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State and Federal mandates and health plan member contract language, including specific provisions/exclusions, take precedence over Medical Policy and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. To verify a member's benefits, contact [Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Customer Service](#).

The BCBSKS Medical Policies contained herein are for informational purposes and apply only to members who have health insurance through BCBSKS or who are covered by a self-insured group plan administered by BCBSKS. Medical Policy for FEP members is subject to FEP medical policy which may differ from BCBSKS Medical Policy.

The medical policies do not constitute medical advice or medical care. Treating health care providers are independent contractors and are neither employees nor agents of Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas and are solely responsible for diagnosis, treatment and medical advice.

If your patient is covered under a different Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan, please refer to the Medical Policies of that plan.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Populations</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Comparators</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with: Discogenic back pain</td>
<td>Interventions of interest are: • Intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty</td>
<td>Comparators of interest are: • Conservative management • Surgical spinal decompression</td>
<td>Relevant outcomes include: • Symptoms • Functional outcomes • Quality of Life • Treatment-related morbidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals: Discogenic back pain</td>
<td>Interventions of interest are: • Intradiscal radiofrequency annuloplasty</td>
<td>Comparators of interest are: • Conservative management • Surgical spinal decompression</td>
<td>Relevant outcomes include: • Symptoms • Functional outcomes • Quality of Life • Treatment-related morbidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populations</td>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>Comparators</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Individuals:  
- Discogenic back pain | Interventions of interest are:  
- Intradiscal biacuplasty | Comparators of interest are:  
- Conservative management  
- Surgical spinal decompression | Relevant outcomes include:  
- Symptoms  
- Functional outcomes  
- Quality of life  
- Treatment-related morbidity |

**DESCRIPTION**
Electrothermal intradiscal annuloplasty therapies use radiofrequency energy sources to treat discogenic low back pain arising from annular tears. These annuloplasty techniques are designed to decrease pain arising from the annulus by thermocoagulating nerves in the disc and tightening of annular tissue.

**Objective**
The objective of this evidence review is to evaluate whether intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty, intradiscal radiofrequency annuloplasty, and intradiscal biacuplasty improve net health outcomes in patients with discogenic back pain.

**Background**

**Discogenic Low Back Pain**
Discogenic low back pain is a common, multifactorial pain syndrome that involves low back pain without radicular symptoms findings, in conjunction with radiologically confirmed degenerative disc disease.

**Treatment**
Typical treatment includes conservative therapy with physical therapy and medication management, with potential for surgical decompression in more severe cases.

A number of electrothermal intradiscal procedures have been introduced to treat discogenic low back pain; they rely on various probe designs to introduce radiofrequency (RF) energy into the disc. It has been proposed that heat-induced denaturation of collagen fibers in the annular lamellae may stabilize the disc and potentially seal annular fissures and that pain reduction may occur through the thermal coagulation of nociceptors in the outer annulus.

Some of the electrothermal intradiscal procedures are briefly described next.

With the intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty (IDEA) procedure, a navigable catheter with an embedded thermal resistive coil is inserted posterolaterally into the disc annulus or nucleus. Using indirect RF energy, electrothermal heat is generated within the thermal resistive coil at a temperature of 90°C; the disc material is heated for up to 20 minutes. Proposed advantages of indirect electrothermal delivery of RF energy with (IDEA) include precise temperature feedback and control, and the ability to provide...
electrothermocoagulation to a broader tissue segment than would be allowed with a direct RF needle.

Percutaneous intradiscal radiofrequency thermocoagulation (PIRFT) uses direct application of RF energy. With PIRFT, the RF probe is placed into the center of the disc, and the device is activated for only 90 seconds at a temperature of 70ºC. The procedure is not designed to coagulate, burn, or ablate tissue. The Radionics RF Disc Catheter System has been specifically designed for this purpose.

Intradiscal biacuplasty uses 2 cooled RF electrodes placed on the posterolateral sides of the intervertebral annulus fibrosus. It is believed that by cooling the probes, a larger area may be treated than could occur with a regular needle probe.

Annuloplasty using a laser-assisted spinal endoscopy kit to coagulate the disc granulation tissue (percutaneous endoscopic laser annuloplasty) has also been described.

**Regulatory Status**

A variety of radiofrequency (RF) coagulation devices are cleared for marketing by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), some of which are designed for disc nucleotomy. In 2002, the Oratec Nucleotomy Catheter (ORATEC Interventions, Menlo Park, CA, acquired by Smith & Nephew in 2002) was cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process. The predicate device was the SpineCATH® Intradiscal Catheter, which received FDA clearance for marketing in 1999. The Radionics (a division of Tyco Healthcare group) Radiofrequency Disc Catheter System received marketing clearance by FDA through the 510(k) process in 2000. FDA product code: GEI.

