



CLINICAL GUIDELINES

CMM-610: Lumbar Total Disc Arthroplasty Guidelines

Version 1.0.2023
Effective January 1, 2023



eviCore healthcare Clinical Decision Support Tool Diagnostic Strategies: This tool addresses common symptoms and symptom complexes. Requests for individuals with atypical symptoms or clinical presentations that are not specifically addressed will require physician review. Consultation with the referring physician, specialist and/or individual's Primary Care Physician (PCP) may provide additional insight.

eviCore's Clinical Review Criteria ("CRC") and related content is made available for the limited uses of: reference; and individual use, only limited to facilitating the determination of medically necessary and appropriate clinical treatment by clinicians for specific delegated patients under their care. The CRC and related content is proprietary information of eviCore, and copyrighted to the full extent of the law. Except as expressly permitted, you may not modify, copy, reproduce, republish, upload, post, transmit, hyperlink to or from, or distribute in any way the CRC, nor may you sell, transfer, distribute, assign, lease, reproduce, or otherwise use the CRC in commerce, in a manner that competes with us or infringes upon our rights, or for any public or commercial endeavor without our prior and express written consent.

CPT® (Current Procedural Terminology) is a registered trademark of the American Medical Association (AMA). CPT® five digit codes, nomenclature and other data are copyright 2022 American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved. No fee schedules, basic units, relative values or related listings are included in the CPT® book. AMA does not directly or indirectly practice medicine or dispense medical services. AMA assumes no liability for the data contained herein or not contained herein.

Clinical guidelines for medical necessity review of Comprehensive Musculoskeletal Management Services.

CMM-610: Lumbar Total Disc Arthroplasty

CMM-610.1: General Guidelines	3
CMM-610.2: Initial Primary Lumbar Total Disc Arthroplasty	3
CMM-610.3: Non-Indications	4
CMM-610.4: Procedure (CPT®) Codes	5
CMM-610.5: References	5

CMM-610.1: General Guidelines

- The determination of medical necessity for the performance of lumbar total disc arthroplasty is always made on a case-by-case basis.
- For prior authorization requirements, see **CMM-600.1: Prior Authorization Requirements**.

CMM-610.2: Initial Primary Lumbar Total Disc Arthroplasty

Initial primary lumbar total disc arthroplasty is considered **medically necessary** when **ALL** of the following are met:

- Lumbar disc prosthesis approved by the FDA or for an FDA approved indication and in accordance with FDA labeling
- Presence of chronic, unremitting, discogenic axial lower back pain and associated disability secondary to single-level degenerative lumbar disc disease (DDD) for at least one year
- Age 18 to 60 years old
- Significant level of pain on a daily basis defined as **EITHER** of the following:
 - ◆ Visual Analog Scale (VAS)/Numeric Rating Scale (NRS) as ≥ 7
 - ◆ Severe, disabling, crippling, or incapacitating pain
- Clinically significant functional impairment (e.g. inability to perform household chores, prolonged standing or essential job functions)
- Absence of unmanaged significant mental and/or behavioral health disorders (e.g. major depressive disorder, chronic pain syndrome, secondary gain, opioid and alcohol use disorders)
- Structured physician-supervised, multi-modal, nonoperative management of medical care with licensed healthcare professionals which includes **ALL** of the following:
 - ◆ Regularly scheduled appointments
 - ◆ Follow-up evaluation
 - ◆ Less than clinically meaningful improvement with **BOTH** of the following for at least 6 consecutive months unless contraindicated:
 - Prescription strength analgesics, steroids, and/or NSAIDs
 - Provider-directed exercise program prescribed by a physical therapist, chiropractic provider, osteopathic or allopathic physician
- Moderate to severe single-level disc degeneration at L4-L5 or L5-S1 has been confirmed on recent (within 6 months) plain X-rays and advanced diagnostic imaging studies (i.e., CT, MRI)
- Absence of facet ankylosis or severe facet degeneration at the operative level

