

(70187)

Medical Benefit		Effective Date: 01/01/08	Next Review Date: 01/18
Preauthorization	No	Review Dates: 06/07, 07/08, 05/09, 01/10, 01/11, 01/12, 01/13, 01/14, 01/15, 01/16, 01/17	

This protocol considers this test or procedure investigational. If the physician feels this service is medically necessary, preauthorization is recommended.

The following protocol contains medical necessity criteria that apply for this service. The criteria are also applicable to services provided in the local Medicare Advantage operating area for those members, unless separate Medicare Advantage criteria are indicated. If the criteria are not met, reimbursement will be denied and the patient cannot be billed. Please note that payment for covered services is subject to eligibility and the limitations noted in the patient's contract at the time the services are rendered.

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With lumbar degenerative disc disease 	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lumber artificial intervertebral disc 	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conservative therapy Lumbar spinal fusion 	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Symptoms Functional outcomes Quality of life Treatment-related morbidity

Description

Total disc replacement, using an artificial intervertebral disc designed for the lumbar spine, is proposed as an alternative to fusion in patients with persistent and disabling degenerative disc disease.

Summary of Evidence

The evidence for the lumbar artificial intervertebral disc in individuals who have lumbar degenerative disc disease includes randomized controlled trials (RCTs) with five-year outcomes and case series with longer term outcomes. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. The Charité disc has been withdrawn from the U.S. market, and its successor, the INMOTION, is not marketed in the United States. Five-year outcomes for the ProDisc-L RCT have provided evidence for the noninferiority of artificial disc replacement. Superiority of ProDisc-L with circumferential fusion was achieved at two but not five years in this unblinded trial. At this time, the potential benefits of the artificial disc (e.g., faster recovery, reduced adjacent-level disc degeneration) have not been demonstrated. In addition, considerable uncertainty remains whether response rates will continue to decline over longer time periods and long-term complications with these implants will emerge. Some randomized trials have concluded that this technology is noninferior to fusion, but outcomes that would make noninferiority sufficient to demonstrate the clinical benefit of the artificial lumbar disc have not been established. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Policy

Artificial intervertebral discs of the lumbar spine are considered **investigational**.

Background

When conservative treatment of degenerative disc disease (DDD) fails, a common surgical approach is spinal fusion; more than 200,000 spinal fusions are performed each year. However, outcomes with spinal fusion have been controversial, in part due to the difficulty in determining if a patient's back pain is related to DDD and in part due to the success of the procedure itself. In addition, spinal fusion alters the spine biomechanics, potentially leading to premature disc degeneration at adjacent levels, a particular concern for younger patients. During the past 30 years, various artificial intervertebral discs have been investigated as an alternative approach to fusion. This approach, also referred to as total disc replacement or spinal arthroplasty, is intended to maintain motion at the operative level once the damaged disc has been removed and normal biomechanics of the adjacent vertebrae.

Potential candidates for artificial disc replacement have chronic low back pain attributed to DDD, lack of improvement with nonoperative treatment, and none of the contraindications for the procedure, which include multilevel disease, spinal stenosis, spondylolisthesis, scoliosis, previous major spine surgery, neurologic symptoms, and other minor contraindications. These contraindications make artificial disc replacement suitable for a subset of patients for whom fusion is indicated. Patients who require procedures in addition to fusion (e.g., laminectomy, decompression) are not candidates for the artificial disc.

Use of a motion-preserving artificial disc increases the potential for various types of implant failure. They include device failure (device fracture, dislocation, or wear), bone-implant interface failure (subsidence, dislocation-migration, vertebral body fracture), and host response to the implant (osteolysis, heterotopic ossification, pseudotumor formation).

