

**PERCUTANEOUS LASER DISC DECOMPRESSION  
FOR TREATMENT OF LUMBAR DISC PROLAPSE**

*A Technology Assessment*

**INTRODUCTION**

The California Technology Assessment Forum (CTAF) is asked to review the scientific evidence for the use of percutaneous laser disc decompression in the treatment of symptomatic lumbar disc herniation.

**BACKGROUND**

Low back pain is a major cause of chronic pain and morbidity in the United States, is the fifth most common reason for physician visits and is responsible for significant social and economic costs<sup>1</sup>. It is estimated that persons with back pain incur 60% more health expenditures compared to those without back pain<sup>2</sup>. Herniation of a lumbar disc is responsible for less than five percent of all low back problems but are the most common cause of sciatica<sup>3</sup>. It is estimated that 90% of sciatica is caused by a disc herniation with nerve entrapment or compression<sup>4</sup>. The incidence of disc herniation in the U.S. is approximately 1.7%<sup>5</sup>. The disc is composed of a series of firm, fibrous rings (annulus fibrosus (AF)) surrounding a soft, jelly-like core (nucleus pulposus (NP)). Herniation occurs when the nucleus material escapes through the annulus. Even in the absence of frank disc herniation, however, degeneration and bulging of the disc may itself be the source of the low back pain as there are nerve endings and fibers in the outer half of the AF<sup>6</sup>.

The vast majority of acute sciatica attacks resolve without surgical intervention within two to six weeks<sup>4, 7, 8</sup>. The usual treatment for a patient with a symptomatic, nonsequestered herniated NP first involves conservative measures, such as nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, physical therapy, muscle relaxants, selective nerve blocks, epidural steroids, and in some cases chiropractic care<sup>9</sup>. Bladder dysfunction and muscle weakness are clear indications for surgery, but fortunately these complications are rare<sup>8</sup>. More commonly, surgical treatment for prolapsed disc to relieve nerve root irritation is recommended for patients to provide more rapid relief from pain and disability when recovery with conservative measures is unacceptably slow. Surgical treatment for

a disc herniation that has been unresponsive to conservative measures has traditionally involved either open laminectomy or discectomy<sup>10,11</sup>. Patients may undergo complete surgical removal of the intervertebral disc and vertebral fusion. A measurable decrease in preoperative pain has been noted in >80% in some series<sup>12</sup>. Minimally invasive intradiscal techniques and percutaneous procedures have been employed for the past decade or more as an alternative to conventional surgical methods. In fact, one review estimates that over 500,000 percutaneous disc decompression procedures have been performed over the past 20 years<sup>13</sup>. These have included chemonucleolysis, manual percutaneous discectomy, automated percutaneous discectomy, endoscopic posterolateral discectomy, laparoscopic discectomy and fusion, intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty (IDET®), the DeKompressor® Percutaneous Discectomy Probe and percutaneous laser disc decompression (also known as percutaneous endoscopic laser discectomy (PELD) )<sup>14-16</sup>.

### **Percutaneous Laser Disc Decompression**

Percutaneous laser disc decompression (PLDD) is a “minimally invasive” procedure to provide symptomatic relief of pain caused by a herniated intervertebral disc<sup>11</sup>. First introduced about 20 years ago<sup>17</sup>, it is estimated that more than 30,000 patients were treated with PLDD in 2001<sup>18</sup>. PLDD is performed in the outpatient setting under fluoroscopic guidance and local anesthesia. Choy (1992) and others have reported the techniques employed in PLDD, however, techniques vary, with some surgeons using laser ablation alone and others using mechanical instruments to remove disc material<sup>19, 20</sup> together with laser ablation<sup>21</sup>. There is no clear consensus on type of laser used or duration of application<sup>18</sup>. In PLDD, the target tissue is the NP of the intervertebral disc, the main constituent of which is water<sup>22</sup>.

During the procedure, the patient is placed in the lateral position with the affected side up. After localization of the disc level, a thin gauge (18- to 20-gauge) hollow needle with a stylet is introduced into the intervertebral disc and positioned halfway between the two vertebral endplates and penetrating the AF into the NP. The optic fiber is then introduced and extends past the end of the needle by 5 mm<sup>18</sup>. The needle position is verified with the use of biplane fluoroscopy, sometimes along with CT scan (CT)<sup>23</sup> or MRI-guidance<sup>24, 25</sup>. Once the needle is inserted, the stylet is removed and a laser fiber introduced. The most commonly used laser is the holmium:yttrium-

aluminum-garnet (Ho:YAG) laser; occasionally, a neodymium (Nd):YAG laser is used. Laser energy is then delivered with 15 W of power in pulses of 0.5 to 1 second followed by a four to ten second pause<sup>18, 25</sup>. The laser energy is usually delivered until the patient's subjective response indicates complete relief of radicular pain or approximately 2000 joules of energy has been delivered<sup>9</sup>. Patients may experience some pain due to heat sensation at the level of intervention that subsides following cessation of the laser light<sup>25, 26</sup>. Magnetic resonance (MR) images are sometimes obtained post-operatively<sup>27</sup>. Patients are generally instructed to rest for a few days, use analgesics as needed and to avoid hyperkyphotic positions for two weeks.

The laser light energy is transformed into heat, which can simultaneously cut, coagulate and vaporize the NP<sup>28</sup>. There is some experimental evidence that this leads to a decrease in the intradiscal pressure<sup>1829-31</sup>, and it is theorized that this pressure change allows the herniated material to retreat toward the center of the disc<sup>28</sup>. The destruction of the disc is determined by the ability of NP to absorb the energy, so the ideal wavelength should be close to the absorption band of water. However, laser treatment does not obliterate the herniated disc material. MRI scans immediately after the procedure show no change in the height of the intervertebral disc or radial bulge<sup>32</sup> or in the extent of disc herniation<sup>25, 27</sup>. Successive MRI scans reveal a modest to moderate decrease of herniation at four to six months after treatment in only one third of cases<sup>21</sup>. The accuracy of placement of the introducer cannula, as well as the timing and firing of the laser, are of critical importance for the safety and efficacy of PLDD<sup>10</sup>.