CMM-610.3: Non-Indications

Not Medically Necessary

- Lumbar artificial total disc arthroplasty is considered **not medically necessary** for **ANY** of the following:
 - ◆ The revision of a failed lumbar artificial total disc arthroplasty
 - ◆ The planned procedure includes the combined use of a prosthesis and spinal fusion (hybrid)
 - ◆ Lumbar partial disc prosthetics
 - ◆ Simultaneous multi-level implantation
 - ◆ The implant will be inserted outside of the spinal motion segments approved by the FDA
 - ◆ The patient has osteopenia or osteoporosis (T-score < -1.0)
 - ◆ Above or below or in combination with a spinal fusion or other stabilizing type surgical procedure
 - ◆ Lumbar disc prosthesis not approved by the FDA and not for an FDA approved indication and not in accordance with FDA labeling
 - ◆ Degenerative disc disease above L4-L5
 - ◆ Presence of unmanaged significant mental and/or behavioral health disorders (e.g. major depressive disorder, chronic pain syndrome, secondary gain, opioid and alcohol use disorders)
 - ◆ Age less than 18 years or greater than 60
 - ◆ As an adjunct to the treatment of primary central or far-lateral disc herniation
 - ◆ There is evidence on imaging studies of **ANY** of the following:
 - Degenerative or lytic spondylolisthesis > 3mm
 - Lumbar spinal stenosis
 - Pars interarticularis defect with either spondylolysis or isthmic spondylolisthesis
 - Lumbar scoliosis (> 11 degrees of sagittal plane deformity)
 - Spinal fracture
 - Infection
 - Multi-level degenerative disc disease (2 or more levels) on a preoperative MRI and plain X-rays
 - Presence of facet ankylosis or severe facet degeneration at the operative level
 - Presence of tumor or active infection at the site of implantation
 - Lumbar nerve root compression or bony spinal stenosis
 - Preoperative remaining disc height < 3mm
 - Mid-sagittal stenosis of <8mm (by MRI)
 - ◆ History of ankylosing spondylitis, rheumatoid arthritis, lupus, or other autoimmune disorder.
 - ◆ Allergy or sensitivity to implant materials
 - ◆ Isolated radicular compression syndromes especially due to lumbar disc herniation
 - ◆ Involved vertebral endplate is dimensionally smaller than the approximate dimensions of the implant in anterior/posterior width and lateral width

- ◆ Clinically compromised vertebral bodies at the affected level due to current or past trauma

CMM-610.4: Procedure (CPT®) Codes

This guideline relates to the CPT® code set below. Codes are displayed for informational purposes only. Any given code's inclusion on this list does not necessarily indicate prior authorization is required.	
CPT®	Code Description/Definitions
22857	Total disc arthroplasty (artificial disc), anterior approach, including discectomy to prepare interspace (other than for decompression), single interspace, lumbar
22860	Total disc arthroplasty (artificial disc), anterior approach, including discectomy to prepare interspace (other than for decompression); second interspace, lumbar (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
22862	Revision including replacement of total disc arthroplasty (artificial disc), anterior approach, single interspace; lumbar
22865	Removal of total disc arthroplasty (artificial disc), anterior approach, single interspace; lumbar
+0164T	Removal of total disc arthroplasty, (artificial disc), anterior approach, each additional interspace, lumbar (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
+0165T	Revision including replacement of total disc arthroplasty (artificial disc), anterior approach, each additional interspace, lumbar (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
This list may not be all inclusive and is not intended to be used for coding/billing purposes. The final determination of reimbursement for services is the decision of the health plan and is based on the individual's policy or benefit entitlement structure as well as claims processing rules	

