

MEDICAL POLICY

Medical Policy Title	Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc
Policy Number	7.01.80
Current Effective Date	October 15, 2026
Next Review Date	June 2027

Our medical policies are guides to evaluate technologies or services for medical necessity. Criteria are established through the assessment of evidence based, peer-reviewed scientific literature, and national professional guidelines. Federal and state law(s), regulatory mandates and the member's subscriber contract language are considered first in the determination of a covered service.

(Link to [Product Disclaimer](#))

POLICY STATEMENT(S)

Initial/Primary for Radiculopathy and Myelopathy

- I. Initial/primary total artificial cervical intervertebral disc implant is considered **medically appropriate** for **either** radiculopathy or myelopathy when **ALL** of the associated criteria are met:
 - A. Radiculopathy, when **ALL** of the following criteria are met:
 1. Age is at least 18 years;
 2. The device has been approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), for an FDA approved indication, and is used in accordance with FDA labeling;
 3. The planned implant(s) will be used in the reconstruction of cervical disc(s) at C3-C7, following discectomy;
 4. The planned implant(s) is/are for a single level or contiguous two-level replacement(s);
 5. The individual is a candidate for single-level or two-level anterior cervical decompression(s) and interbody fusion(s);
 6. No previous surgeries at the operative level;
 7. Symptoms include **BOTH** of the following:
 - a. significant level of pain on a daily basis, defined as clinically significant functional impairment (e.g., inability to perform household chores, prolonged standing, etc.); **and**
 - b. unremitting, radicular pain to shoulder girdle and/or upper extremity, resulting in a disability;
 8. Physical exam findings including **ANY** of the following:
 - a. dermatomal sensory deficit;
 - b. motor deficit (e.g., biceps, triceps weakness);
 - c. reflex changes;

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 2 of 22

- d. shoulder abduction relief sign;
 - e. nerve root tension sign (e.g., Spurling's maneuver); **or**
 - f. unremitting radicular pain to shoulder girdle and/or upper extremity without concordant objective physical exam findings;
9. Less than clinically meaningful improvement with at least **TWO** (2) of the following (unless contraindicated):
- a. prescription-strength analgesics, steroids, gabapentinoids and/or NSAIDs for six (6) weeks;
 - b. provider-directed exercise program prescribed by a physical therapist, chiropractic provider, osteopathic or allopathic physician for six (6) weeks;
 - c. epidural steroid injections/selective nerve root block performed at the same level(s) as the requested surgery;
10. Absence of clinically significant cervical instability on plain X-rays with **ANY** of the following findings:
- a. subluxation or translation of more than 3.5 mm on static lateral or dynamic flexion/extension views;
 - b. sagittal plane angulation of more than 11 degrees between adjacent segments on static or dynamic flexion/extension views; **or**
 - c. kyphotic deformity/significant reversal of lordosis or spondylolisthesis;
11. MRI/CT shows neural structure compression at the requested level(s) that is concordant with the individual's symptoms and physical exam findings and that is caused by **ANY** of the following:
- a. herniated disc(s) (retained disc material or a recurrent disc herniation);
 - b. synovial cyst or arachnoid cyst;
 - c. central/lateral/foraminal stenosis; **or**
 - d. osteophytes;
12. The patient has no unmanaged, significant behavioral health disorders (e.g., major depressive disorder, chronic pain syndrome, secondary gain, or opioid use or alcohol use disorder).
- B. Myelopathy, when **ALL** of the following criteria are met:
- 1. Age is at least 18 years;
 - 2. The device has been approved by the FDA, for an FDA approved indication, and is used in accordance with FDA labeling;
 - 3. The planned implant(s) will be used in the reconstruction of cervical disc(s) at C3-C7,

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 3 of 22

following discectomy;