Indications for PLDD include: 1) Contained disc herniation demonstrated on CT or MRI; 2) Neurological findings referring to a single nerve root; and 3) No improvement after conservative therapy for a minimum of six weeks. Exclusion criteria include spondylolisthesis, spinal stenosis, prior surgery at the target disc level, significant disc space narrowing and others<sup>18, 33</sup>. Proponents of PLDD cite several potential advantages over open discectomy procedures: reduced morbidity, less potential for perineural scarring, less intraoperative blood loss, fewer complications of epidural fibrosis, transverse myelitis or disc space infection, reduced patient recovery times, and a faster return to normal activity<sup>9</sup>. In addition, nuclear ablation is not limited to what can be plucked or suctioned out<sup>22</sup>, the procedure can be repeated, and it does not preclude future surgical treatment<sup>11</sup>.

The procedure's efficacy remains controversial, however, with skeptics reporting high rates of subsequent open surgery<sup>34</sup> and its inability to treat sequestered fragments, therefore its limited applicability<sup>11, 35</sup>. Some have suggested that PLDD may be no more effective than conservative treatment or no treatment<sup>36</sup>. Potential complications from PLDD include injuries from thermal effects of the laser; infection of the disc (discitis); disc rupture; epidermal hematoma; lateral stenosis; transient nerve block; contralateral transient dermatomal discomfort; and rarely, abdominal perforation and partial cauda equina syndrome<sup>11, 18, 21, 22</sup>.

PLDD has been used to treat cervical and thoracic disc herniation<sup>5, 12, 22, 37-39</sup>, however, this evaluation will focus on the efficacy and safety of PLDD for lumbar disc herniation as the main body of experience and literature is for this indication.

#### TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT (TA)

**TA Criterion 1:           The technology must have final approval from the appropriate government regulatory bodies.**

Trimedyn e OmniPulse Holmium:YAGE laser received FDA 510(k) clearance in 1991 for percutaneous laser discectomy (Trimedyn e, Inc., Lake Forest, CA). Other lasers approved by the FDA for laser discectomy include the KTP/532 Surgical Laser System with the KTP DiscKit (Laserscope Surgical Systems, San Jose, CA) and the Coherent Laser-Assisted Spinal Endoscopy (LASE)<sup>TM</sup> kit and Versa Pulse Laser<sup>TM</sup> (Coherent, Inc., Palo Alto, CA).

**TA criterion1 is met.**

**TA Criterion 2:           The scientific evidence must permit conclusions concerning the effectiveness of the technology regarding health outcomes.**

The Medline database, Cochrane clinical trials and reviews database and the Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects (DARE) were searched using the key words “percutaneous laser disc decompression”, “percutaneous endoscopic laser discectomy” and “lumbar disc” or “disc herniation” from 1966 to April 2008. The bibliographies of systematic reviews and key articles were manually searched for additional references. Abstracts of citations were reviewed and all relevant articles reviewed in full.

No randomized, concurrently controlled, blinded trials comparing outcomes of PLDD with conventional conservative measures or open discectomy or laminectomy have been published. The published articles concerning PLDD are almost all uncontrolled case series. Two nonrandomized comparative trials<sup>40, 41</sup> and one systematic review<sup>11</sup> of PLDD have been published.

Patients included in the various published studies have generally had: single nerve-root symptoms (radicular leg pain with or without low back pain) and signs (motor, sensory, or reflex deficits, and/or diminished straight-leg-raising); evidence of nonsequestered herniated NP on MRI; and no response to a minimum of six to twelve weeks of conservative treatment. Patients were generally excluded from studies if they had previous surgery, spinal stenosis, severe osteoarthritis, greater than first-degree spondylolisthesis, facet (zygapophyseal) joint syndrome, significant disease at more than one level, MRI evidence of extruded or sequestered disc fragments, vertebral fracture, cancer, or a hemorrhagic diathesis.

Outcomes assessed in the various clinical trials of treatment of spinal disorders generally include relief of pain and improvement in level of function<sup>42</sup>. In the published trials, pain relief is often assessed with the Visual Analog Scale (VAS), ranging from 0 = no pain, to 10 = worst possible pain<sup>43</sup>. Functional results have been scored according to the MacNab (1971) or Andrews et al (1990) rating scales. The MacNab scale classifies as surgical “success” as those with either “excellent” results (free of pain, no restriction of mobility, and able to return to normal work and activities) or “good results” (occasional nonradicular pain, relief of presenting symptoms, and able to return to modified work). The MacNab scale classifies as surgical “failure” those with either “fair” results (some

improved functional capacity, still handicapped and/or unemployed) or “poor results” (continued objective symptoms of root involvement, and additional operative intervention needed at the index level, irrespective of repeat or length of postoperative follow-up). The Andrews scale is an 8-point scale that stratifies outcome with respect to pain relief, functional recovery, and time to recovery.

Overall, the scientific evidence does not permit conclusions concerning the effectiveness of PLDD regarding health outcomes.

**Fifty two additional references were reviewed, but did not meet criteria for inclusion in this assessment. (References 71-121).**

Level of evidence: 4,5

TA Criterion 2 is not met.

TA Criterion 3: The technology must improve net health outcomes.

Table 1 summarizes 29 uncontrolled clinical trials of patients undergoing PLDD. Most studies report immediate or short term results; in less than half of the studies has follow-up data at  $\geq 1$  year been provided. Results from the majority of these studies suggest that 64% to 87% of patients experience “success” (“excellent-good” on MacNab ratings) following PLDD; however, many of these studies suffer from significant methodological shortcomings that may bias their results in favor of effectiveness. In addition to the lack of blinding and use of an appropriate comparison group, several investigators failed to use reproducible and independent assessment of key outcome variables and few provided appropriate statistical analysis of results.

