

(70187)

Medical Benefit		Effective Date: 01/01/08	Next Review Date: 01/20
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, 01/18, 01/19	

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"> Lumbar 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 spinal fusion in patients with degenerative disc disease leading to disabling symptoms.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

For individuals who have lumbar degenerative disc disease who receive a lumbar artificial intervertebral disc, the evidence includes randomized controlled trials with five-year outcomes and case series with longer term outcomes. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. Five-year outcomes for the ProDisc-L RCT have provided evidence for the noninferiority of artificial disc replacement. The superiority of ProDisc-L with circumferential fusion was achieved at two but not at five years in this unblinded trial. The potential benefits of the artificial disc (e.g., faster recovery, reduced adjacent-level disc degeneration) have not been demonstrated. Also, considerable uncertainty remains whether response rates will continue to decline over longer time periods and long-term complications with these implants will emerge. Although some randomized trials have concluded that this technology is noninferior to spinal fusion, 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. Also, 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 maintain 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

Three artificial lumbar disc 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 when approved, 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. DDD is defined as discogenic back pain with degeneration of the disc confirmed by patient history and radiographs. Production under the name Charité[®] was stopped in 2010.

A number of other artificial lumbar discs are in development or available only outside of the United States:

- The INMOTION[®] lumbar artificial disc (DePuy Spine) is a modification of the Charité[®] device with a change in name under the same premarket approval. 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.
- Kineflex-L[™] (Spinal Motion) is a three-piece, modular, metal-on-metal implant. An FDA advisory committee meeting on the Kineflex-L, scheduled in 2013, but was canceled 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. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Artificial lumbar disc replacement. TEC Assessments. 2007;Volume 22:Tab 2.
3. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Artificial lumbar disc arthroplasty. TEC Assessments. 2013;Volume 28:Tab 7.
4. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Draft: PRODISC-L Total Disc Replacement package insert. 2005; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf5/P050010c.pdf. Accessed March 15, 2018.
5. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data: PRODISC-L Total Disc Replacement. 2006; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf5/P050010b.pdf. Accessed March 15, 2018.
6. 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
7. 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
8. 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
9. Hellum C, Johnsen LG, Storheim K, et al. Surgery with disc prosthesis versus rehabilitation in patients with low back pain and degenerative disc: two year follow-up of randomised study. *BMJ*. May 19 2011;342:d2786. PMID 21596740
10. Hellum C, Berg L, Gjertsen O, et al. Adjacent level degeneration and facet arthropathy after disc prosthesis surgery or rehabilitation in patients with chronic low back pain and degenerative disc: second report of a randomized study. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. Dec 1 2012;37(25):2063-2073. PMID 22706091
11. Furunes H, Storheim K, Brox JJ, et al. Total disc replacement versus multidisciplinary rehabilitation in patients with chronic low back pain and degenerative discs: 8-year follow-up of a randomized controlled multicenter trial. *Spine J*. Oct 2017;17(10):1480-1488. PMID 28583869
12. 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

13. Garcia R, Jr., Yue JJ, and 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
14. Schoenfeld AJ. Commentary on an article by Rick Delamarter, MD, et al.: "Prospective, randomized, multi-center 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
15. 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
16. Laugesen LA, Paulsen RT, Carreon L, et al. Patient-reported Outcomes and Revision Rates at a Mean Follow-up of 10 Years After Lumbar Total Disc Replacement. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. Nov 1 2017;42(21):1657-1663. PMID 28368983
17. 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
18. North American Spine Society (NASS). NASS coverage policy recommendations: Lumbar Artificial Disc Replacement. 2014; <https://www.spine.org/PolicyPractice/CoverageRecommendations/AboutCoverageRecommendations.aspx>. Accessed March 15, 2018.
19. 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
20. 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
21. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Prosthetic intervertebral disc replacement in the lumbar spine [IPG306]. 2009; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/IPG306>. Accessed March 13, 2018.
22. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). National Coverage Determination (NCD) for LUMBAR ARTIFICIAL DISC Replacement (LADR) (150.10). 2007; <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coveredatabase/details/ncddetails.aspx?NCDId=313&ncdver=2&CoverageSelection=National&Keyword=lumbar+artificial+disc&KeywordLookUp=Title&KeywordSearchType=And&id=170&bc=gAAAABAAAA&>. Accessed March 13, 2018.
23. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. CMS Manual System: Change request 5727. 2007 September 11 <https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/Transmittals/downloads/R75NCD.pdf>. Accessed March 13, 2018.
24. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). Medicare Learning Network Matters. 2007; <http://www.cms.hhs.gov/MLNMattersArticles/downloads/MM5727.pdf>. Accessed March 13, 2018.