CMM-610.5: References

1. Activ-L™ Artificial Disc Treatment of Degenerative Disc Disease in the Treatment of Degenerative Disc Disease - Full Text View - ClinicalTrials.gov. Clinicaltrials.gov. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT00589797>. Published 2020.
2. Ahrens M, Tsantrizos A, Donkersloot P, Martens F, Lauweryns P, Le Huec JC, et al. Nucleus replacement with the DASCOR disc arthroplasty device: interim two-year efficacy and safety results from two prospective, non-randomized multicenter European studies. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2009 Jun 1;34(13):1376-84.
3. Balsano M, Zachos A, Ruggiu A, Barca F, Tranquilli-Leali P, Doria C. Nucleus disc arthroplasty with the NUBAC™ device: 2-year clinical experience. *Eur Spine J*. 2011 May;20 Suppl 1:S36-40. Epub 2011 Mar 18.
4. Bertagnoli R, Karg A, Voigt S. Lumbar partial disc replacement. *Orthop Clin N Am*. 2005;36:341-7.
5. Bertagnoli R, Yue JJ, Fenk-Mayer A, Eerulker J, Emerson JW. Treatment of symptomatic adjacent-segment degeneration after lumbar fusion with total disc arthroplasty by using the ProDisc prosthesis: a prospective study with 2-year minimum follow up. *J Neurosurg Spine*. 2006[a];4:91-7.
6. Bertagnoli R, Yue JJ, Kershaw T, Shah RV, Pfeiffer F, Fenk-Mayer A, et al. Lumbar total disc arthroplasty utilizing the ProDisc prosthesis in smokers versus nonsmokers. *Spine*. 2006[b];31:992-7.
7. Bertagnoli R, Yue JJ, Shah RV, Nanieva R, Pfeiffer F, Fenk-Mayer A, et al. The treatment of disabling single-level lumbar discogenic low back pain with total disc arthroplasty utilizing the ProDisc Prosthesis. *Spine*. 2005;30(19):2230-6.
8. Blumenthal S, McAfee PC, Guyer RD, Hochschuler, Geisler RD, Holt RT. A prospective, randomized, multicenter Food and Drug Administration investigational device exemptions study of lumbar total disc replacement with the Charité™ artificial disc versus lumbar fusion. Part I: evaluation of clinical outcomes. *Spine*. 2005;30(14):1565-75.
9. Blumenthal SL, Ohnmeiss DD, Guyer RD, Hochschuler SH. Prospective study evaluating total disc replacement: preliminary results. *J Spinal Disord Tech*. 2003 Oct;16(5):450-4.