In 2005, the Baylis Pain Management Cooled Probe was cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process. It is intended for use “in conjunction with the Radio Frequency Generator to create radiofrequency lesions in nervous tissue.” FDA product code: GXI.

Note: This evidence review does not address disc nucleoplasty, a technique based on the bipolar RF device (Coblation®; ArthroCare, Austin, TX, acquired by Smith & Nephew, 2014). With the coblation system, a bipolar RF device is used to provide lower energy treatment to the intervertebral disc, which is designed to provide tissue removal with minimal thermal damage to collateral tissue. Disc nucleoplasty is closer in concept to a laser discectomy in that tissue is removed or ablated in an effort to provide decompression of a bulging disc.
Percutaneous annuloplasty (eg, intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty, intradiscal radiofrequency annuloplasty, or intradiscal biacuplasty) for the treatment of chronic discogenic back pain is considered experimental / investigational.

RATIONALE
This evidence review has been updated with searches of the PubMed database. The most recent literature update was performed through February 11, 2020. This review is based in part on TEC Assessments from 2002 and 2003.1,2.

Evidence reviews assess the clinical evidence to determine whether the use of a technology improves the net health outcome. Broadly defined, health outcomes are length of life, quality of life, and ability to function, including benefits and harms. Every clinical condition has specific outcomes that are important to patients and to managing the course of that condition. Validated outcome measures are necessary to ascertain whether a condition improves or worsens; and whether the magnitude of that change is clinically significant. The net health outcome is a balance of benefits and harms.

To assess whether the evidence is sufficient to draw conclusions about the net health outcome of a technology, 2 domains are examined: the relevance and the quality and credibility. To be relevant, studies must represent one or more intended clinical use of the technology in the intended population and compare an effective and appropriate alternative at a comparable intensity. For some conditions, the alternative will be supportive care or surveillance. The quality and credibility of the evidence depend on study design and conduct, minimizing bias and confounding that can generate incorrect findings. The randomized controlled trial (RCT) is preferred to assess efficacy; however, in some circumstances, nonrandomized studies may be adequate. RCTs are rarely large enough or long enough to capture less common adverse events and long-term effects. Other types of studies can be used for these purposes and to assess generalizability to broader clinical populations and settings of clinical practice.

Intradiscal Electrothermal Annuloplasty
Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose
The purpose of percutaneous intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty in patients who have discogenic back pain is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty improve the net health outcome in patients with discogenic back pain?

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The relevant population of interest is patients with discogenic back pain.
Interventions
The therapy being considered is percutaneous intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty, which is administered by an orthopedist or orthopedic surgeon in an outpatient clinical setting.

Comparators
Relevant comparators are conservative management and surgical spinal decompression, which are administered and managed by orthopedists and orthopedic surgeons.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. Based on available literature, follow-up of at least 6-12 months is recommended.

Study Selection Criteria
Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:
1. To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs.
2. In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies.
3. To assess long-term outcomes and adverse events, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow-up and/or larger populations were sought.
4. Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

As with any therapy for pain, a placebo effect is anticipated, and thus randomized placebo-controlled trials are necessary to investigate the extent of the placebo effect and to determine whether any improvement with annuloplasty exceeds that associated with a placebo. Therefore, evidence reviewed for this review focuses on RCTs.

Review of Evidence
Randomized Controlled Trials
Pauza et al (2004)\(^2\) published the results of an RCT evaluating intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty (referred to as intradiscal electrothermal therapy in Pauza) in patients with discogenic low back pain, which was the focus of discussion in the 2003 TEC Assessment. The trial included 64 patients with low back pain of more than 6 months in duration who were randomized to intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty or a sham procedure. Visual analog scale scores for pain were reduced by an average of 2.4 cm in the intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty group compared with 1.1 cm in the sham group, a statistically significant difference between groups (p=0.045). The mean change in the Oswestry Disability Index score was also significantly greater for the intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty group than for the sham group. Improvements in the 36-Item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36) bodily pain subscale score were slightly higher for the intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty group. The trial also reported the percent change in visual analog scale scores more than 2.0 cm, which is greater than the minimal clinically significant improvement of 1.8 to 1.9. When the visual analog scale score was dichotomized in this way, a relative risk of 1.5 was observed with a 95% confidence interval of 0.82 to 2.74. While this single-center trial was well-designed with respect to randomization, clear description of the intervention, and use of valid and reliable outcomes measures, it does not permit conclusions about the relative effects of intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty and placebo, and it is unclear whether intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty
achieves clinically and statistically significant improvements in measures of pain, disability, or quality of life.