Regulatory Status

While a number of artificial intervertebral discs in the lumbar spine have been used internationally, only three devices (activL[®], Charité[®], ProDisc[®]-L) have been approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through the premarket approval process. Because the long-term safety and effectiveness of these devices were not known, approval was contingent on completion of postmarketing studies. The activL[®] (Aesculap Implant Systems), Charité[®] (DePuy), and ProDisc[®]-L (Synthes Spine) devices are indicated for spinal arthroplasty in skeletally mature patients with DDD at one level; activL[®] and Charité[®] are approved for use in levels L4-S1; and ProDisc[®]-L is approved for use in levels L3-S1. DDD is defined as discogenic back pain with degeneration of the disc confirmed by patient history and radiographs. The INMOTION[®] lumbar artificial disc (DePuy Spine) is a modification of the Charité[®] device with a change in name under the same premarket approval. Production under the name Charité[®] was stopped in 2010. The INMOTION[®] is not currently marketed in the United States. The Maverick[™] artificial disc (Medtronic) is not marketed in the United States due to patent infringement litigation. The metal-on-metal FlexiCore[®] artificial disc (Stryker Spine) has completed the investigational device exemption trial as part of the FDA approval process and is currently being used under continued access. (Artificial intervertebral discs for treating the cervical spine are considered in the Artificial Intervertebral Disc: Cervical Spine Protocol). Kineflex-L[™] (Spinal Motion) is a three-piece, modular, metal-on-metal implant. An FDA advisory committee meeting on the Kineflex-L was scheduled for July 2013, but was cancelled without explanation. FDA product code: MJO.

Related Protocol

Artificial Intervertebral Disc: Cervical Spine

Services that are the subject of a clinical trial do not meet our Technology Assessment Protocol criteria and are considered investigational. *For explanation of experimental and investigational, please refer to the Technology Assessment Protocol.*

It is expected that only appropriate and medically necessary services will be rendered. We reserve the right to conduct prepayment and postpayment reviews to assess the medical appropriateness of the above-referenced procedures. **Some of this protocol may not pertain to the patients you provide care to, as it may relate to products that are not available in your geographic area.**

References

We are not responsible for the continuing viability of web site addresses that may be listed in any references below.

1. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Artificial vertebral disc replacement. TEC Assessments. 2005; Volume 20, Tab 1.
2. Blumenthal S, McAfee PC, Guyer RD, et al. A prospective, randomized, multicenter Food and Drug Administration investigational device exemptions study of lumbar total disc replacement with the CHARITE artificial disc versus lumbar fusion: part I: evaluation of clinical outcomes. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. Jul 15 2005; 30(14):1565-1575; discussion E1387-1591. PMID16025024
3. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Draft of PRODISC-L Total Disc Replacement package insert. http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf5/P050010c.pdf. Accessed November, 2014.
4. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. PRODISC-L Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data. http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf5/P050010b.pdf. Accessed November, 2014.
5. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Artificial lumbar disc replacement. TEC Assessments. 2007; Volume 22, Tab 2.
6. van den Eerenbeemt KD, Ostelo RW, van Royen BJ, et al. Total disc replacement surgery for symptomatic degenerative lumbar disc disease: a systematic review of the literature. *Eur Spine J*. Aug 2010; 19(8):1262-1280. PMID 20508954
7. Yajun W, Yue Z, Xiuxin H, et al. A meta-analysis of artificial total disc replacement versus fusion for lumbar degenerative disc disease. *Eur Spine J*. Aug 2010; 19(8):1250-1261. PMID 20364392
8. Wang JC, Arnold PM, Hermsmeyer JT, et al. Do lumbar motion preserving devices reduce the risk of adjacent segment pathology compared with fusion surgery? A systematic review. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. Oct 15 2012; 37(22 Suppl):S133-143. PMID 22872221
9. Berg S, Tullberg T, Branth B, et al. Total disc replacement compared to lumbar fusion: a randomised controlled trial with 2-year follow-up. *Eur Spine J*. Oct 2009; 18(10):1512-1519. PMID 19506919
10. Guyer RD, McAfee PC, Banco RJ, et al. Prospective, randomized, multicenter Food and Drug Administration investigational device exemption study of lumbar total disc replacement with the CHARITE artificial disc versus lumbar fusion: five-year follow-up. *Spine J*. May 2009; 9(5):374-386. PMID 18805066
11. Jacobs W, Van der Gaag NA, Tuschel A, et al. Total disc replacement for chronic back pain in the presence of disc degeneration. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2012; 9:CD008326. PMID22972118
12. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Artificial lumbar disc arthroplasty. TEC Assessments. 2013; Volume 28, Tab 7.