10. Blumenthal SL, Ohnmeiss DD, Guyer R, Hochschuler S, McAfee P, Garcia R, Salib R, et al. Artificial intervertebral disks and beyond: a North American Spine Society Annual Meeting Symposium. *Spine J*. Nov-Dec 2002;2(6):460-3.
11. Boden SD, Balderston RA, Heller J, Hanley EN Jr., Zigler JE. An AOA critical issue. Disc Replacements: This Time Will We Really Cure Low-Back and Neck Pain? *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2004 Feb;86-A(2):411-22.
12. Boswell MV, Shah RV, Everett CR, Sehgal N, McKenzie-Brown AM, Abdi S, et al. Interventional techniques in the management of chronic spinal pain: evidence-based practice guidelines. *Pain Phys*. 2005;8(1):1-47. Updated 2005.
13. Bree Collaborative Spine/Low Back Pain Topic – Report and Recommendations. November, 2013.
14. Chung SS, Lee CS, Kang CS. Lumbar total disc replacement using ProDisc II: A prospective study with a 2-year minimum follow-up. *J Spinal Disord Tech*. 2006;19:411-5.
15. Cinotti G, Thierry D, Postacchini F. Results of disc prosthesis after a minimum follow-up period of 2 years. *Spine*. 1996;21(8):995-1000.
16. Cunningham BW, McAfee PC, Geisler FH, Holsapple G, Adams K, Blumenthal SL, et al. Distribution of in vivo and in vitro range of motion following 1-level arthroplasty with the CHARITE artificial disc compared with fusion. *J Neurosurg Spine*. 2008 Jan;8(1):7-12.
17. David T. Long-term results of one-level lumbar arthroplasty: minimum 10-year followup of the Charite artificial disc in 106 patients. *Spine*. 2007;32:661-6.
18. Davidson, M, Keating, JL. A Comparison of Five Low Back Disability Questionnaires: Reliability and Responsiveness: *Phys Ther*. 2002; 82: 8-24 Di Silvestre M, Bakaloudis G, Lolli F, Vommaro F, Parisini P. Two-level total lumbar disc replacement. *Eur Spine J*. 2009 Jun;18 Suppl 1:64-70. Epub 2009 Apr 28.
19. Delamarter R, Zigler JE, Balderston RA, Cammisa FP, Goldstein JA, Spivak JM. 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*. 2011 Apr 20;93(8):705-15. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.I.00680. Epub 2011 Mar 11.
20. Donnally C, Patel P, Canseco J et al. Current incidence of adjacent segment pathology following lumbar fusion versus motion-preserving procedures: a systematic review and meta-analysis of recent projections. *Spine J*. 2020;20(10):1554-1565. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2020.05.100.
21. ECRI Institute. *Artificial intervertebral disc replacement (AIDR) for lumbar degenerative disc disease (DDD)*. Emerging Technology Evidence Report. Plymouth Meeting (PA): ECRI Institute; 2009a October 14.
22. FDA *Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data Prodisc-L Total Disc Replacement*.
23. Fekete TF, Porchet F. Overview of disc arthroplasty-past, present and future. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)*. 2010 Mar;152(3):393-404.
24. Fischer, CR, Ducoffe, AR, Errico, TJ. Review Article: Posterior Lumbar Fusion: Choice of Approach and Adjunct Techniques. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg*. 2014; 22: 503-511.
25. Freeman BJC, Davenport J. Total disc replacement in the lumbar spine: a systematic review of the literature. *Eur Spine J*. 2006;15 (Suppl. 3):S439-47.
26. Geisler FH, Guyer RD, Blumenthal SL, McAfee PC, Cappuccino A, Bitan F, Regan JJ. Effect of previous surgery on clinical outcome following 1-level lumbar arthroplasty. *J Neurosurg Spine*. 2008b Feb;8(2):108-14.
27. Geisler FH, Guyer RD, Blumenthal SL, McAfee PC, Cappuccino A, Bitan F, Regan JJ. Patient selection for lumbar arthroplasty and arthrodesis: the effect of revision surgery in a controlled, multicenter, randomized study. *J Neurosurg Spine*. 2008a Jan;8(1):13-6.
28. German JW, Foley KT. Disc arthroplasty in the management of the painful lumbar motion segment. *Spine*. 2005;30(16S):S60-7.
29. Griffith SL, Shelokov AP, Buttner-Janz K, LeMaire, JP, Zeegers WS. A multicenter retrospective study of the clinical results of the LINK® SB Charité intervertebral prosthesis: the initial European experience. *Spine*. 1994;19:1842-9.
30. Guyer RD, Geisler FH, Blumenthal SL, et al. Effect of age on clinical and radiographic outcomes and adverse events following 1 level lumbar arthroplasty after a minimum 2 year follow-up. *J Neurosurg Spine*. 2008b;8(2): 101-7.
31. Guyer RD, McAfee PC, Banco RJ, Bitan FD, Cappuccino A, Geisler FH, et al. Prospective, randomized, multicenter Food and Drug Administration investigational device exemption study of lumbar total disc replacement with the CHARITE artificial disc versus lumbar fusion: Five-year follow-up. *Spine J*. 2008a Sep 18.
32. Hannibal M, Thomas DJ, Low J, Hsu KY, Zucherman J. ProDisc-L total disc replacement: a comparison of 1-level versus 2-level arthroplasty patients with a minimum 2-year follow-up. *Spine*. 2007 Oct 1;32(21):2322-6.
33. Huang RC, Girardi FP, Lim MR, Cammisa FP. Advantages and disadvantages of nonfusion technology in spine surgery. *Orthop Clin N Am*. 2005;36:263-9.
34. Institutes for Clinical Systems Improvement (ICSI). Lumbar artificial intervertebral discs. Bloomington, MN: Institute for Clinical Systems Improvement (ICSI); 2005 Dec.
35. Jacobs WC, Van der Gaag NA, Krut MC, Tuschel A, de Kleuver M, Peul WC, Verbout AJ, Oner FC. Total Disc Replacement for Chronic Discogenic Low-Back Pain: A Cochrane Review. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2012 Sep 19.