**Table 1. Published Uncontrolled Case Series of Percutaneous Laser Disc Decompression**

Study	Participants and Methods	Device Used	Outcomes	Complications	Comments
Choy et al, 1991 <sup>44</sup>		Nd: YAG	71%		21.6% had later operative interventions
Choy et al, 1992 <sup>21</sup>	n=333; case series	Nd: YAG	(Macnab criteria) Good-fair: 78%; poor response 22% (26 months)		
Davis et al, 1992 <sup>45</sup>	n=40; case series	KTP	Good-fair: 85%		2.5% had later open laminectomy
Mayer et al, 1992 <sup>19</sup>	n= 6 case series; no end assessment of outcomes	Nd:YAG	100%	none	3 pts had 'stress dependent' back pain
Siebert et al, 1993 <sup>46</sup>	n=100	Nd:YAG	78%		
Mayer et al, 1993 <sup>20</sup>	n=40; case series; no definition of how ratings scale derived	Nd:YAG	60%good to excellent (2 years)	none	10% reoperations; also used forceps to remove herniated nuc pulp
Sherk et al, 1993 <sup>47</sup>	n=48	Holmium	85%		
Ohnmeiss et al, 1994 <sup>40</sup>	n=41	KTP	71% "success rate"	1.2% Reflex sympathetic dystrophy 7.3% dysesthesias	Wide range of outcomes depend on pt selection
Casper et al, 1995a <sup>48</sup>	n=223; no controls; outcomes ind. evaluated by phone	Holmium YAG	Excellent-good: 84% (1 year)	1.8% Discitis, dermatomal discomfort, nerve block	4.5% later had open laminectomy
Choy et al, 1995a <sup>49</sup>	n=322; no controls	Nd:YAG	75% (58 months)	1% Discitis	5% had later recurrence; 10% required surgery
Liebler, 1995 <sup>26</sup>	n=46 (117 pts originally treated--most lost to f/up)	KTP YAG	Excellent-good: (1 year): 75%  (2 years): 72%(33% response rate)	not reported	Many pts lost to f/up and low response rate to mail survey

Schatz et al, 1995 <sup>50</sup>	n=16	Nd:YAG	Pain-free: 64% (early) (1 - 6 months)	none reported	7.1% required discectomy
Bosacco et al, 1996 <sup>28</sup>	n=61; case series; Andrews and Lavayne rating scale	KTP YAG	Excellent-good: 66% Fair-poor: 34% (32 months)	1.6% Acute urinary retention, ileus	54% relief from back pain; 23% "failed" treatment
Casper et al, 1996a <sup>10</sup>	n=100; no controls; outcomes ind. evaluated by phone:	Holmium: YAG	Excellent-good: 87%at 2 years; 10% required 2nd PLDD	None reported	4% had open laminectomy
Casper et al, 1996b <sup>9</sup>	n=31 (65 y/o and older) case series; no controls; independent f/u by phone	Holmium:YAG	Excellent-good: 80%(modified Macnab criteria) (1 year); 10% had second PLDD at same or different level	None reported	
Tonami et al, 1997 <sup>27</sup>	n=26, case series Assessed w/ JOA for LBP	MRI Holmium YAG	Recovery (defined as > 25% on JOA) (24 hrs): 53% (1 year): 65%+/- 26%	None	11.5% later had open laminectomy No sig change seen in size of disc herniation
Choy, 1998a <sup>51</sup>	n=518, case series		75-89%	<1%	
Dangaria, 1998 <sup>52</sup>	n=15, case series	ND: YAG	Excellent: 0% Good: 20% Fair: 33% Poor: 47%		
Steiner et al, 1998 <sup>25</sup>	n=8, case series	Nd:YAG	Good: 50%	Disciitis	
Gevargez et al, 2000 <sup>43</sup>	n=26, case series	Ceralas - D diode	Pain-free (>85% VAS): 46% (1 month)	None	

<b>Knight et al 2002</b> <sup>53</sup>	n=576; case series; Assessed w/ Oswestry Index	KTP-LDD	At 3 years: 52% Good to excellent backpain; 12% pain free by VAS; 61% pts satisfied overall	aseptic discitis n 4 pts; further disc prolapse in 2%	17% required further intervention
<b>Gronemeyer et al 2003</b> <sup>54</sup>	n=200 case series	NdYAG with CT/fluoro	73% success (pain reduced or eliminated); 74% "satisfied" (4 yr follow up)	discitis in one pt	Use of pain medications increased slightly overall
<b>Black et al, 2004</b> <sup>55</sup>	n=37; case series	not reported	Good: 44% Fair: 44% Poor: 12.5%	none reported	
<b>McMillan et al, 2004</b> <sup>56</sup>	n=32 case series	ND:YAG	80% reported improved sciatica at 3 months; 75% reported improved discogenic pain	63% new onset or worsened "mechanical" LBP	LBP thought to be procedure related
<b>Tassi 2004</b> <sup>57</sup>	n=92; case series; MacNab criteria	Nd-YAG	83% good /excellent (5 months)	none reported	
<b>Tassi 2006</b> <sup>41</sup>	n=500 microdiscectomy n=500 PLDD  non-contemporaneous comparison group	Nd:YAG	microdisc gp - 86% good/excellent PLDD grp - 84%  good/excellent (2 years for both)	2.2% microdisc; 0 in PLDD	Non-randomized design; ? pts truly comparable
<b>Ishiwata et al 2007</b> <sup>58</sup>	n=32; case series	MR guided Nd:YAG	69% success at 6 months (MacNabb criteria)	none reported	Location of needle tip strong predictor of clinical response

The two major outcomes reported (pain relief and patient function) are measured almost exclusively by patient report. Only one study reported results of objective findings on neurological examination<sup>59</sup> and one used the Oswestry Index<sup>53</sup> a validated measure of function in back pathology. In the Choy analysis (1996), they reported post-operative neurological improvement, including return of absent ankle jerks in 54% of 67 cases, return of knee jerks in 64% of 69 cases, and disappearance of positive straight-leg-raising tests in 81% of 134 cases by one week after PLDD<sup>59</sup>.

Without control patients, it is difficult to assess the magnitude of a placebo response from the PLDD procedure. The lack of matched control groups also precludes comparison of PLDD with traditional conservative therapies or open surgical procedures.

### Systematic Reviews

A recent Cochrane review concluded that: "Surgical discectomy for carefully selected patients with sciatica due to lumbar disc prolapse provides faster relief from acute attack than conservative management . . . The evidence for other minimally invasive techniques remains unclear . . ."<sup>3, 8</sup>.

Goupille et al (2007) recently published a comprehensive systematic review of PLDD for the treatment of lumbar disc herniation<sup>18</sup>. They concluded that: "Although the concept of laser disc nucleotomy is appealing, this treatment cannot be considered validated for disc herniation-associated radiculopathy resistant to medical treatment".

