or fractured vertebral body that physical therapy is intolerable, pain persisting at that level despite 24 hours of analgesic therapy"; or
3. Patients with "a weakened or fractured vertebral body, unacceptable side effects such as excessive sedation, confusion, or constipation as a result of the analgesic therapy necessary to reduce pain to a tolerable level."

American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons

The American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (2010) approved clinical guidelines on the treatment of osteoporotic spinal compression fractures, which had a weak recommendation for offering kyphoplasty to patients who "present with an osteoporotic spinal compression fracture on imaging with correlating clinical signs and symptoms...and who are neurologically intact."³² The American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons indicated that future evidence could overturn existing evidence and that the quality of the current literature is poor. These recommendations were based on the literature reviewed through September 2009.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2013) issued a guidance that recommended percutaneous vertebroplasty and percutaneous balloon kyphoplasty as treatment options for treating osteoporotic vertebral compression fractures in persons having severe, ongoing pain after a recent unhealed vertebral fracture, despite optimal pain management, and whose pain has been confirmed through physical exam and imaging at the level of the fracture.³³ This guidance did not address balloon kyphoplasty with stenting, because the manufacturer of the stenting system (Synthes) stated there is limited evidence for vertebral body stenting given that the system had only recently become available.

The Institute (2008) issued guidance on the diagnosis and management of adults with metastatic spinal cord compression. It was last reviewed in 2014, and placed on the static list (no major ongoing studies identified, with the next review in 5 years).³⁴ The guidance stated that vertebroplasty or kyphoplasty should be considered for patients who have vertebral metastases, and no evidence of spinal cord compression or spinal instability if they have mechanical pain resistant to conventional pain management and vertebral body collapse. Surgery should only be performed when all appropriate specialists, agree. Despite a relatively small sample base, the Institute concluded the evidence suggests, in a select subset of patients, that early surgery may be more effective at maintaining mobility than radiotherapy.

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations

Not applicable.

Medicare National Coverage

There is no national coverage determination. In the absence of a national coverage determination, coverage decisions are left to the discretion of local Medicare carriers.

REFERENCES

1. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Percutaneous Vertebroplasty. TEC Assessments. 2000;Volume 15:Tab 21.

2. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Percutaneous kyphoplasty for vertebral fractures caused by osteoporosis and malignancy. TEC Assessments. 2004;Volume 19:Tab 12.
3. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Percutaneous kyphoplasty for vertebral fractures caused by osteoporosis or malignancy. TEC Assessments. 2005;Volume 20:Tab 7.
4. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Percutaneous vertebroplasty or kyphoplasty for vertebral fractures caused by osteoporosis or malignancy. TEC Assessments. 2008;Volume 23:Tab 5.
5. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Percutaneous vertebroplasty or kyphoplasty for vertebral fractures caused by osteoporosis. TEC Assessments. 2009;Volume 24:Tab 7.
6. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Percutaneous vertebroplasty or kyphoplasty for vertebral fractures caused by osteoporosis. TEC Assessments. 2010;Volume 25:Tab 9.
7. Jarvik JG, Deyo RA. Cementing the evidence: time for a randomized trial of vertebroplasty. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Sep 2000; 21(8): 1373-4. PMID 11003266
8. Moerman DE, Jonas WB. Deconstructing the placebo effect and finding the meaning response. *Ann Intern Med*. Mar 19 2002; 136(6): 471-6. PMID 11900500
9. Hrobjartsson A, Gotzsche PC. Is the placebo powerless? An analysis of clinical trials comparing placebo with no treatment. *N Engl J Med*. May 24 2001; 344(21): 1594-602. PMID 11372012
10. Vase L, Riley JL, Price DD. A comparison of placebo effects in clinical analgesic trials versus studies of placebo analgesia. *Pain*. Oct 2002; 99(3): 443-452. PMID 12406519
11. Buchbinder R, Osborne RH, Ebeling PR, et al. A randomized trial of vertebroplasty for painful osteoporotic vertebral fractures. *N Engl J Med*. Aug 06 2009; 361(6): 557-68. PMID 19657121
12. Kallmes DF, Comstock BA, Heagerty PJ, et al. A randomized trial of vertebroplasty for osteoporotic spinal fractures. *N Engl J Med*. Aug 06 2009; 361(6): 569-79. PMID 19657122
13. Zhao S, Xu CY, Zhu AR, et al. Comparison of the efficacy and safety of 3 treatments for patients with osteoporotic vertebral compression fractures: A network meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. Jun 2017; 96(26): e7328. PMID 28658144
14. Hinde K, Maingard J, Hirsch JA, et al. Mortality Outcomes of Vertebral Augmentation (Vertebroplasty and/or Balloon Kyphoplasty) for Osteoporotic Vertebral Compression Fractures: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Radiology*. Apr 2020; 295(1): 96-103. PMID 32068503
15. Sun HB, Jing XS, Tang H, et al. Clinical and radiological subsequent fractures after vertebral augmentation for treating osteoporotic vertebral compression fractures: a meta-analysis. *Eur Spine J*. Oct 2020; 29(10): 2576-2590. PMID 32776263
16. Eddin AA, Ong KL, Lau E, et al. Mortality risk for operated and nonoperated vertebral fracture patients in the medicare population. *J Bone Miner Res*. Jul 2011; 26(7): 1617-26. PMID 21308780
17. Ong KL, Beall DP, Frohbergh M, et al. Were VCF patients at higher risk of mortality following the 2009 publication of the vertebroplasty sham trials?. *Osteoporos Int*. Feb 2018; 29(2): 375-383. PMID 29063215
18. Wardlaw D, Cummings SR, Van Meirhaeghe J, et al. Efficacy and safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-surgical care for vertebral compression fracture (FREE): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. Mar 21 2009; 373(9668): 1016-24. PMID 19246088
19. Boonen S, Van Meirhaeghe J, Bastian L, et al. Balloon kyphoplasty for the treatment of acute vertebral compression fractures: 2-year results from a randomized trial. *J Bone Miner Res*. Jul 2011; 26(7): 1627-37. PMID 21337428
20. Van Meirhaeghe J, Bastian L, Boonen S, et al. A randomized trial of balloon kyphoplasty and nonsurgical management for treating acute vertebral compression fractures: vertebral body kyphosis correction and surgical parameters. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. May 20 2013; 38(12): 971-83. PMID 23446769
21. Tutton SM, Pflugmacher R, Davidian M, et al. KAST Study: The Kiva System As a Vertebral Augmentation Treatment-A Safety and Effectiveness Trial: A Randomized, Noninferiority Trial Comparing the Kiva System With Balloon Kyphoplasty in Treatment of Osteoporotic Vertebral Compression Fractures. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. Jun 15 2015; 40(12): 865-75. PMID 25822543
22. Korovessis P, Vardakastanis K, Repantis T, et al. Balloon kyphoplasty versus KIVA vertebral augmentation--comparison of 2 techniques for osteoporotic vertebral body fractures: a prospective randomized study. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. Feb 15 2013; 38(4): 292-9. PMID 23407406
23. Noriega D, Marcia S, Theumann N, et al. A prospective, international, randomized, noninferiority study comparing an implantable titanium vertebral augmentation device versus balloon kyphoplasty in the reduction of vertebral compression fractures (SAKOS study). *Spine J*. Nov 2019; 19(11): 1782-1795. PMID 31325625
24. Pron G, Holubowich C, Kaulback K. Vertebral Augmentation Involving Vertebroplasty or Kyphoplasty for Cancer-Related Vertebral Compression Fractures: A Systematic Review. *Ont Health Technol Assess Ser*. 2016; 16(11): 1-202. PMID 27298655
25. Berenson J, Pflugmacher R, Jarzem P, et al. Balloon kyphoplasty versus non-surgical fracture management for treatment of painful vertebral body compression fractures in patients with cancer: a multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Oncol*. Mar 2011; 12(3): 225-35. PMID 21333599
26. Korovessis P, Vardakastanis K, Vitsas V, et al. Is Kiva implant advantageous to balloon kyphoplasty in treating osteolytic metastasis to the spine? Comparison of 2 percutaneous minimal invasive spine techniques: a prospective randomized controlled short-term study. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. Feb 15 2014; 39(4): E231-9. PMID 24253785
27. Petersen A, Hartwig E, Koch EM, et al. Clinical comparison of postoperative results of balloon kyphoplasty (BKP) versus radiofrequency-targeted vertebral augmentation (RF-TVA): a prospective clinical study. *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol*. Jan 2016; 26(1): 67-75. PMID 26482590
28. Feng L, Shen JM, Feng C, et al. Comparison of radiofrequency kyphoplasty (RFK) and balloon kyphoplasty (BKP) in the treatment of vertebral compression fractures: A meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. Jun 2017; 96(25): e7150. PMID 28640091
29. Yi X, Lu H, Tian F, et al. Recompression in new levels after percutaneous vertebroplasty and kyphoplasty compared with conservative treatment. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg*. Jan 2014; 134(1): 21-30. PMID 24287674