36. Katsimihis M, Bailey CS, Issa K, Fleming J, Rosas-Arellano P, Bailey SI, Gurr KR. Prospective clinical and radiographic results of CHARITÉ III artificial total disc arthroplasty at 2- to 7-year follow-up: a Canadian experience. *Can J Surg*. 2010 Dec;53(6):408-4145.
37. Kostuik JP. Intervertebral disk replacement. Experimental study. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 1997 Apr;337:27-41.
38. Kuhns BD, Louk S, Buchanan C, Lubelski D, Alvin MD, Benzel EC, Mroz TE, Tozzi J. Sensitivity of Magnetic Resonance Imaging in the Diagnosis of Mobile and Non-Mobile L4-5 Degenerative Spondylolisthesis. *Spine J*. 2014.
39. Kurtz SM, Peloza J, Siskey R, Villarraga ML. Analysis of a retrieved polyethylene total disc replacement component. *Spine J*. 2005 May-Jun;5(3):344-50.
40. Kurtz SM, van Ooij A, Ross R, Malefit JdW, Peloza J, Ciccarelli L, Villarraga ML. Polyethylene wear and rim fracture in total disc arthroplasty. *Spine J*. 2007;7:12-21.
41. Leahy M, Zigler JE, Ohnmeiss DD, Rashbaum RF, Sachs BL. Comparison of results of total disc replacement in postdiscectomy patients versus patients with no previous lumbar surgery. *Spine*. 2008 Jul 1;33(15):1690-3; discussion 1694-5.
42. Leary SP, Regan JJ, Lanman TH, Wagner WH. Revision and Explantation Strategies Involving the Lumbar Artificial Disc Replacement. *Spine*. 2007;32(9):1001-11.
43. Le Huec [a] J-C, Basso Y, Aunoble S, Friesem T, Bruno MB. Influence of Facet and Posterior Muscle Degeneration on Clinical Results of Lumbar Total Disc Replacement: Two-Year Follow-Up. *J Spinal Disord Tech*. 2005 Jun;18(3):219-23.
44. Le Huec [b] JC, Basso Y, Mathews H, Mehbod A, Aunoble S, Friesem T, Zdeblick T. The effect of single-level, total disc arthroplasty on sagittal balance parameters: a prospective study. *Eur Spine J*. 2005;14:480-6.
45. Leivseth G, Braaten S, Frobin W, Brinckmann P. Mobility of lumbar segments instrumented with a ProDisc II Prosthesis: A two-year follow-up study. *Spine*. 2006;31(15):1726-33.
46. LeMaire JP, Carrier H, Sari Ali E-H, Skalli W, Lavaste F. Clinical and radiological outcomes with the Charité™ artificial disc: a 10-year minimum follow-up. *J Spinal Disord Tech*. 2005 Aug;18(4):353-9.
47. Lurie JD, Tosteson TD, Tosteson AN, Zhao W, Morgan TS, Abdu WA, Herkowitz H, Weinstein, JN. Surgical versus Nonoperative Treatment for Lumbar Disc Herniation. *Spine*. 39 (1): 3-16.
48. Markwalder TM, Wenger M, Marbacher S. A 6.5-year follow-up of 14 patients who underwent ProDisc total disc arthroplasty for combined long-standing degenerative lumbar disc disease and recent disc herniation. *J Clin Neurosci*. 2011 Dec;18(12):1677-81.
49. Marshman LA, Friesem T, Rampersaud YR, Le Huec JC, Krishna M. Subsidence and malplacement with the Oblique Maverick Lumbar Disc Arthroplasty: technical note. *Spine J*. 2008 Jul-Aug;8(4):650-5. Epub 2007 May 22.
50. Martin CW and the Work Comp Board (WCB) Evidence Based Practice Group. Artificial cervical and lumbar disc implants: a review of the literature. Updated Apr 2005.
51. McAfee PC, Geisler FH, Saiedy SS, Moore SV, Regan JJ, Guyer RD, et al. Revisability of the CHARITÉ artificial disc replacement. *Spine*. 2006;31(11):1217-26.
52. McAfee PC, Cunningham B, Holsapple G, Adams K, Blumenthal S, Guyer RD. A prospective, randomized, multicenter Food and Drug device exemption study of lumbar total disc replacement with the Charité™ artificial disc versus lumbar fusion. Part II: Evaluation of radiographic outcomes and correlations of surgical technique accuracy with clinical outcomes. *Spine*. 2005;30(14):1576-83.
53. McAfee PC, Fedder IL, Saiedy S, Shucosky EM, Cunningham BW. SB Charité disc replacement: report of 60 prospective randomized cases in a U.S. center. *J Spinal Disord Tech*. 2003 Aug;16(4):424-33.
54. Mirza SK, Deyo RA. Systematic Review of Randomized Trials Comparing Lumbar Fusion Surgery to Nonoperative Care for Treatment of Chronic Back Pain. *Spine*. 2007;32(7):816-23.
55. National Institutes for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). Prosthetic intervertebral disc replacement in the cervical spine. Interventional Procedure Guidance 341. May 2010.
56. North American Spine Society (NASS). Clinical Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Spine Care. *Diagnosis and Treatment of Degenerative Lumbar Spinal Stenosis*. Updated 2006.
57. North American Spine Society (NASS). Coverage Policy Recommendations. *Lumbar Artificial Disc Replacement*. Burr Ridge: North American Spine Society Coverage Committee; Feb 2019:1-8.
58. Ontario Health Technology Assessment Committee (OHTAC). OHTAC Recommendation: Updated Health Technology Policy Assessment (HPTA) on Artificial Disc Replacement for Lumbar and Cervical Degenerative Disc Disease. Updated Apr 2006. *Ont Health Technol Assess Ser*. 2006;6(10):1-98.
59. Panjabi M, Malcolmson G, Teng E, Tominaga Y, Henderson G, Serhan H. Hybrid Testing of Lumbar Discs Versus Fusions. *Spine*. 2007;32(9):959-66.
60. Park CK, Ryu KS, Jee WH. Degenerative changes of discs and facet joints in lumbar total disc replacement using ProDisc II: minimum two-year follow-up. *Spine*. 2008 Jul 15;33(16):1755-61.
61. Park CK, Ryu KS, Lee KY, Lee HJ. Clinical Outcome of Lumbar Total Disc Replacement Using ProDisc-L® in Degenerative Disc Disease: Minimum 5-year Follow-up Results at a Single Institute. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2011 Aug 18. Regan JJ. Clinical results of Charité lumbar total disc replacement. *Orthop Clin N Am*. 2005;36:323-40:1-10.