Boult et al (2000) conclude that the level of evidence for the safety and efficacy of PLDD is low due to the lack of controlled, blinded or randomized studies<sup>11</sup>. The authors conclude: "Given the extremely low level of evidence available for this procedure it was recommended that the procedure be regarded as experimental until results are available from a controlled clinical trial, ideally with random allocation to an intervention and control group."

### Patient Risks and Complications

Deep tissue penetration of laser energy has the potential to produce serious side effects but cannot generally be assessed during the procedure<sup>25</sup>. PLDD has occasionally been complicated by cases of septic discitis occurring in up to one percent of treated patients<sup>5, 25, 30, 37, 60-62</sup>; causalgia related to damage to the spinal nerve or sympathetic chain<sup>63</sup>; paraspinal muscle spasm<sup>5</sup>; L4-L5 neuropathic pain and neural damage with foot drop<sup>64</sup>; and partial cauda equina syndrome<sup>22</sup>. Structures beyond the intervertebral disc are also at risk for damage during PLDD. For example, there have been reports of psoas muscle hematoma<sup>65</sup>; and even abdominal perforation<sup>22</sup>. Nerve and disc root injuries from excessive heat have been documented following failed PLDD<sup>66</sup>.

Many of the published series have small numbers ( $\leq 100$ ) of patients. With such small numbers, data regarding safety may be unreliable, especially for infrequent complications.

**TA criterion 3 is not met.**

**TA Criterion 4: The technology must be as beneficial as any established alternatives.**

The established alternatives to PLDD for treatment of a symptomatic disc herniation include **conservative measures**, such as nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, physical therapy, selective nerve blocks, epidural steroids, and chiropractic care; **open surgical techniques** consisting of either open laminectomy or discectomy; and other **percutaneous techniques**. A minority of patients suffering from low back pain ultimately require surgical intervention. The goal of surgery is to relieve symptoms by removing all or a portion of the affected disc that is exerting pressure on nerve roots. In eligible patients, standard open discectomy results in better short-term relief of sciatica (65-85%) than conservative treatment (36%)<sup>67</sup> and a meta-analysis of randomized studies has concluded that surgical discectomy produces better results than placebo treatment<sup>68</sup>.

Microdiscectomy is more commonly performed than standard open discectomy with laminectomy. In this procedure, a small incision is made in the back and, following

removal of a portion of the lamina (hemilaminectomy), the offending disc fragment is removed with the aid of an operating microscope. Microdiscectomy has been found in randomized clinical trials to be as good as or superior to conservative therapy in relieving symptoms, time to recovery and improving function<sup>69, 70</sup>. Overall, these trials have found that early surgery is associated with quicker recovery, but one year outcomes are similar to outcomes in patients who begin with conservative treatment and undergo surgery only if symptoms do not improve. A recent Cochrane review concluded that surgical discectomy is superior to placebo for treatment of selected patients with sciatica from lumbar disc herniation who have not improved with conservative care<sup>3</sup>. This same review concluded that chemonucleolysis with chymopapain is also superior to placebo for treatment of sciatica not responsive to conservative treatment; however, enzymatic dissolution of disc tissue with chymopapain is no longer used due to severe allergic reactions in some patients<sup>47</sup>.

Other percutaneous or minimally invasive techniques for removal or destruction of prolapsed and extruded intervertebral discs such as automated percutaneous lateral discectomy (APLD) and arthroscopic microdiscectomy (AMD) have been used for a number of years but have not been thoroughly evaluated in randomized clinical trials or in trials comparing them with PLDD. PLDD has not been compared to microdiscectomy in a randomized clinical trial, but the Cochrane review<sup>8</sup> concluded that “outcomes following (laser discectomy) are at best fair and certainly worse than after microdiscectomy”.

**TA criterion 4 is not met.**

**TA Criterion 5: The improvement must be attainable outside of the investigational setting.**

The number of centers performing PLDD has remained limited and the published data are not sufficient to conclude that the efficacy and safety of PLDD has been established in the investigational setting, let alone under conditions of usual medical practice.

Whether PLDD will be effective in improving health outcomes when used to treat individuals with herniated lumbar discs in the community setting under conditions of usual medical practice remains to be demonstrated.

**TA criterion 5 is not met.**

## CONCLUSION

No randomized, concurrently controlled, blinded trials comparing outcomes for patients with chronic symptoms referable to lumbar disc herniation treated with PLDD compared with conventional conservative measures, open discectomy or microdiscectomy have been published in the peer reviewed literature. The published articles concerning PLDD are almost all uncontrolled case series. In these trials, the procedure appears to provide subjective pain relief in about half to 3/4 of patients with relatively short follow up; long term success rates are inferior to this and re-intervention rates range from 5% to 25%. As with all case series that lack a control group involving pain as an outcome, a placebo effect cannot be excluded. The methodology used in most of the PLDD trials to date is of poor quality. Patient selection is generally inadequately described and is not consistent across the trials. The case series often report on findings from a single site; the surgeon and evaluator are usually the same individual; and the evaluation criteria are not uniformly applied. Results are infrequently subjected to statistical scrutiny and complications of the procedure are poorly tracked and inconsistently reported. Many of the published series have small numbers ( $\leq 100$ ) of patients. With such small numbers, data regarding safety may be unreliable, especially for infrequent complications.

Patients suffering from chronic, symptomatic disc herniation do have evidence based established alternatives to PLDD, such as open or microdiscectomy, to turn to that have been shown to provide more rapid relief of symptoms than conservative therapy.

The published data are not sufficient to conclude that the efficacy and safety of the percutaneous laser disc decompression procedure have been established in the investigational setting, let alone under conditions of usual medical practice. Percutaneous laser disc decompression requires further evaluation in a randomized controlled trial to assess its efficacy as an alternative treatment for symptomatic lumbar disc herniation.

#### **DRAFT RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that percutaneous laser disc decompression (laser discectomy) for the treatment of symptomatic lumbar disc prolapse does not meet CTAF TA criteria 2-5 for safety, efficacy and improvement in health outcomes.

June 18, 2008

## RECOMMENDATIONS OF OTHERS

### BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD ASSOCIATION (BCBSA)

The BCBSA Technology Evaluation Center has not conducted a review of this technology.

