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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Populations</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Comparators</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals: • Who are undergoing spinal fusion</td>
<td>Interventions of interest are: • Interspinous fixation device with interbody fusion</td>
<td>Comparators of interest are: • Interspinous fixation device with pedicle screw construct</td>
<td>Relevant outcomes include: • Symptoms • Functional outcomes • Quality of life • Resource utilization • Treatment-related morbidity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Populations</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Comparators</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals: • With spinal stenosis and/or spondylolisthesis</td>
<td>Interventions of interest are: • Interspinous fixation device alone</td>
<td>Comparators of interest are: • Decompression</td>
<td>Relevant outcomes include: • Symptoms • Functional outcomes • Quality of life • Resource utilization • Treatment-related morbidity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DESCRIPTION

Interspinous fixation (fusion) devices are being developed to aid in the stabilization of the spine. They are evaluated as alternatives to pedicle screw and rod constructs in combination with interbody fusion. Interspinous fixation devices (IFDs) are also being evaluated for stand-alone use in patients with spinal stenosis and/or spondylolisthesis.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

For individuals who are undergoing spinal fusion who receive an IFD with interbody fusion, the evidence includes a systematic review of nonrandomized comparative studies and case series. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, resource utilization, and treatment-related morbidity. There is a lack of evidence on the efficacy of IFDs in combination with interbody fusion. One risk is spinous process fracture, while a potential benefit is a reduction in adjacent segment degeneration. Randomized trials with longer follow-up are needed to evaluate the risks and benefits following use of IFDs compared with the established standard (pedicle screw with rod fixation). The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.
For individuals who have spinal stenosis and/or spondylolisthesis who receive an IFD alone, the evidence includes a retrospective series. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, resource utilization, and treatment-related morbidity. There is a lack of evidence on the efficacy of IFDs as a stand-alone procedure. Randomized controlled trials are needed that evaluate health outcomes following use of IFDs as a stand-alone for decompression. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

**POLICY**

Interspinous fixation (fusion) devices are considered investigational for any indication, including but not limited to use:

- in combination with interbody fusion, or
- alone for decompression in patients with spinal stenosis.

**POLICY GUIDELINES**

Potential exceptions exist where the devices might be considered medically necessary, such as patients with small pedicles where pedicle screws could not be safely placed.

**BACKGROUND**

Contemporary models of IFDs have evolved from spinous process wiring with bone blocks and early device designs (e.g., Wilson plate, Meurig-Williams system, Daab plate). The newer devices range from paired plates with teeth to U-shaped devices with wings that are attached to the spinous process. They are intended as an alternative to pedicle screw and rod constructs to aid in the stabilization of the spine with interbody fusion. IFDs are placed under direct visualization, while screw and rod systems may be placed under direct visualization or percutaneously. Use of an IFD in combination with a unilateral pedicle screw system has also been proposed. IFDs are not intended for stand-alone use.

For use in combination with fusion, it has been proposed that IFDs are less invasive and present fewer risks than pedicle or facet screws. While biomechanics studies have indicated that IFDs may be similar to pedicle screw-rod constructs in limiting the range of flexion and extension, they may be less effective than bilateral pedicle screw-rod fixation for limiting axial rotation and lateral bending.¹ There is a potential for a negative impact on the interbody cage and bone graft due to focal kyphosis resulting from the IFD. There is also a potential for spinous process fracture.

Unlike IFDs, interspinous distraction devices (spacers) are used alone for decompression and are typically not fixed to the spinous process (see the Interspinous and Interlaminar Stabilization/Distraction Devices [Spacers] Protocol). In addition, interspinous distraction devices have been designed for dynamic stabilization, whereas IFDs are rigid. However, IFDs might also be used to distract the spinous processes and decrease lordosis. Thus, IFDs could be used off-label without interbody fusion as decompression (distraction) devices in patients with spinal stenosis. If IFDs are used alone as a spacer, there is a risk of spinous process fracture.

**REGULATORY STATUS**

The following IFDs have been cleared for marketing by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration through the 510(k) process. This list may not be exhaustive.
• Affix™ (NuVasive)
• Aileron™ (Life Spine)
• Aspen™ (Lanx, acquired by BioMet)
• Axle™ (X-Spine)
• BacFuse® (Pioneer Surgical)
• BridgePoint™ (Alphatec Spine)
• coflex-IF® (Paradigm Spine)
• Inspan™ (Spine Frontier)
• InterBRIDGE® Interspinous Posterior Fixation System (LDR Spine)
• Minuteman™ (Spinal Simplicity)
• PrimaLOK™ (OsteoMed Spine)
• Octave™ (Life Spine)
• Spire™ (Medtronic)
• SP-Fix™ (Globus)
• ZIP® MIS Interspinous Fusion System (Aurora Spine).

Food and Drug Administration product code: PEK.

IFDs are intended for use as an adjunct to interbody fusion. For example, the indication for the coflex-IF® implant is as: “a posterior, nonpedicle supplemental fixation device intended for use with an interbody cage as an adjunct to fusion at a single level in the lumbar spine (L1-S1). It is intended for attachment to the spinous processes for the purpose of achieving stabilization to promote fusion in patients with degenerative disc disease – defined as back pain of discogenic origin with degeneration of the disc confirmed by history and radiographic studies – with up to Grade 1 spondylolisthesis.”

A number of interspinous plate systems have also been cleared for marketing by the Food and Drug Administration.

Use of an IFD for a stand-alone procedure is considered off-label.

RELATED PROTOCOL
Interspinous and Interlaminar Stabilization/Distraction Devices (Spacers)

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.
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