62. Park SJ, Lee CS, Chung SS, Lee KH, Kim WS, Lee JY. Long-Term Outcomes Following Lumbar Total Disc Replacement Using ProDisc-II: Average 10-Year Follow-Up at a Single Institution. *Spine*. 2016. 41(11): 971-977.
63. Punt IM, Vissor VM, van Rhijn LW, et al. Complications and reoperations of the SB Charite lumbar disc prosthesis: experience in 75 patients. *Eur Spine J*. 2008;17(1): 36-43.
64. Radcliff K, Spivak J, Darden B 2nd, Janssen M, Bernard T, Zigler J. Five-Year Reoperation Rates of 2-Level Lumbar Total Disk Replacement Versus Fusion: Results of a Prospective, Randomized Clinical Trial. *Clin Spine Surg*. 2018 Feb;31(1):37-42. doi: 10.1097/BSD.0000000000000476.
65. Rasouli A, Cuellar JM, Kanim L, Delamarter R. Multiple-Level Lumbar Total Disk Replacement: A Prospective Clinical and Radiographic Analysis of Motion Preservation at 24-72 Months. *Clin Spine Surg*. 2019 Feb;32(1):38-42. doi: 10.1097/BSD.0000000000000704.
66. Ross R, Mirza AH, Norris HE, et al. Survival and clinical outcome of SB Charite III disc replacement for back pain. *J Bone Joint Surg BR*. 2007;89(6): 785-9
67. SariAli E, LeMaire JP, Pascal-Moussellard H, et al. In vivo study of the kinematics in axial rotation of the lumbar spine after total intervertebral disc replacement: long-term results: a 10-22 years follow-up evaluation. *Eur Spine J*. 2006
68. Scott-Young MN, Lee MJ, Nielsen DE, Magno CL, Kimlin KR, Mitchell EO. Clinical and Radiological Mid-Term Outcomes of Lumbar Single-Level Total Disc Replacement. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2011 Sep 8. [Epub ahead of print]
69. Sharan AD, Goldstein JA. Cervical artificial disc replacement technologies. Updated Aug 2015
70. Shim CS, Lee S-H, Shin H-- Versus ProDisc: A Comparative Study of a Minimum 3-Year Follow-up. *Spine*. 2007;32(9):1012-8
71. Siepe CJ, Heider F, Haas E, Hitzl W, Szeimies U, Stäbler A, Weiler C, Nerlich AG, Mayer MH. Influence of lumbar intervertebral disc degeneration on the outcome of total lumbar disc replacement: a prospective clinical, histological, X-ray and MRI investigation. *Eur Spine J*. 2012 May 29
72. Siepe CJ, Korge A, Grochulla F, Mehren C, Mayer HM. Analysis of post-operative pain patterns following total lumbar disc replacement: results from fluoroscopically guided spine infiltrations. *Eur Spine J*. 2008 Jan;17(1):44-56.
73. Siepe CJ, Mayer HM, Heinz-Leisenheimer M, Korge A. Total lumbar disc replacement: different results for different levels. *Spine*. 2007 Apr 1;32(7):782-90
74. Siepe CJ, Mayer M, Wiechert K, Korge A. Clinical results of total lumbar disc replacement with ProDisc I: Three-year results for different indications. *Spine*. 2006;31:1923-32.
75. Siepe CJ, Tepass A, Hitzl W, Meschede P, Beisse R, Korge A, Mayer HM. Dynamics of improvement following total lumbar disc replacement: is the outcome predictable? *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2009 Nov 1;34(23):2579-86. doi: 10.1097/BRS.0b013e3181b612bd.
76. Siepe CJ, Zelenkov P, Sauri-Barraza JC, Szeimies U, Grubinger T, Tepass A, Stäbler A, Mayer MH. The fate of facet joint and adjacent level disc degeneration following total lumbar disc replacement: a prospective clinical, x-ray, and magnetic resonance imaging investigation. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2010 Oct 15;35(22):1991-2003.
77. Tropiano P, Huang RC, Giradi FP, et al. Lumbar total disc replacement: surgical technique. *J Bone Joint Surg AM*. 2006;88A (Supp 1, Part 1): 50-64.
78. Total disc replacement for chronic low back pain: background and a systemic review of the literature. The Cochrane Review. In: The Cochrane Library, Issue 12, 2005. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.; 2005. Oxford: Update software. Uschold TD, Fusco D, Germain R, Tumialan LM, Chang SW. Cervical and Lumbar Spinal Arthroplasty: Clinical Review. *AJNR*. 2011 Oct 27.
79. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. *Orthopaedic and Rehabilitation Devices Panel of the Medical Devices Advisory Committee*. Nov 2002. Updated Nov 2002.
80. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH). *New Device Approval. ProDisc®-L Total Disc Replacement – P050010*. Updated Aug 2006.
81. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH). *New Device Approval. Charite™ Artificial Disc- P040006*. Issued October 26, 2004. Updated March 9, 2005.
82. van den Eerenbeemt KD, Ostelo RW, van Royen BJ, Peul WC, van Tulder MW. Total disc replacement surgery for symptomatic degenerative lumbar disc disease: a systematic review of the literature. *AJNR*. 2011 Oct 27. Wang G. Health Technology Assessment: Artificial Disc Replacement. Washington State Department of Labor and Industries. Updated Nov 2004.
83. van Ooij A, Kurtz SM, Stessels F, et al. Polyethylene wear debris and long term clinical failure of the Charite disc prosthesis: a study of 4 patients. *Spine*. 2007;32(2):223-9.
84. Wagner WH, Regan JJ, Leary SP, et al. Access strategies for revision or explanation of the Char. *J Vasc Surg*. 2006;44:1266-72.
85. van Ooij A, Oner FC, Verbout AJ. Complications of artificial disc replacement: a report of 27 patients with the SB Charite disc. *J Spinal Disord Tech*. 2003;16(4): 369-83.