13. Putzier M, Funk JF, Schneider SV, et al. Charite total disc replacement--clinical and radiographical results after an average follow-up of 17 years. *Eur Spine J.* Feb 2006; 15(2):183-195. PMID 16254716
14. Guyer RD, Pettine K, Roh JS, et al. Comparison of 2 lumbar total disc replacements: results of a prospective, randomized, controlled, multicenter Food and Drug Administration trial with 24-month follow-up. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* May 20, 2014; 39(12):925-931. PMID 24718066
15. Guyer RD, Shellock J, MacLennan B, et al. Early failure of metal-on-metal artificial disc prostheses associated with lymphocytic reaction: diagnosis and treatment experience in four cases. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* Apr 1 2011; 36(7):E492-497. PMID 21252827
16. Guyer RD, Pettine K, Roh JS, et al. Five-Year Follow-Up of a Prospective, Randomized Trial Comparing Two Lumbar Total Disc Replacements. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* Jan 2016; 41(1):3-8. PMID 26335669
17. Zigler J, Delamarter R, Spivak JM, et al. Results of the prospective, randomized, multicenter Food and Drug Administration investigational device exemption study of the ProDisc-L total disc replacement versus circumferential fusion for the treatment of 1-level degenerative disc disease. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* May 15, 2007; 32(11):1155-1162; discussion 1163. PMID 17495770
18. Zigler JE, Delamarter RB. Five-year results of the prospective, randomized, multicenter, Food and Drug Administration investigational device exemption study of the ProDisc-L total disc replacement versus circumferential arthrodesis for the treatment of single-level degenerative disc disease. *J Neurosurg Spine.* Dec 2012; 17(6):493-501. PMID 23082846
19. Zigler JE, Glenn J, Delamarter RB. Five-year adjacent-level degenerative changes in patients with single-level disease treated using lumbar total disc replacement with ProDisc-L versus circumferential fusion. *J Neurosurg Spine.* Dec 2012; 17(6):504-511. PMID 23082849
20. Delamarter R, Zigler JE, Balderston RA, et al. Prospective, randomized, multicenter Food and Drug Administration investigational device exemption study of the ProDisc-L total disc replacement compared with circumferential arthrodesis for the treatment of two-level lumbar degenerative disc disease: results at twenty-four months. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* Apr 20 2011; 93(8):705-715. PMID 21398574
21. Schoenfeld AJ. Commentary on an article by Rick Delamarter, MD, et al.: "Prospective, randomized, multicenter Food and Drug Administration investigational device exemption study of the ProDisc-L total disc replacement compared with circumferential arthrodesis for the treatment of two-level degenerative lumbar disc disease. Results at twenty-four months". *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* Apr 20 2011; 93(8):e41. PMID 21398573
22. Garcia R, Jr., Yue JJ, Blumenthal S, et al. Lumbar Total Disc Replacement for Discogenic Low Back Pain: Two-year Outcomes of the activL Multicenter Randomized Controlled IDE Clinical Trial. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* Dec 2015; 40(24):1873-1881. PMID 26630435
23. Gornet MF, Burkus JK, Dryer RF, et al. Lumbar disc arthroplasty with MAVERICK disc versus stand-alone interbody fusion: a prospective, randomized, controlled, multicenter investigational device exemption trial. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* Dec 1 2011; 36(25):E1600-1611. PMID 21415812
24. Sasso RC, Foulk DM, Hahn M. Prospective, randomized trial of metal-on-metal artificial lumbar disc replacement: initial results for treatment of discogenic pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* Jan 15 2008; 33(2):123-131. PMID 18197095
25. Skold C, Tropp H, Berg S. Five-year follow-up of total disc replacement compared to fusion: a randomized controlled trial. *Eur Spine J.* Oct 2013; 22(10):2288-2295. PMID 23893083
26. Berg S, Tropp HT, Leivseth G. Disc height and motion patterns in the lumbar spine in patients operated with total disc replacement or fusion for discogenic back pain. Results from a randomized controlled trial. *Spine J.* Nov 2011; 11(11):991-998. PMID 21978518
27. Hoff EK, Strube P, Pumberger M, et al. ALIF and total disc replacement versus 2-level circumferential fusion with TLIF: a prospective, randomized, clinical and radiological trial. *Eur Spine J.* Mar 7 2015. PMID 25749689
28. Siepe CJ, Heider F, Wiechert K, et al. Mid- to long-term results of total lumbar disc replacement: a prospective analysis with 5- to 10-year follow-up. *Spine J.* Aug 1 2014; 14(8):1417-1431. PMID 24448028
29. Aghayev E, Etter C, Barlocher C, et al. Five-year results of lumbar disc prostheses in the SWISSpine registry. *Eur Spine J.* Oct 2014; 23(10):2114-2126. PMID 24947182

