Decompression of the Intervertebral Disc Using Laser Energy (Laser Discectomy) or Radiofrequency Coblation (Nucleoplasty)

Description

Laser energy (laser discectomy) and radiofrequency coblation (nucleoplasty) are being evaluated for decompression of the intervertebral disc. For laser discectomy under fluoroscopic guidance, a needle or catheter is inserted into the disc nucleus, and a laser beam is directed through it to vaporize tissue. For disc nucleoplasty, bipolar radiofrequency energy is directed into the disc to ablate tissue. These minimally invasive procedures are being evaluated for the treatment of discogenic back pain.

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this evidence review is to evaluate whether laser discectomy or disc nucleoplasty with radiofrequency coblation improve the net health outcome in patients who have discogenic back pain.

POLICY STATEMENT

Laser discectomy and radiofrequency coblation (disc nucleoplasty) are considered investigative as techniques of disc decompression and treatment of associated pain.

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.
BENEFIT APPLICATION

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

FDA REGULATORY STATUS

A number of laser devices have been cleared for marketing by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through the 510(k) process for incision, excision, resection, ablation, vaporization, and coagulation of tissue. Intended uses described in FDA summaries include a wide variety of procedures, including percutaneous discectomy. Trimedyne received 510(k) clearance in 2002 for the Trimedyne Holmium Laser System Holmium:Yttrium, Aluminum Garnet (Holmium:YAG), in 2007 RevoLix Duo™ Laser System, and in 2009 Quanta System LITHO Laser System. All were cleared, based on equivalence with predicate devices for percutaneous laser disc decompression/discectomy, including foraminoplasty, percutaneous cervical disc decompression/discectomy, and percutaneous thoracic disc decompression/discectomy. The summary for the Trimedyne system states that indications for cervical and thoracic decompression/discectomy include uncomplicated ruptured or herniated discs, sensory changes, imaging consistent with findings, and symptoms unresponsive to 12 weeks of conservative treatment. Indications for treatment of cervical discs also include positive nerve conduction studies. FDA product code: GEX.

In 2001, the Perc-D SpineWand™ (ArthroCare) was cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process. FDA determined that this device was substantially equivalent to predicate devices. It is used in conjunction with the ArthroCare Coblation System 2000 for ablation, coagulation, and decompression of disc material to treat symptomatic patients with contained herniated discs. Smith & Nephew acquired ArthroCare in 2014; as of 2017, Smith & Nephew has not provided any information about coblation devices specific to spine surgeries on its website. FDA product code: GEI.

RATIONALE

Summary of Evidence

For individuals who have discogenic back pain or radiculopathy who receive laser discectomy, the evidence includes systematic reviews of observational studies. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, and treatment-related morbidity. While numerous case series and uncontrolled studies have reported improvements in pain levels and functioning following laser discectomy, the lack of well-designed and -conducted controlled trials limits interpretation of reported data. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effect of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have discogenic back pain or radiculopathy who receive disc nucleoplasty with radiofrequency coblation, the evidence includes RCTs and systematic reviews. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, and treatment-related morbidity. For nucleoplasty, there are 2 RCTs in addition to several uncontrolled studies. These RCTs are limited by the lack of blinding, an inadequate control condition in one, and inadequate data reporting in the second. The available evidence is insufficient to permit conclusions concerning the effect of these procedures on health outcomes due to multiple confounding factors that may bias results. High-quality randomized trials with adequate follow-up (at least 1 year), which control for selection bias, the placebo effect, and variability in the natural history of low back pain, are needed. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effect of the technology on health outcomes.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

In 2016, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence NICE) updated its guidance on laser lumbar discectomy for the treatment of sciatica. The guidance stated that current evidence “is inadequate in quantity and quality.”

NICE also updated its guidance on percutaneous disc decompression using coblation for lower back pain and sciatica in 2016. NICE stated: “Current evidence on percutaneous coblation of the intervertebral disc for low back pain and sciatica raises no major...”
safety concerns. The evidence on efficacy is adequate and includes large numbers of patients with appropriate follow-up periods." The guidance also noted that the patient should be informed of the range of treatment options available.

**American Pain Society**

American Pain Society practice guidelines (2009) on nonsurgical interventions for low back pain found that "there is insufficient (poor) evidence from randomized trials (conflicting trials, sparse and lower quality data, or no randomized trials) to reliably evaluate" a number of interventions including coblation.15,16.

**American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians**

Practice guidelines on lumbar disc compression and chronic spinal pain were published in 2009 and updated in 2013, respectively, by the American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians.17,18 The systematic reviews informing the 2013 guidelines found limited evidence for percutaneous laser disc decompression and limited to fair evidence for nucleoplasty.2,7.

**U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations**

Not applicable.

**Medicare National Coverage**

The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services have determined that thermal intradiscal procedures, including percutaneous (or plasma) disc decompression or coblation, are not reasonable and necessary for the treatment of low back pain. Therefore, thermal intradiscal procedures, which include procedures that "employ the use of a radiofrequency energy source or electrothermal energy to apply or create heat and/or disruption within the disc for the treatment of low back pain, are noncovered."19.

The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services has not published a national coverage decision on laser discectomy; however, the Centers did indicate the following in its decision on laser procedures:

"Medicare recognizes the use of lasers for many medical indications. Procedures performed with lasers are sometimes used in place of more conventional techniques. In the absence of a specific noncoverage instruction, and where a laser has been approved for marketing by the Food and Drug Administration, contractor discretion may be used to determine whether a procedure performed with a laser is reasonable and necessary and, therefore, covered."20.
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