86. Weinstein JN, Lurie JD, Tosteson TD, Zhao W, Blood EA, Tosteson ANA, Birkmeyer N, Herkowitz H, Longley M, Lenke L, Emery S, Hu SS. Surgical Compared with Nonoperative Treatment for Lumbar Degenerative Spondylolisthesis. Four –Year Results in the Spine Patient Outcomes Research Trial (SPORT) Randomized and Observational Cohorts. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2009; 91: 1295-1304. Yaszay B, Bendo JA, Goldstein JA, Quirno M, Spivak JM, Errico TJ. Effect of intervertebral disc height on postoperative motion and outcomes after ProDisc-L lumbar disc replacement. *Spine*. 2008 Mar 1;33(5):508-12; discussion 513.
87. Yue J, Garcia R, Blumenthal S et al. Five-year Results of a Randomized Controlled Trial for Lumbar Artificial Discs in Single-level Degenerative Disc Disease. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2019;44(24):1685-1696. doi:10.1097/brs.0000000000003171.
88. Yue J, Zhang K, Bai HX, Du J, Cammisa F, Abjornson C, Mo F. A comparison of patients who have undergone 1-Level versus 2-Level ProDisc arthroplasty: a prospective study with minimum of 5-year follow-up. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2013 Jun 15;38(14):1194-8. doi: 10.1097/BRS.0b013e31828b31e8.
89. Zeller JL. Artificial spinal disk superior to fusion for treating degenerative disk disease. *JAMA*. 2006;296(22):2665-6.
90. 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*. 2012;17: 493-501.
91. Zigler J, Delamater 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*. 2007;32(11): 1155-62.
92. Sigler 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. *Neurosurg Spine*. 2012.
93. Zindrick MR, Tzermiadianos MN, Voronov LI, Lorenz M, Hadjipavlou A. An evidence-based medicine approach in determining factors that may affect outcome in lumbar total disc replacement. *Spine*. 2008 May 15;33(11):1262-9.