### CENTERS FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES (CMS)

CMS is silent on the use of this technology.

### CALIFORNIA ORTHOPAEDIC ASSOCIATION (COA)

The COA has been invited to provide an opinion and to participate at the meeting.

### CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF NEUROLOGICAL SURGEONS (CANS)

The CANS has been invited to attend the meeting and has provided the following opinion statement:

*"Percutaneous laser disc decompression is not a widely accepted procedure and the efficacy of using this procedure to treat or manage disc disorders has not been scientifically proven. It is considered an investigational procedure at this time.*

*In light of potential significant morbidity to the spine and to the spinal cord, only surgeons with experience and competency in spine surgery should perform the procedure if and when it is performed."*

**ABBREVIATIONS USED**

AF	Annulus fibrosus
NP	Nucleus pulposus
IDET <sup>®</sup>	Intradiscal electrothermal annuloplasty
PELD	Percutaneous endoscopic laser discectomy
PLDD	Percutaneous laser disc decompression
CT	CAT scan
Ho:YAG	Holmium:yttrium-aluminum-garnet laser
Nd	Neodymium
MR	Magnetic resonance
DARE	Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects
APLD	Automated percutaneous lateral discectomy
AMD	Arthroscopic microdiscectomy
VAS	Visual Analog Scale

## REFERENCES

1. Chou R, Qaseem A, Snow V, et al. Diagnosis and treatment of low back pain: a joint clinical practice guideline from the American College of Physicians and the American Pain Society. *Ann Intern Med.* Oct 2 2007;147(7):478-491.
2. Singh V, Derby R. Percutaneous lumbar disc decompression. *Pain Physician.* Apr 2006;9(2):139-146.
3. Gibson JN, Waddell G. Surgical Interventions for Lumbar Disc Prolapse. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2008.
4. Koes BW, van Tulder MW, Peul WC. Diagnosis and treatment of sciatica. *Bmj.* Jun 23 2007;334(7607):1313-1317.
5. Choy DS. Techniques of percutaneous laser disc decompression with the Nd:YAG laser. *J Clin Laser Med Surg.* Jun 1995;13(3):187-193.
6. Houpt JC, Conner ES, McFarland EW. Experimental study of temperature distributions and thermal transport during radiofrequency current therapy of the intervertebral disc. *Spine.* Aug 1 1996;21(15):1808-1812; discussion 1812-1803.
7. Schenk B, Brouwer PA, Peul WC, van Buchem MA. Percutaneous laser disk decompression: a review of the literature. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol.* Jan 2006;27(1):232-235.
8. Gibson JN, Waddell G. Surgical interventions for lumbar disc prolapse: updated Cochrane Review. *Spine.* Jul 15 2007;32(16):1735-1747.
9. Casper GD, Hartman VL, Mullins LL. Laser assisted disc decompression: an alternative treatment modality in the Medicare population. *J Okla State Med Assoc.* Jan 1996;89(1):11-15.
10. Casper GD, Hartman VL, Mullins LL. Results of a clinical trial of the holmium:YAG laser in disc decompression utilizing a side-firing fiber: a two-year follow-up. *Lasers Surg Med.* 1996;19(1):90-96.
11. Boulton M, Fraser RD, Jones N, et al. Percutaneous endoscopic laser discectomy. *Aust N Z J Surg.* Jul 2000;70(7):475-479.
12. Lee CK, Vessa P, Lee JK. Chronic disabling low back pain syndrome caused by internal disc derangements. The results of disc excision and posterior lumbar interbody fusion. *Spine.* Feb 1 1995;20(3):356-361.

13. Reddy AS, Loh S, Cutts J, Rachlin J, Hirsch JA. New approach to the management of acute disc herniation. *Pain Physician*. Oct 2005;8(4):385-390.
14. Choi G, Lee SH, Raiturker PP, Lee S, Chae YS. Percutaneous endoscopic interlaminar discectomy for intracanalicular disc herniations at L5-S1 using a rigid working channel endoscope. *Neurosurgery*. Feb 2006;58(1 Suppl):ONS59-68; discussion ONS59-68.
15. Maroon JC, Quigley MR, Gleason PL. Is there a future for percutaneous intradiscal therapy? *Clin Neurosurg*. 1996;43:239-251.
16. Fehlings MG. Point of View. *Spine*. 1996;21(15):1812.
17. Ascher PW. Application of the laser in neurosurgery. *Lasers Surg Med*. 1986;2:91.
18. Goupille P, Mulleman D, Mammou S, Griffoul I, Valat JP. Percutaneous laser disc decompression for the treatment of lumbar disc herniation: a review. *Semin Arthritis Rheum*. Aug 2007;37(1):20-30.
19. Mayer HM, Brock M, Berlien HP, Weber B. Percutaneous endoscopic laser discectomy (PELD). A new surgical technique for non-sequestered lumbar discs. *Acta Neurochir Suppl (Wien)*. 1992;54:53-58.
20. Mayer HM, Muller G, Schwetlick G. Lasers in percutaneous disc surgery. Beneficial technology or gimmick? *Acta Orthop Scand Suppl*. 1993;251:38-44.
21. Choy DS, Ascher PW, Ranu HS, et al. Percutaneous laser disc decompression. A new therapeutic modality. *Spine*. Aug 1992;17(8):949-956.
22. Quigley MR. Percutaneous laser discectomy. *Neurosurg Clin N Am*. Jan 1996;7(1):37-42.
23. Schenk B, Brouwer PA, van Buchem MA. Experimental basis of percutaneous laser disc decompression (PLDD): a review of literature. *Lasers Med Sci*. Dec 2006;21(4):245-249.
24. Schoenenberger AW, Steiner P, Debatin JF, et al. Real-time monitoring of laser discectomies with a superconducting, open-configuration MR system. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. Sep 1997;169(3):863-867.
25. Steiner P, Zweifel K, Botnar R, et al. MR guidance of laser disc decompression: preliminary in vivo experience. *Eur Radiol*. 1998;8(4):592-597.
26. Liebler WA. Percutaneous laser disc nucleotomy. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. Jan 1995(310):58-66.
27. Tonami H, Yokota H, Nakagawa T, et al. Percutaneous laser discectomy: MR findings within the first 24 hours after treatment and their relationship to clinical outcome. *Clin Radiol*. Dec 1997;52(12):938-944.