4. The planned implant(s) is/are for a single level or contiguous two-level replacement(s);
5. The individual is a candidate for single-level or two-level anterior cervical decompression(s) and interbody fusion(s);
6. No previous surgeries at the operative level;
7. Symptoms include **ANY** of the following:
 - a. upper/lower extremity weakness, numbness or pain;
 - b. fine motor dysfunction with tasks such as buttoning or handwriting, or clumsiness of hands;
 - c. new-onset bowel or bladder dysfunction due to a neuro-compressive pathology; **or**
 - d. frequent falls;
8. Physical exam findings including **ANY** of the following:
 - a. grip and release test;
 - b. ataxic gait;
 - c. hyperreflexia;
 - d. Hoffman sign;
 - e. Babinski sign;
 - f. tandem, walking test;
 - g. inverted brachial radial reflex;
 - h. increased muscle tone and spasticity;
 - i. clonus; **or**
 - j. myelopathic hand;
9. Absence of clinically significant cervical instability on plain X-rays with **ANY** of the following findings:
 - a. subluxation or translation of more than 3.5 mm on static lateral or dynamic flexion/extension views;
 - b. sagittal plane angulation of more than 11 degrees between adjacent segments on static or dynamic flexion/extension views; **or**
 - c. kyphotic deformity/significant reversal of lordosis or spondylolisthesis;
10. MRI/CT shows findings that are concordant with the individual's symptoms and physical exam findings and that are caused by **EITHER** of the following:
 - a. cervical spinal cord compression; **or**

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 4 of 22

- b. cervical spinal stenosis.

Adjacent Segment Disease Secondary to Total Disc Arthroplasty

- II. Cervical total disc arthroplasty performed for adjacent segment disease secondary to cervical total disc arthroplasty is considered **medically necessary** for **either** radiculopathy or myelopathy when **ALL** of the associated criteria are met:
 - A. Radiculopathy, when **ALL** of the following criteria are met:
 - 1. The prior cervical total disc arthroplasty procedure at an adjacent level was performed at least six (6) months prior;
 - 2. Age is at least 18 years;
 - 3. The procedure will be performed using a cervical disc prosthesis approved by the FDA, for an FDA-approved indication, and in accordance with FDA labeling;
 - 4. The planned implant(s) will be used in the reconstruction of cervical disc(s) at C3-C7, following discectomy;
 - 5. The planned implant is for a single-level adjacent segment replacement;
 - 6. The individual is a candidate for single-level anterior cervical decompression and interbody fusion;
 - 7. No previous surgeries at the operative level;
 - 8. Symptoms include **BOTH** of the following:
 - a. significant level of pain on a daily basis defined as clinically significant functional impairment (e.g., inability to perform household chores, prolonged standing, etc.); **and**
 - b. unremitting radicular pain to shoulder girdle and/or upper body extremity resulting in disability;
 - 9. Physical exam findings include **ANY** of the following:
 - a. dermatomal sensory deficit;
 - b. motor deficit (e.g., biceps, triceps weakness);
 - c. reflex changes;
 - d. shoulder abduction relief sign;
 - e. nerve root tension sign (e.g., Spurling's maneuver); **or**
 - f. unremitting radicular pain to shoulder girdle and/or upper extremity without concordant objective physical exam findings;
 - 10. Less than clinically meaningful improvement with at least **TWO** (2) of the following (unless contraindicated):
 - a. prescription-strength analgesics, steroids, gabapentinoids and/or NSAIDs for six (6)

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 5 of 22

weeks;

- b. provider-directed exercise program prescribed by a physical therapist, chiropractic provider, osteopathic or allopathic physician for six (6) weeks; **or**
- c. epidural steroid injections/selective nerve root block performed at the same level(s) as the requested surgery;

- 11. Imaging studies of the cervical spine, including flexion/extension lateral views, demonstrate successful cervical total disc arthroplasty at the adjacent level;
 - 12. Absence of clinically significant cervical instability on resting plain X-rays with **ANY** of the following findings:
 - a. subluxation or translation of more than 3.5 mm on static lateral or dynamic flexion/extension views;
 - b. sagittal plane angulation of more than 11 degrees between adjacent segments on static or dynamic flexion/extension views; **or**
 - c. kyphotic deformity/significant reversal of lordosis or spondylolisthesis;
 - 13. MRI/CT shows neural structure compression at the requested level(s) that is concordant with the individual's symptoms and physical exam findings and that is caused by **ANY** of the following:
 - a. herniated disc(s) (retained disc material or a recurrent disc herniation);
 - b. synovial cyst or arachnoid cyst;
 - c. central/lateral/foraminal stenosis; **or**
 - d. osteophytes; and
 - 14. The patient has no unmanaged, significant behavioral health disorders (e.g., major depressive disorder, chronic pain syndrome, secondary gain, opioid use or alcohol use disorder).
- B. Myelopathy, when **ALL** of the following criteria are met:
- 1. Age is at least 18 years;
 - 2. The procedure will be performed using a cervical disc prosthesis approved by the FDA, for an FDA-approved indication, and in accordance with FDA labeling;
 - 3. The planned implant(s) will be used in the reconstruction of cervical disc(s) at C3-C7, following discectomy;
 - 4. The planned implant is for a single-level adjacent segment replacement;
 - 5. The individual is a candidate for single-level anterior cervical decompression and interbody fusion;
 - 6. No previous surgeries at the operative level;