Freeman et al (2005) reported on an industry-sponsored, double-blinded, sham-controlled randomized trial evaluating intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty (referred to as intradiscal electrothermal therapy in this report) in patients with chronic discogenic low back pain, marked functional disability, magnetic resonance imaging evidence of degenerative disc disease, and failure of conservative management. Both the active intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty and sham groups had an intradiscal catheter that was navigated to cover at least 75% of the posterior annulus. Planned enrollment based on power analysis was for 75 patients; however, the trial was stopped early due to slower than expected recruitment after 57 patients (38 intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty, 19 placebo) had been enrolled. Follow-up was for 6 months, and the outcome measure was successful treatment response, as defined by all of the following: (1) no neurologic deficit; (2) an increase on the Low Back Outcome Score of at least 7 points; and (3) improvements in the 36-Item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36) physical functioning and bodily pain subscales scores of at least 1 standard deviation. No subject in either group achieved a successful treatment response. Outcomes were similar between the intradiscal electrothermal therapy and sham groups on the Low Back Outcome Score (38.31 vs. 37.45), Oswestry Disability Index score (39.77 vs. 41.58), 36-Item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36) subscale scores (35.10 vs. 30.40), the Zung Depression Index score (41.39 vs. 40.82), and the Modified Somatic Perception Questionnaire score (8.67 vs. 8.6), respectively. None of the subgroup analyses showed statistically or clinically significant differences in study outcomes. No serious adverse events were reported in either group.

Section Summary: Intradiscal Electrothermal Annuloplasty
Two RCTs on intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty have reported conflicting results, with one finding a benefit for intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty and the other no benefit. The most recent RCT identified was from 2005. No recent literature on intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty has been identified.

Percutaneous Intradiscal Radiofrequency Annuloplasty

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose
The purpose of percutaneous intradiscal radiofrequency annuloplasty in patients who have discogenic back pain is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does percutaneous intradiscal radiofrequency annuloplasty improve the net health outcome in patients with discogenic back pain?

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The relevant population of interest is patients with discogenic back pain.

Interventions
The therapy being considered is percutaneous intradiscal radiofrequency annuloplasty, which is administered by an orthopedist or orthopedic surgeon in an outpatient clinical setting.
Comparators
Relevant comparators are conservative management and surgical spinal decompression, which are administered and managed by orthopedists and orthopedic surgeons.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. Based on available literature, follow-up of at least 6-12 months is recommended.

Study Selection Criteria
Methodologically credible studies were selected using the principles described in the first indication.

Review of Evidence
Randomized Controlled Trials
There is relatively little published data on percutaneous intradiscal radiofrequency thermocoagulation. Barendse et al (2001) reported on a double-blind trial that randomized 28 patients with chronic low back pain to percutaneous intradiscal radiofrequency thermocoagulation or a sham-control group. The primary outcome was the percentage of success at 8 weeks, as measured by changes in pain level, impairment, Oswestry Disability Index scores, and analgesics taken. At the end of 8 weeks, there were 2 treatment successes in the sham group and 1 in the treatment group. Trialists concluded that percutaneous intradiscal radiofrequency thermocoagulation was no better than placebo in reducing pain and disability.

Kvarstein et al (2009) published a 12-month follow-up from an RCT of intra-annular radiofrequency thermal disc therapy using the discTRODE probe. Recruitment was discontinued when blinded interim analysis of the first 20 patients showed no trend toward overall effect or difference in pain intensity between active and sham treatment at 6 months. At 12 months, there was a reduction from baseline pain but no significant difference between the groups. Two patients from each group reported an increase in pain.

Section Summary: Percutaneous Intradiscal Radiofrequency Annuloplasty
Two sham-controlled randomized trials showed no evidence of a benefit with percutaneous intradiscal radiofrequency thermocoagulation. One found that only 1 of 14 patients was considered a treatment success. The other was terminated after blinded interim analysis showed no trend to benefit compared with sham.

Intradiscal Radiofrequency Biacuplasty
Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose
The purpose of intradiscal radiofrequency biacuplasty in patients who have discogenic back pain is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does intradiscal radiofrequency biacuplasty improve the net health outcome in patients with discogenic back pain?

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.
Patients
The relevant population of interest is patients with discogenic back pain.

Interventions
The therapy being considered is intradiscal radiofrequency biacuplasty, which is administered by an orthopedist or orthopedic surgeon in an outpatient clinical setting.