28. Bosacco SJ, Bosacco DN, Berman AT, Cordover A, Levenberg RJ, Stellabotte J. Functional results of percutaneous laser discectomy. *Am J Orthop*. Dec 1996;25(12):825-828.
29. Yonezawa T, Onomura T, Kosaka R, et al. The system and procedures of percutaneous intradiscal laser nucleotomy. *Spine*. Nov 1990;15(11):1175-1185.
30. Choy DS. Percutaneous laser disc decompression (PLDD) update: focus on device and procedure advances. *J Clin Laser Med Surg*. Aug 1993;11(4):181-183.
31. Prodoehl JA, Lane GJ, Black J. The effects of lasers on intervertebral disc pressures. In: Sherk HH, ed. *Spine: State of the Art Reviews. Laser discectomy*. Vol 7. Philadelphia: Hanley & Belfus; 1993:17.
32. Castro WH, Halm H, Jerosch J, Schilgen M, Winkelmann W. [Changes in the lumbar intervertebral disk following use of the Holmium-Yag laser--a biomechanical study]. *Z Orthop Ihre Grenzgeb*. Nov-Dec 1993;131(6):610-614.
33. Gangi A, Dietemann JL, Ide C, Brunner P, Klinkert A, Warter JM. Percutaneous laser disk decompression under CT and fluoroscopic guidance: indications, technique, and clinical experience. *Radiographics*. Jan 1996;16(1):89-96.
34. Kleinpeter G, Markowitsch MM, Bock F. Percutaneous endoscopic lumbar discectomy: minimally invasive, but perhaps only minimally useful? *Surg Neurol*. Jun 1995;43(6):534-539; discussion 540-531.
35. Maroon JC, Quigley MR, Gleason PL. Is there a future for percutaneous intradiscal therapy? *Clin Neurosurg*. 1995;43:239.
36. Postacchini F. Management of herniation of the lumbar disc. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*. Jul 1999;81(4):567-576.
37. Siebert W. Percutaneous laser discectomy of cervical discs: preliminary clinical results. *J Clin Laser Med Surg*. Jun 1995;13(3):205-207.
38. Ahn Y, Lee SH, Lee SC, Shin SW, Chung SE. Factors predicting excellent outcome of percutaneous cervical discectomy: analysis of 111 consecutive cases. *Neuroradiology*. May 2004;46(5):378-384.
39. Hellinger J, Stern S, Hellinger S. Nonendoscopic Nd-YAG 1064 nm PLDN in the treatment of thoracic discogenic pain syndromes. *J Clin Laser Med Surg*. Apr 2003;21(2):61-66.
40. Ohnmeiss DD, Guyer RD, Hochschuler SH. Laser disc decompression. The importance of proper patient selection. *Spine*. Sep 15 1994;19(18):2054-2058; discussion 2059.

41. Tassi GP. Comparison of results of 500 microdiscectomies and 500 percutaneous laser disc decompression procedures for lumbar disc herniation. *Photomed Laser Surg.* Dec 2006;24(6):694-697.
42. Bombardier C. Outcome assessments in the evaluation of treatment of spinal disorders: summary and general recommendations. *Spine.* Dec 15 2000;25(24):3100-3103.
43. Gevargez A, Groenemeyer DW, Czerwinski F. CT-guided percutaneous laser disc decompression with Ceralas D, a diode laser with 980-nm wavelength and 200-microm fiber optics. *Eur Radiol.* 2000;10(8):1239-1241.
44. Choy DS, Saddekni S, Michelson J, Alkaitis D, Liebler WA, Diwan S. Percutaneous Lumbar Disc Decompression With ND:YAG Laser. *American Journal of Arthroscopy.* 1991;1(9).
45. Davis JK. Early experience with laser disc decompression. A percutaneous method. *J Fla Med Assoc.* Jan 1992;79(1):37-39.
46. Siebert W. Percutaneous laser disc decompression: the European experience. In: Sherk HH, ed. *Spine: State of the Art Reviews. Laser Discectomy.* Philadelphia: Hanley & Belfus; 1993:103-133.
47. Sherk HH, Black JD, Prodoehl JA, Cummings RS. Laser discectomy. *Orthopedics.* May 1993;16(5):573-576.
48. Casper GD, Mullins LL, Hartman VL. Laser-assisted disc decompression: a clinical trial of the holmium:YAG laser with side-firing fiber. *J Clin Laser Med Surg.* Feb 1995;13(1):27-32.
49. Choy DS. Percutaneous laser disc decompression (PLDD): 352 cases with an 8 1/2-year follow-up. *J Clin Laser Med Surg.* Feb 1995;13(1):17-21.
50. Schatz SW, Talalla A. Preliminary experience with percutaneous laser disc decompression in the treatment of sciatica. *Can J Surg.* Oct 1995;38(5):432-436.
51. Choy DS. Percutaneous laser disc decompression (PLDD): twelve years' experience with 752 procedures in 518 patients. *J Clin Laser Med Surg.* Dec 1998;16(6):325-331.
52. Dangaria T. Result of laser-assisted disc ablation after unsuccessful percutaneous disc decompression. *J Clin Laser Med Surg.* Dec 1998;16(6):321-323.
53. Knight M, Goswami A. Lumbar percutaneous KTP532 wavelength laser disc decompression and disc ablation in the management of discogenic pain. *J Clin Laser Med Surg.* Feb 2002;20(1):9-13; discussion 15.
54. Gronemeyer DH, Buschkamp H, Braun M, Schirp S, Weinsheimer PA, Gevargez A. Image-guided percutaneous laser disk decompression for herniated lumbar disks: a 4-year follow-up in 200 patients. *J Clin Laser Med Surg.* Jun 2003;21(3):131-138.