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 6 of 22

7. Symptoms include **ANY** of the following:
 - a. upper/lower extremity weakness, numbness or pain;
 - b. fine motor dysfunction (buttoning or handwriting, clumsiness of hands);
 - c. gait disturbance;
 - d. new-onset bowel or bladder dysfunction; **or**
 - e. frequent falls;
 8. Physical exam findings include **ANY** of the following:
 - a. grip and release test;
 - b. ataxic gait;
 - c. hyperreflexia;
 - d. Hoffmann sign;
 - e. Babinski sign;
 - f. tandem walking test demonstrating ataxia;
 - g. inverted brachial radial reflex;
 - h. increased muscle tone or spasticity;
 - i. clonus; **or**
 - j. myelopathic hand;
 9. Absence of clinically significant cervical instability on resting plain X-rays, with **ANY** of the following findings:
 - a. subluxation or translation of more than 3.5 mm on static lateral or dynamic flexion/extension views;
 - b. sagittal plane angulation of more than 11 degrees between adjacent segments on static or dynamic flexion/extension views; **or**
 - c. kyphotic deformity/significant reversal of lordosis or spondylolisthesis;
 10. MRI/CT shows findings that are consistent with the individual's symptoms or physical exam findings and that are caused by, **EITHER** of the following:
 - a. cervical spinal cord compression; **or**
 - b. cervical spinal stenosis.
- III. Cervical total disc arthroplasty performed for degenerative disc disease as the sole indication is considered **not medically necessary**.
- IV. Cervical total disc arthroplasty following a failed cervical total disc arthroplasty at the same level is considered **not medically necessary**.

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 7 of 22

- V. Cervical total disc arthroplasty without meeting the criteria listed in the policy guidelines (when applicable for urgent/emergent conditions) and the criteria in the applicable procedure-specific sections is considered **not medically necessary**.
- VI. Artificial cervical intervertebral disc implant is considered **investigational** when **ANY** of the following contraindications are present:
- A. Performed for the revision of a failed cervical artificial total disc arthroplasty;
 - B. Decreased bone mineral density, defined by a T-score less than (worse than) -1.5 on a previous dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DEXA) scan;
 - C. Allergy or sensitivity to titanium, aluminum or vanadium;
 - D. Active systemic infection is present;
 - E. A revision of an infected cervical disc arthroplasty;
 - F. Rheumatoid arthritis or other autoimmune disease;
 - G. Paget's disease, osteomalacia or other metabolic bone disease;
 - H. Severe, poorly controlled diabetes mellitus requiring insulin treatment;
 - I. Imaging evidence of **ANY** of the following:
 - 1. Significant cervical anatomical deformity or compromised vertebral bodies at the index level (e.g., ankylosing spondylitis, rheumatoid arthritis, or compromise due to current or past trauma);
 - 2. Spinal metastases;
 - 3. Severe spondylosis at the level to be treated, characterized by bridging osteophytes, marked reduction or absence of motion, or collapse of the intervertebral disc space greater than 50% of its normal height;
 - 4. Severe facet joint arthropathy; **or**
 - 5. Ossification of the posterior longitudinal ligament (OPLL).

RELATED POLICIES

Corporate Medical Policy

11.01.03 Experimental or Investigational Services

7.01.63 Artificial Lumbar Intervertebral Disc

POLICY GUIDELINES(S)

Urgent/Emergent Conditions:

- I. Urgent/Emergent Indications/Conditions
 - A. All individuals being evaluated for spine surgery should be screened for the presence of

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 8 of 22

urgent/emergent indications/conditions that warrants definitive surgical treatment. Imaging findings noted in the applicable procedure section(s) are required.