Comparators
Relevant comparators are conservative management and surgical spinal decompression, which are administered and managed by orthopedists and orthopedic surgeons.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. Based on available literature, follow-up of at least 6-12 months is recommended.

Study Selection Criteria
Methodologically credible studies were selected using the principles described in the first indication.

Review of Evidence
Randomized Controlled Trials
Kapural et al (2013), Desai et al (2016), and colleagues have published several studies on the use of transdiscal radiofrequency annuloplasty using 2 transdiscal probes (biacuplasty) in patients with discogenic lower back pain, including a 2013 industry-sponsored, phase 1, double-blind RCT and a 2016 RCT. 7,8,9,10.

Kapural et al (2013) conducted the phase 1 RCT. 7 Of the 1894 patients screened, 1771 (94%) did not meet inclusion criteria. Sixty-four subjects consented and were enrolled. Outcome measures were the SF-36 physical functioning subscale (0-100), a numeric rating scale for pain (0-10), and the Oswestry Disability Index (0-100). There were no significant differences between the groups at 1 month or 3 months. At 6 months, the biacuplasty group showed a significantly greater change from baseline for the SF-36 (15.0 vs. 2.63), numeric rating scale (-2.19 vs. -0.64), and Oswestry Disability Index (-7.43 vs. 0.53) scores. Mean SF-36 and numeric rating scale scores were considered to be clinically significant, but mean Oswestry Disability Index scores did not achieve the minimally important difference of 10 points. With clinical success defined post hoc as a 15-point increase in physical function together with a greater than 2-point decrease in pain, 30% of biacuplasty patients and 3% of sham-treated patients were considered successful. There was no significant difference in opioid use between groups.

Kapural et al (2015) reported on the unblinded 12-month follow-up from this phase 1 trial.8 Improvements continued through 12 months, with a change from baseline to posttreatment of 47.0 to 68.9 (of 100) on the SF-36 physical functioning subscale (p<0.01) and 7.1 to 4.4 (of 10) on the numeric rating scale (p<0.01). Although the change in numeric rating scale score was statistically significant, the magnitude of the decrease was modest, and a final numeric rating scale score (4.4) remained high. The change in Oswestry Disability Index score (from 40.37 at baseline to 32.44 at 12 months) was also modest (p=0.05). Opioid usage did not decrease significantly (53.47 mg at baseline to 34.07 mg at follow-up, p=0.23).
Desai et al (2016) randomized 63 patients with lumbar discogenic pain diagnosed by provocation discography to intradiscal biacuplasty plus conservative medical management (n=29) or medical management alone (n=34). Another 234 patients were scheduled for diagnostic discography but did not meet inclusion criteria. The primary outcome (the mean reduction in visual analog scale score for pain at 6 months) was significantly greater in the biacuplasty group (-2.4) than in the medical management group (-0.56; p=0.02). The secondary outcomes were not statistically significant, which included the proportion of responders, defined as a 2-point or 30% decrease in visual analog scale scores, which was achieved in 50% of the biacuplasty group compared to 18% of controls (p=0.073). Investigators did not report whether the trial was adequately powered. Other limitations of this industry-sponsored trial were the lack of a sham-control and patient blinding, which could contribute to a placebo effect in the subjective pain outcomes.

Of the 29 patients originally randomized to intradiscal biacuplasty, 22 (76%) were available for 12-month follow-up. Mean 12-month change in visual analog scale score was -2.2 (from 6.7 at baseline to 4.4 at 12 months; p=0.001). After 6 months, patients randomized to medical management were allowed to receive intradiscal biacuplasty and were followed for another 6 months; 25 of 34 patients crossed over. Visual analog scale score improved from 7.0 to 4.7 (p<0.001) in the crossover group, and 55% were considered to be responders.

**Section Summary: Intradiscal Radiofrequency Biacuplasty**

Two industry-sponsored RCTs have assessed use of biacuplasty to treat chronic low back pain. In one, only 6% of subjects screened met the strict inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study. Significant differences in outcomes were observed at 6 months, but not at 1 month or 3 months, and the definition of successful treatment appears to have been post hoc. In the second multicenter RCT, 63 patients met inclusion criteria, which included a positive result on provocation discography. There was a significant treatment effect for the primary outcome measure, but not the secondary outcome measures. This trial was not sham-controlled, and it was not reported whether it was adequately powered. Additional sham-controlled trials in a broader population of patients are needed to determine the effect of this treatment with greater certainty.