55. Black W, Fejos AS, Choy DS. Percutaneous laser disc decompression in the treatment of discogenic back pain. *Photomed Laser Surg.* Oct 2004;22(5):431-433.
56. McMillan MR, Patterson PA, Parker V. Percutaneous laser disc decompression for the treatment of discogenic lumbar pain and sciatica: a preliminary report with 3-month follow-up in a general pain clinic population. *Photomed Laser Surg.* Oct 2004;22(5):434-438.
57. Tassi GP. Preliminary Italian experience of lumbar spine percutaneous laser disc decompression according to Choy's method. *Photomed Laser Surg.* Oct 2004;22(5):439-441.
58. Ishiwata Y, Takada H, Gondo G, Osano S, Hashimoto T, Yamamoto I. Magnetic resonance-guided percutaneous laser disk decompression for lumbar disk herniation--relationship between clinical results and location of needle tip. *Surg Neurol.* Aug 2007;68(2):159-163.
59. Choy DS. Rapid correction of neurologic deficits by percutaneous laser disc decompression (PLDD). *J Clin Laser Med Surg.* Feb 1996;14(1):13-15.
60. Choy DS. Successful emergency percutaneous laser disc decompression. *Photomed Laser Surg.* Jun 2004;22(3):171-172.
61. Naim-ur-Rahman N, Khan FA, Jamjoom A, Jamjoom ZA. Lumbar discitis complicating percutaneous laser disc decomposition: case report and review of literature. *J Pak Med Assoc.* Mar 1996;46(3):62-64.
62. Farrar MJ, Walker A, Cowling P. Possible salmonella osteomyelitis of spine following laser disc decompression. *Eur Spine J.* 1998;7(6):509-511.
63. Plancarte R, Calvillo O. Complex regional pain syndrome type 2 (causalgia) after automated laser discectomy. A case report. *Spine.* Feb 15 1997;22(4):459-461; discussion 461-452.
64. Epstein NE. Nerve root complications of percutaneous laser-assisted discectomy performed at outside institutions: a technical note. *J Spinal Disord.* Dec 1994;7(6):510-512.
65. Savitz MH. Same-day microsurgical arthroscopic lateral-approach laser-assisted (SMALL) fluoroscopic discectomy. *J Neurosurg.* Jun 1994;80(6):1039-1045.
66. Kobayashi S, Uchida K, Takeno K, et al. A case of nerve root heat injury induced by percutaneous laser disc decompression performed at an outside institution: technical case report. *Neurosurgery.* Feb 2007;60(2 Suppl 1):ONSE171-172; discussion ONSE172.
67. Hoffman RM, Wheeler KJ, Deyo RA. Surgery for herniated lumbar discs: a literature synthesis. *J Gen Intern Med.* Sep 1993;8(9):487-496.

68. Gibson JN, Grant IC, Waddell G. *Disc Prolapse: surgical treatment. Surgery for lumbar disc prolapse* 1999.
69. Peul WC, van Houwelingen HC, van den Hout WB, et al. Surgery versus prolonged conservative treatment for sciatica. *N Engl J Med.* May 31 2007;356(22):2245-2256.
70. Osterman H, Seitsalo S, Karppinen J, Malmivaara A. Effectiveness of microdiscectomy for lumbar disc herniation: a randomized controlled trial with 2 years of follow-up. *Spine.* Oct 1 2006;31(21):2409-2414.
71. Ahn Y, Lee SH, Park WM, Lee HY, Shin SW, Kang HY. Percutaneous endoscopic lumbar discectomy for recurrent disc herniation: surgical technique, outcome, and prognostic factors of 43 consecutive cases. *Spine.* Aug 15 2004;29(16):E326-332.
72. Ahn Y, Lee SH, Shin SW. Percutaneous endoscopic cervical discectomy: clinical outcome and radiographic changes. *Photomed Laser Surg.* Aug 2005;23(4):362-368.
73. Andreula C, Muto M, Leonardi M. Interventional spinal procedures. *Eur J Radiol.* May 2004;50(2):112-119.
74. Andreula C, Muto M, Leonardi M. Interventional spinal procedures. *Eur J Radiol.* May 2004;50(2):112-119.
75. Andrews DW, Lavyne MH. Retrospective analysis of microsurgical and standard lumbar discectomy. *Spine.* Apr 1990;15(4):329-335.
76. Beldzinski P, Dzierzanowski J, Sloniewski P. Lumbar disc surgery in historical perspective. *Ortop Traumatol Rehabil.* Jun 30 2004;6(3):382-384.
77. Black WA, Jr. A neurosurgical perspective on PLDD. *J Clin Laser Med Surg.* Jun 1995;13(3):167-171.
78. Bonaldi G, Baruzzi F, Facchinetti A, Fachinetti P, Lunghi S. Plasma radio-frequency-based discectomy for treatment of cervical herniated nucleus pulposus: feasibility, safety, and preliminary clinical results. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol.* Nov-Dec 2006;27(10):2104-2111.
79. Boswell MV, Trescot AM, Datta S, et al. Interventional techniques: evidence-based practice guidelines in the management of chronic spinal pain. *Pain Physician.* Jan 2007;10(1):7-111.
80. Botsford JA. Radiological considerations: patient selection for percutaneous laser disc decompression. *J Clin Laser Med Surg.* Oct 1994;12(5):255-259.
81. Botsford JA. The role of radiology in percutaneous laser disc decompression. *J Clin Laser Med Surg.* Jun 1995;13(3):173-186.