1. The following criteria are **NOT** required for confirmed urgent/emergent conditions:
 - a. Provider-directed non-surgical management;
 - b. Proof of smoking cessation;
 - c. 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);
 - d. Time frame for repeat procedure.
- II. An urgent/emergent request is based on the 2019 NCQA standards for utilization management and is as follows:
 - A. A request for medical care or services where application of the time frame for making routine or non-life-threatening care determinations:
 1. Could seriously jeopardize the life or health of the member or the individual's ability to regain maximum function, based on a prudent layperson's judgment,
 2. Could seriously jeopardize the life, health, or safety of the member or others, due to the individual's psychological state,
 3. In the opinion of a practitioner with knowledge of the individual's medical or behavioral condition, would subject the individuals to adverse health consequences without the care or treatment that is the subject of the request.
- III. Urgent/emergent conditions for cervical total disc arthroplasty include **ANY** of the following:
 - A. Central cord syndrome;
 - B. Myelopathy or Cord signal changes on MRI due to cord compression;
 - C. Progressive neurological deficit documented on two (2) separate physical exams;
 - D. **ANY** of the following due to a neurocompressive pathology:
 1. Motor weakness of grade 3/5 or less of specified muscle(s);
 2. Rapidly progressive symptoms of motor loss;
 3. Bowel incontinence; or
 4. Bladder incontinence/retention; **or**
 - E. A condition otherwise meeting criteria listed in the applicable procedure sections with documentation of severe debilitating pain and/or dysfunction to the point of being incapacitated.
- IV. Minimum documentation requirements needed to complete a spinal surgery prior authorization request include **ALL** of the following:

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 9 of 22

- A. CPT codes, ICD-10 codes, and disc levels or motion segments involved for planned surgery must be provided;
- B. Detailed documentation of the type, duration, and frequency of provider-directed non-surgical treatment (e.g., interventional pain management, physical therapy, chiropractic care, or provider-directed active exercise program, etc.) that includes response to each treatment:
 - 1. Detailed documentation explaining why a sufficient trial of non-surgical treatment was contraindicated (if applicable);
 - 2. Detailed documentation of less than clinically meaningful improvement for each treatment;
- C. Written reports/interpretations of the most recent advanced diagnostic imaging reports (e.g., computed tomography [CT] scan, magnetic resonance imaging [MRI], or Myelography) performed, read, and interpreted by an independent radiologist. Clinically significant discrepancies in interpretation between the surgeon and the radiologist need to be reconciled prior to the documentation submission:
 - 1. Acceptable imaging modalities for purposes of the Spine Surgery guidelines are CT, MRI, and Myelography.
 - 2. Discography or MR Spectroscopy results will not be used as a determining factor of medical necessity for any requested procedure. Discography or MR Spectroscopy use is not endorsed.
- D. The documentation for spinal fusion surgery requests must include flexion-extension plain x-rays based upon indications for instability and/or other plain x-rays that document failure of instrumentation, fusion, etc.

DESCRIPTION

Radiculopathy

Radiculopathy, for the purpose of this policy, is defined as the presence of pain, dysesthesia(s), or paresthesia(s) reported by the individual in a level-specific referral pattern of an involved named spinal root(s) causing significant functional limitations, (i.e., diminished quality of life and impaired age-appropriate activities of daily living).

Spinal Stenosis

Spinal stenosis refers to the narrowing of the spinal canal usually due to spinal degeneration that occurs with aging. It may also be the result of spinal disc herniation, osteoarthritis, or a tumor.

Clinically Meaningful Improvement

Clinically meaningful improvement is defined as a global assessment showing at least 50% improvement.

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 10 of 22

Cervical Degenerative Disc Disease (DDD)

Cervical DDD is a manifestation of spinal spondylosis that causes deterioration of the intervertebral discs of the cervical spine. Symptoms of cervical DDD include arm pain, weakness, and paresthesia associated with cervical radiculopathy. Disc herniation, osteophytes, kyphosis, or instability that compress the spinal cord can result in myelopathy, which is manifested by subtle changes in gait or balance, and, in severe cases, leads to weakness in the arms or legs and numbness of the arms or hands.

Anterior Cervical Discectomy and Fusion (ACDF)

ACDF is currently considered the definitive surgical treatment for symptomatic DDD of the cervical spine. The goals of ACDF are to relieve pressure on the spinal nerves (decompression) and to restore spinal column alignment and stability.

Artificial Intervertebral Disc Arthroplasty (AIDA)

AIDA, the replacement of the intervertebral disc with an artificial device is proposed as an alternative ACDF to treat symptomatic DDD. It is thought that an artificial disc would restore, not only the anatomy, but also normal mechanical function. Many designs have been proposed over the past 40 years, both total disc and disc nucleus (partial disc replacement or PDA) devices.