**Summary of Evidence**

For individuals who have discogenic back pain who receive intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty, the evidence includes a small number of randomized controlled trials (RCTs). Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. Two RCTs on intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty reported conflicting results, with one reporting benefit for intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty and the other reporting no benefit. Further study in a sham-controlled trial with a representative population of patients is needed. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have discogenic back pain who receive intradiscal radiofrequency annuloplasty, the evidence includes 2 RCTs. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. Neither RCT found evidence of benefit with the treatment. More sham-controlled trials are needed. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.
For individuals who have discogenic back pain who receive intradiscal biacuplasty, the evidence includes 2 industry-sponsored RCTs. Relevant outcomes are symptoms, functional outcomes, quality of life, and treatment-related morbidity. One trial reported significant improvements at 6 months post-treatment, but not at 1 and 3 months. The other trial also showed a significant reduction in visual analog scale scores at 6 months that appeared to continue to the 12 month follow-up; however, it is unclear whether this trial was sufficiently powered. More sham-controlled trials are needed. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

**Practice Guidelines and Position Statements**

**American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians**

A 2013 review of the evidence informing American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians guidelines found limited-to-fair evidence for intradiscal electrothermal therapy (IDET; another term for intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty) and biacuplasty and limited evidence for percutaneous intradiscal radiofrequency thermocoagulation.\(^\text{11}\). These guidelines updated 2007 guidelines, which concluded that the evidence was moderate for management of chronic discogenic low back pain with IDET.\(^\text{12}\). Complications included catheter breakage, nerve root injuries, post-IDET disc herniation, cauda equina syndrome, infection, epidural abscess, and spinal cord damage. The evidence for percutaneous intradiscal radiofrequency thermocoagulation was limited, with complications similar to IDET.\(^\text{12}\).

**National Institute for Health and Care Excellence**

A 2016 guidance update by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) indicated that the evidence on safety and efficacy of percutaneous intradiscal radiofrequency thermocoagulation for low back pain was “limited” and should only be used by “special arrangement”.\(^\text{13}\).

In 2016, NICE guidance on electrothermal annuloplasty was also updated.\(^\text{14}\). NICE considered evidence on the efficacy of percutaneous intradiscal radiofrequency thermocoagulation for low back pain to be inconsistent and of poor quality, although no major safety concerns were identified. NICE recommended percutaneous intradiscal radiofrequency thermocoagulation only with special arrangements for clinical governance, consent, and audit or research.

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

Not applicable.

**Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials**

A search of ClinicalTrials.gov in February 2020 did not identify any ongoing or unpublished trials that would likely influence this review.
CODING

The following codes for treatment and procedures applicable to this policy are included below for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement. Please refer to the member’s contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

CPT/HCPCS

22526  Percutaneous intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty, unilateral or bilateral including fluoroscopic guidance; single level

22527  Percutaneous intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty, unilateral or bilateral, including fluoroscopic guidance; 1 or more additional levels (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

62290  Injection procedure for discography, each level: lumbar

62291  Injection procedure for discography, each level: cervical or thoracic

72285  Discography, cervical or thoracic, radiological supervision and interpretation

72295  Discography, lumbar, radiological supervision and interpretation

DIAGNOSIS

Experimental / Investigational for all diagnoses related to this policy.

REVISIONS

02-08-2010  The Percutaneous Intradiscal Electrothermal (IDET) Annuloplasty and Percutaneous Intradiscal Radiofrequency Annuloplasty medical policy is a new freestanding policy developed from the Minimally Invasive Procedures for Spine Pain medical policy which was effective October 18, 2004. The Minimally Invasive Procedures for Spine Pain is no longer an active medical policy.

12-01-2011  Description section updated

Rationale section updated

References updated

01-01-2012  In Coding section:

- Revised CPT code nomenclature: 62310, 62311

11-06-2012  Rational section updated

In Coding section:

- Revised CPT code nomenclature: 62292

References updated

10-13-2015  Description section updated

Rationale section updated

In Coding section:

- Removed CPT Codes: 62292, 62310, 62311, 64640, 64999

References updated

02-15-2017  Title revised to "Percutaneous Intradiscal Electrothermal Annuloplasty, Radiofrequency Annuloplasty, and Biacuplasty" from "Percutaneous Intradiscal Electrothermal (IDET) Annuloplasty, and Percutaneous Intradiscal Radiofrequency Annuloplasty"

Description section updated

In Policy section:

- Removed "percutaneous" and "thermocoagulation" and added "annuloplasty" to read "Percutaneous annuloplasty (eg, intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty, intradiscal
Percutaneous Intradiscal Electrothermal Annuloplasty, Radiofrequency Annuloplasty, and Bacuplasty
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