82. Casper GD, Hartman VL, Mullins LL. Percutaneous laser disc decompression with the holmium: YAG laser. *J Clin Laser Med Surg.* Jun 1995;13(3):195-203.
83. Chambers RA, Botsford JA, Fanelli E. The PLDD registry. *J Clin Laser Med Surg.* Jun 1995;13(3):215-219.
84. Chiu JC. Evolving transforaminal endoscopic microdecompression for herniated lumbar discs and spinal stenosis. *Surg Technol Int.* 2004;13:276-286.
85. Chiu JC, Clifford TJ, Greenspan M, Richley RC, Lohman G, Sison RB. Percutaneous microdecompressive endoscopic cervical discectomy with laser thermodiskoplasty. *Mt Sinai J Med.* Sep 2000;67(4):278-282.
86. Chiu JC, Negron F, Clifford T, Greenspan M, Princethal RA. Microdecompressive Percutaneous Endoscopy: Spinal Discectomy with New Laser Thermodiskoplasty for Non-Extruded Herniated Nucleosus Pulposus. *Surg Technol Int.* 2000;VIII:343-351.
87. Choy DS. Clinical experience and results with 389 PLDD procedures with the Nd:YAG laser, 1986 to 1995. *J Clin Laser Med Surg.* Jun 1995;13(3):209-213.
88. Choy DS. Percutaneous laser disc decompression. *J Clin Laser Med Surg.* Jun 1995;13(3):125-126.
89. Choy DS, Botsford J, Black WA, Jr. Patient selection: indications and contraindications. *J Clin Laser Med Surg.* Jun 1995;13(3):157-159.
90. Choy DS, Ngeow J. Percutaneous laser disc decompression in spinal stenosis. *J Clin Laser Med Surg.* Apr 1998;16(2):123-125.
91. Coulter AH. Percutaneous laser disc decompression (PLDD) moves to the clinic. *J Clin Laser Med Surg.* Jun 1994;12(3):181-182.
92. Davis JK. Percutaneous discectomy improved with KTP laser. *Clin Laser Mon.* Jul 1990;8(7):105-106.
93. Deyo RA. Back surgery--who needs it? *N Engl J Med.* May 31 2007;356(22):2239-2243.
94. Ditsworth DA. Endoscopic transforaminal lumbar discectomy and reconfiguration: a postero-lateral approach into the spinal canal. *Surg Neurol.* Jun 1998;49(6):588-597; discussion 597-588.
95. Fessler RG, O'Toole JE, Eichholz KM, Perez-Cruet MJ. The development of minimally invasive spine surgery. *Neurosurg Clin N Am.* Oct 2006;17(4):401-409.
96. Gibson JN, Grant IC, Waddell G. *Disc Prolapse: surgical treatment. Surgery for lumbar disc prolapse* 1999.

97. Gibson JN, Grant IC, Waddell G. Surgery for lumbar disc prolapse. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2000(3):CD001350.
98. Lee SH, Ahn Y, Choi WC, Bhanot A, Shin SW. Immediate pain improvement is a useful predictor of long-term favorable outcome after percutaneous laser disc decompression for cervical disc herniation. *Photomed Laser Surg.* Aug 2006;24(4):508-513.
99. Lee SH, Lee JH, Choi WC, Jung B, Mehta R. Anterior minimally invasive approaches for the cervical spine. *Orthop Clin North Am.* Jul 2007;38(3):327-337; abstract v.
100. Lee SH, Lee SJ, Park KH, et al. [Comparison of percutaneous manual and endoscopic laser discectomy with chemonucleolysis and automated nucleotomy]. *Orthopade.* Feb 1996;25(1):49-55.
101. Luijsterburg PA, Verhagen AP, Ostelo RW, et al. Physical therapy plus general practitioners' care versus general practitioners' care alone for sciatica: a randomised clinical trial with a 12-month follow-up. *Eur Spine J.* Apr 2008;17(4):509-517.
102. Macnab I. The traction spur. An indicator of segmental instability. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* Jun 1971;53(4):663-670.
103. Maroon JC. Current concepts in minimally invasive discectomy. *Neurosurgery.* Nov 2002;51(5 Suppl):S137-145.
104. Maroon JC, Onik G, Vidovich DV. Percutaneous discectomy for lumbar disc herniation. *Neurosurg Clin N Am.* Jan 1993;4(1):125-134.
105. Mayer HM, Muller G, Schwetlick G. Lasers in percutaneous disc surgery. Beneficial technology or gimmick? *Acta Orthop Scand Suppl.* 1993;251:38-44.
106. Nerubay J, Caspi I, Levinkopf M. Percutaneous carbon dioxide laser nucleolysis with 2- to 5-year follow-up. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* Apr 1997(337):45-48.
107. Polk DL. Percutaneous discectomy. *J Okla State Med Assoc.* Jan 1994;87(1):16-19.
108. Quigley MR, Maroon JC. Laser discectomy: a review. *Spine.* Jan 1 1994;19(1):53-56.
109. Quigley MR, Maroon JC, Shih T, Elrifai A, Lesiecki ML. Laser discectomy. Comparison of systems. *Spine.* Feb 1 1994;19(3):319-322.
110. Quigley MR, Shih T, Elrifai A, Maroon JC, Lesiecki ML. Percutaneous laser discectomy with the Ho:YAG laser. *Lasers Surg Med.* 1992;12(6):621-624.
111. Savitz MH, Doughty H, Burns P. Percutaneous lumbar discectomy with a working endoscope and laser assistance. *Neurosurg Focus.* Feb 15 1998;4(2):e9.

112. Schick U, Dohnert J. Technique of microendoscopy in medial lumbar disc herniation. *Minim Invasive Neurosurg.* Sep 2002;45(3):139-141.
113. Siebert W, Berendsen BT. Percutaneous laser disc decompression (PLDD):Technique and results. *Lasers Surg Med.* 1994;Suppl 6:21.
114. Simons P, Lensker E, von Wild K. Percutaneous nucleus pulposus denaturation in treatment of lumbar disc protrusions--a prospective study of 50 neurosurgical patients. *Eur Spine J.* 1994;3(4):219-221.
115. Singh K, Ledet E, Carl A. Intradiscal therapy: a review of current treatment modalities. *Spine.* Sep 1 2005;30(17 Suppl):S20-26.
116. Stiith WJ, Judy MM, Hochschuler SH, Guyer RD. Choice of lasers for minimally invasive spinal surgery. *Orthop Rev.* Feb 1991;20(2):137-142.
117. Thongtrangan I, Le H, Park J, Kim DH. Minimally invasive spinal surgery: a historical perspective. *Neurosurg Focus.* Jan 15 2004;16(1):E13.
118. Thongtrangan I, Le H, Park J, Kim DH. Minimally invasive spinal surgery: a historical perspective. *Neurosurg Focus.* Jan 15 2004;16(1):E13.
119. Weinstein JN, Lurie JD, Tosteson TD, et al. Surgical vs. nonoperative treatment for lumbar disk herniation: the Spine Patient Outcomes Research Trial (SPORT) observational cohort. *Jama.* Nov 22 2006;296(20):2451-2459.
120. Wittenberg RH, Oppel S, Rubenthaler FA, Steffen R. Five-year results from chemonucleolysis with chymopapain or collagenase: a prospective randomized study. *Spine.* Sep 1 2001;26(17):1835-1841.
121. Yeung AT. The evolution of percutaneous spinal endoscopy and discectomy: state of the art. *Mt Sinai J Med.* Sep 2000;67(4):327-332.