Total Artificial Disc

A total artificial disc replaces the entire disc, including nucleus, annulus, and end plate, and consists of a polyurethane nucleus designed to fit between two titanium alloy surfaces. An artificial disc nucleus is designed to replace only the degenerative nucleus; most of the annulus is left intact. Partial disc replacement is also referred to as a nucleus arthroplasty. Hybrid constructs or procedures that combine ACDF with cervical artificial disc replacement (C-ADR) in a single procedure are also being investigated. The intent of the hybrid construct is to avoid multilevel fusion and maintain cervical motion when the individual has more than one level of symptomatic cervical disc disease.

SUPPORTIVE LITERATURE

Evidence for the Prestige Disc is available from the non-inferiority randomized, controlled trial (RCT) presented to the FDA, comparing the Prestige disc with fusion, and from a published report on 421 cases from the trial. Statistical non-inferiority was demonstrated on all outcome measures. Outcomes at two years were similar in both groups. Disc recipients improved more than the fusion group only on neurological status; however, the information provided about how this was evaluated is insufficient to understand its significance. Sixty-month follow-up of participants in this clinical trial was reported by J.K. Burkus et al. All participants were followed up in this FDA-regulated, post-approval study, and outcomes at 60 months were reported on approximately half of the original RCT participants. The majority of the remaining patients had not yet reached that point in their follow-up, rather than being lost to follow-up. About 18% of all participants were actually lost to follow-up at 60 months. The Neck Disability Index (NDI) improved by 38.4 points for the Prestige disc, compared to 34.1 for ACDF ($p=0.022$). For most other clinical outcomes, the Prestige disc was similar to ACDF, with no significant difference between groups in improvement in neck pain score (56.0 vs. 52.4) or arm pain score (52.5 vs. 47.7 – both, respectively). There was a trend for greater neurologic success

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 11 of 22

in the Prestige disc group (95% vs. 89%, $p=0.051$). Need for additional surgery was similar between the two procedures, and there was no significant difference in the percentage of patients requiring adjacent-level surgery (2.9% vs. 4.9% for ACDF). No implant migration was observed up to 60 months. Bridging bone was observed in three of 94 patients (3.2%) with the Prestige disc. The Prestige LP artificial disc was approved by the FDA in 2014. It differs from the original Prestige cervical disc in terms of material and fixation.

J.K. Burkus and colleagues (2014) assessed the long-term safety and efficacy of cervical disc replacement with the Prestige Cervical Disc in a prospective, randomized, multi-center trial at seven years of follow-up. The study included 541 patients with single-level cervical disc disease with radiculopathy who were randomized to one of two treatment groups: 276 investigational group patients underwent anterior cervical discectomy and arthroplasty with the Prestige disc, and 265 control group patients underwent ACDF. Clinical outcomes included NDI, the 36-item short-form health survey, and neck and arm pain scores. Radiographs were assessed for angle of motion and fusion. Clinical and radiographic outcomes were evaluated pre-operatively, intra-operatively, and at 1.5, 3, 6, 12, 24, 36, 60, and 84 months post-operatively. Of the 541 patients treated, 395 patients (73%; 212 investigational and 183 control patients) completed seven years of clinical follow-up. Significant improvements achieved by 1.5 months in both groups were sustained at the seven-year mark. In the investigation group, mean NDI improvements from pre-operative scores were 38.2 and 37.5 at 60 and 84 months, respectively. In the control group, the corresponding means were 33.8 and 31.9. The differences between the investigation and control groups at the 60-month and 84-month periods were significant ($p = 0.014$ and 0.002 , respectively). The overall rates of maintenance or improvement in neurological status in the investigation group were significantly higher: 92.2% and 88.2% at 60 months and 84 months, respectively, compared with 85.7% and 79.7% in the control group ($p = 0.017$ and 0.011 , respectively). At 84 months, the percentage of working patients in the investigational group was 73.9%, and in the control group, 73.1%. Post-operatively, the implant effectively maintained average angular motion of 6.67° at 60 months and 6.75° at 84 months. Cumulative rates for surgery at the index level were lower ($p < 0.001$) in the investigational group (11 [4.8%] of 276) when compared with the control group (29 [13.7%] of 265) (based on life-table method), and there were statistical differences between the investigational and control groups with specific regard to the rate of subsequent revision and supplemental fixation surgical procedures. Rates for additional surgical procedures that involved adjacent levels were lower in the investigational group than in the control group (11 [4.6%] of 276 vs 24 [11.9%] of 265, respectively). The authors concluded the following: Cervical disc arthroplasty has the potential for preserving motion at the operated level, while providing biomechanical stability and global neck mobility, and may result in a reduction in adjacent-segment degeneration. The Prestige Cervical Disc maintains improved clinical outcomes and segmental motion achieved after implantation at seven-year follow-up.