30. Baerlocher MO, Saad WE, Dariushnia S, et al. Quality improvement guidelines for percutaneous vertebroplasty. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. Feb 2014; 25(2): 165-70. PMID 24238815
31. ACR-ASNR-ASSR-SIR-SNIS Practice Parameter for the Performance of Vertebral Augmentation. Available at <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/VertebralAug.pdf>. Accessed February 22, 2021.
32. American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS). The treatment of symptomatic osteoporotic spinal compression fractures: Summary of Recommendations. 2010; <https://www.maine-general.org/app/files/public/921/aaossummary.pdf>. Accessed February 22, 2021.
33. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Percutaneous vertebroplasty and percutaneous balloon kyphoplasty for treating osteoporotic vertebral compression fractures [TA279]. 2013; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ta279>. Accessed February 22, 2021.
34. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Metastatic spinal cord compression in adults: risk assessment, diagnosis and management [CG75]. 2014; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg75/chapter/1-Guidance>. Accessed February 22, 2021.

POLICY HISTORY - THIS POLICY WAS APPROVED BY THE FEP® PHARMACY AND MEDICAL POLICY COMMITTEE ACCORDING TO THE HISTORY BELOW:

Date	Action	Description
December 2011	New policy	
June 2013	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through March 5, 2013; references 17, 30, 31 added and references reordered; statement added that all other percutaneous mechanical vertebral augmentation devices, including but not limited to Kiva, are considered investigational.
June 2014	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review, references 31-32, 34-35, 37-39, 41 and 42 added; and others reordered. Vertebral body stenting added to investigational statement. Added policy statement that percutaneous balloon kyphoplasty for all other indication is considered investigational.
June 2015	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review; references 32-34 added; Kiva considered medically necessary
March 2017	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review. Rationale revised; some references removed. The last investigational policy statement was revised to delete the wording, "including but not limited to vertebral body stenting".
September 2017	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through June 22, 2017; references 20 and 24 added. Radiofrequency kyphoplasty added to title and investigational statement.
June 2018	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through February 22, 2018; references 19 and 25 added. Policy statements unchanged.
June 2019	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through February 7, 2019; references 32-33 added. Policy statements unchanged.
June 2020	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through February 18, 2020; references added. Policy statements clarified that the medically necessary statements on compression fractures apply to the thoracolumbar spine. The tradename "Kiva" was removed from policy statements..
June 2021	Replace policy	Policy updated with literature review through February 18, 2021; references added. Policy statements unchanged.

The policies contained in the FEP Medical Policy Manual are developed to assist in administering contractual benefits and do not constitute medical advice. They are not intended to replace or substitute for the independent medical judgment of a practitioner or other health care professional in the treatment of an individual member. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association does not intend by the FEP Medical Policy Manual, or by any particular medical policy, to recommend, advocate, encourage or discourage any particular medical technologies. Medical decisions relative to medical technologies are to be made strictly by members/patients in consultation with their health care providers. The conclusion that a particular service or supply is medically necessary does not constitute a representation or warranty that the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Service Benefit Plan covers (or pays for) this service or supply for a particular member.