30. Tropiano P, Huang RC, Girardi FP, et al. Lumbar total disc replacement. Seven to eleven-year follow-up. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. Mar 2005; 87(3):490-496. PMID 15741612
31. Hannibal M, Thomas DJ, Low J, et al. ProDisc-L total disc replacement: a comparison of 1-level versus 2-level arthroplasty patients with a minimum 2-year follow-up. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. Oct 1 2007; 32(21):2322-2326. PMID 17906573
32. Lu SB, Hai Y, Kong C, et al. An 11-year minimum follow-up of the Charite III lumbar disc replacement for the treatment of symptomatic degenerative disc disease. *Eur Spine J*. Sep 2015; 24(9):2056-2064. PMID 25895882
33. Shim CS, Lee SH, Shin HD, et al. CHARITE versus ProDisc: a comparative study of a minimum 3-year follow-up. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. Apr 20 2007; 32(9):1012-1018. PMID 17450077
34. Park CK, Ryu KS, Jee WH. Degenerative changes of discs and facet joints in lumbar total disc replacement using ProDisc II: minimum two-year follow-up. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. Jul 15 2008; 33(16):1755-1761. PMID 18580548
35. Siepe CJ, Korge A, Grochulla F, et al. Analysis of post-operative pain patterns following total lumbar disc replacement: results from fluoroscopically guided spine infiltrations. *Eur Spine J*. Jan 2008; 17(1):44-56. PMID 17972116
36. Punt IM, Visser VM, van Rhijn LW, et al. Complications and reoperations of the SB Charite lumbar disc prosthesis: experience in 75 patients. *Eur Spine J*. Jan 2008; 17(1):36-43. PMID 17929065
37. Berry MR, Peterson BG, Alander DH. A granulomatous mass surrounding a Maverick total disc replacement causing iliac vein occlusion and spinal stenosis: a case report. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. May 2010; 92(5):1242-1245. PMID 20439671
38. Cabraja M, Schmeding M, Koch A, et al. Delayed formation of a devastating granulomatous process after metal-on-metal lumbar disc arthroplasty. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. Jun 1 2012; 37(13):E809-813. PMID 22089396
39. North American Spine Society (NASS). NASS coverage policy recommendations: Lumbar Artificial Disc Replacement. May 2014. Accessed April, 2016.
40. Zigler J, Garcia R. ISASS Policy Statement - Lumbar Artificial Disc. *Int J Spine Surg*. 2015; 9:7. PMID 25785243
41. Chou R, Loeser JD, Owens DK, et al. Interventional therapies, surgery, and interdisciplinary rehabilitation for low back pain: an evidence-based clinical practice guideline from the American Pain Society. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. May 1, 2009; 34(10):1066-1077. PMID 19363457
42. Chou R, Baisden J, Carragee EJ, et al. Surgery for low back pain: a review of the evidence for an American Pain Society Clinical Practice Guideline. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. May 1, 2009; 34(10):1094-1109. PMID 19363455
43. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). Prosthetic intervertebral disc replacement. IP Guidance Number: IPG100. 2004.
44. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). Prosthetic intervertebral disc replacement in the lumbar spine (IPG306). 2009; <http://www.nice.org.uk/nicemedia/pdf/IPG306Guidance.pdf>. Accessed November, 2014.
45. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). National Coverage Determination (NCD) for LUMBAR ARTIFICIAL DISC Replacement (LADR) (150.10). 2007; <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/ncd-details.aspx?NCDId=313&ncdver=2&CoverageSelection=National&Keyword=lumbar+artificial+disc&KeywordLookup=Title&KeywordSearchType=And&id=170&bc=gAAAABAAAA&>. Accessed November, 2014.
46. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). Change request 5727, CMS Manual system. September 11, 2007; <http://www.cms.hhs.gov/Transmittals/Downloads/R75NCD.pdf>. Accessed November, 2014.
47. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). Medicare Learning Network Matters. 2007; <http://www.cms.hhs.gov/MLNMattersArticles/downloads/MM5727.pdf>. Accessed November, 2014.
48. National Government Services, Inc. (Primary Geographic Jurisdiction - Illinois, New York - Entire State, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, Wisconsin, Minnesota) Local

Coverage Determination (LCD): Category III CPT® Codes (L33392), Revision Effective Date for services performed on or after 10/01/2016.