Murrey et al (2008) reported the two-year follow-up of the pivotal FDA randomized non-inferiority trial to determine the safety and efficacy of ProDisc-C in comparison with ACDF. Clinical outcomes at 24-month follow-up were reported to be similar in the ProDisc-C and fusion groups for the following components: neurological success (91% vs. 88%, respectively), NDI (21.4 vs. 20.5 points), reduction in pain scores (e.g., 46 mm vs. 43 mm reduction in neck pain on a visual analog scale), and patient satisfaction (83 mm vs. 80 mm). Four-year interim follow-up of participants in this clinical trial was

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 12 of 22

reported by Delamarter et al. All participants in the clinical trial were followed up in this FDA-regulated, post-approval study. At 48 months, follow-up rates for ProDisc-C and ACDF were 63% and 46.2%, respectively. It was not reported what proportion of these patients had not yet reached 48 months post-surgery or were lost to follow-up at that time point. Also included in this report was 24-month follow-up on 77% of 136 continued access patients who received the ProDisc-C after the clinical trial. Clinical outcomes were similar between the three groups, with point estimates in favor of ProDisc-C. The NDI at 48 months was 20.3 for ProDisc-C versus 21.2 for ACDF. Neurologic success was achieved in 88.9% of ProDisc-C patients, compared to 74.4% of ACDF patients ($p=0.067$). There was a cumulative incidence of additional surgeries of 2.9% (three patients) in the ProDisc-C group and 11.3% (12 patients) in the ACDF group. Two patients were converted to fusion with removal of the device; one patient had decompression with supplemental fixation without removal of the device. At 48 months, five ProDisc-C patients (7.7%) were found to have bridging bone. Five-year results of this trial were published by Zigler et al. in 2013, with follow-up rates of 72.7% for ProDisc-C and 63.5% for ACDF. Outcomes on the NDI were found to be similar (50-60% improved), along with VAS for arm pain (18 for both groups) and scores on the SF-36. VAS for neck pain was modestly improved with ProDisc-C compared to ACDF (21 vs. 30), although the proportion of patients who achieved a clinically significant improvement in neck pain was not reported. There was a lower percentage of patients with ProDisc-C who had secondary surgery at either the index or adjacent level (2.9% vs. 14.5%).

G.M. Malham et al (2014) evaluated the clinical and radiographic outcomes in C-ADR patients using the ProDisc-C device, with a five- to nine-year follow-up. Data were collected through a prospective registry, with retrospective analysis performed on 24 consecutive patients treated with C-ADR by a single surgeon. All patients underwent single- or two-level C-ADR with the ProDisc-C device. Outcome measures included neck and arm pain (visual analogue scale), disability (NDI), complications, and secondary surgery rates. Flexion-extension cervical radiographs were performed to assess range of motion (ROM) of the device and adjacent segment disease (ASD). Average follow-up was 7.7 years. Neck and arm pain improved 60% and 79%, respectively, and NDI had an improvement of 58%. There were no episodes of device migration or subsidence. Mean ROM of the device was 6.4°. Heterotopic ossification was present in seven patients (37%). Radiographic ASD below the device developed in four patients (21%) (one single-level and three two-level C-ADR). No patient required secondary surgery (repeat operations at the index level or adjacent levels). Fourteen out of 19 patients (74%) were able to return to employment, with a median return to work time of 1.3 months. The authors concluded that the ProDisc-C device for C-ADR is a safe option for patients, providing excellent clinical outcomes, satisfactory return-to-work rates, and maintenance of segmental motion, despite radiographic evidence of heterotopic ossification and ASD on long-term follow-up. This study is limited due to being a small, single-center study that was not randomized. Also, the follow-up rate was only 79%.

Patients receiving the FDA approved BRYAN Cervical Disc system should have failed at least six weeks of non-operative treatment prior to implantation of the device. Heller and colleagues published the results of a non-inferiority trial in 2009. This multi-center RCT investigated the safety and efficacy of the device in 242 patients, compared to 221 patients undergoing an anterior cervical discectomy. At 24-month follow-up, both groups had similar improvements in clinical outcomes. Four-year follow-

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 13 of 22

up was reported for 181 patients (75% of 242) who received the Bryan disc and 138 patients (62% of 223) who underwent ACDF (Sasso et al.). It was reported that 25% of AIDA and 38% of the ACDF patients failed to return for follow-up at 48 months, due, in part, to FDA and institutional review board approvals and the need for additional patient consent for the continuation study. Overall success was defined as an improvement of equal to or greater than 15 points in the NDI, neurologic improvement, no serious adverse events related to the implant or surgical implantation procedure, and no subsequent surgery or intervention that would be classified as a treatment failure. The four-year overall success rates were significantly greater in the Bryan (85.1%) than the ACDF (72.5%) group. This finding was driven largely by differences in the NDI success (90.6% of arthroplasty and 79.0% of ACDF). Neurologic success rates were not different between the groups. Arm pain improved from a baseline of 71.2 in both groups to 16.6 for the Bryan disc and 22.4 for ACDF, which was a statistically significant difference between groups. The improvement in neck pain scores was also significantly better in the Bryan disc group (from 75.4 to 20.7), compared to patients with fusion (from 74.8 to 30.6). Improvement in the SF-36 physical component score was also significantly greater in the arthroplasty group (15.8 vs. 13.1). There was no significant difference in additional surgical procedures at either the index (3.7% Bryan, 4.5% ACDF) or adjacent (4.1% Bryan, 4.1% ACDF) levels. FDA-required follow-up will continue for 10 years after the index surgery.

Phillips and colleagues reported the results of the two-year, FDA-regulated, multi-center, randomized non-inferiority trial of the PCM Cervical Disc in 2013. The investigator and surgical staff were not blinded to treatment assignment, and patients were informed of the treatment assignment after surgery. Out of the 416 patients who were randomized (224 PCM, 192 ACDF), 340 (82%, 189 PCM and 151 ACDF) were per protocol for the 24-month primary endpoint of overall success. Overall success was defined as at least 20% improvement in NDI; absence of reoperation, revision, or removal; maintenance or improvement in neurological status; and absence of radiographic or major complications during the 24-month follow-up period. At 24 months, overall success was 75.1% in the PCM group and 64.9% in the ACDF group, which was statistically non-inferior and superior for AIDA. There was a trend toward a greater neurological success rate in the PCM group (94.7%), compared with ACDF (89.5%, $p = 0.10$). There was no significant difference between the groups for VAS pain scores, SF-36 component scores, or implant- or surgery-related adverse events (5.2% PCM vs. 5.4% ACDF). Patients with prior fusion were included in this study. Overall success for the two sub-groups in this analysis was similar (65.4% PCM and 64.3% ACDF).

FDA approval was based on a prospective, multi-center, two-arm, randomized (1:1), unmasked, concurrently controlled, non-inferiority clinical study that compared the safety and effectiveness of the SECURE-C Cervical Artificial Disc to the standard of care (ACDF) using a plate (ASSURE Anterior Cervical Plate System) and structural allograft in treating patients with intractable symptomatic cervical disc disease (SCDD) at one level between C3 and C7. Based on the FDA conclusion, the study data indicated that, at 24 months post-operatively, the SECURE-C device is at least as effective as ACDF in terms of clinically significant improvement on the NDI and maintenance or improvement in neurological status and is statistically superior to ACDF in terms of subsequent surgeries at the index level, device-related adverse event rates, and overall success according to both composite definitions analyzed.

The Mobi-C Cervical Disc Prosthesis received FDA approval, in August 2013. Data from a single-level

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 14 of 22

clinical study was the basis for the PMA approval decision. The study was a prospective, multi-center, two-arm, randomized (2:1), unmasked, concurrently controlled, non-inferiority clinical study to compare the safety and effectiveness of the Mobi-C Cervical Disc Prosthesis to the standard of care ACDF. The study data indicated that, at 24 months post-operatively, the Mobi-C device is at least as effective as the control treatment ACDF for the patient population and indications studied in this investigation, in terms of the overall success according to the protocol-specified composite primary endpoint and alternative primary endpoint definitions analyzed.

Two- and four-year results from the two-level Mobi-C IDE trial were reported by Davis et al in 2013 and 2015, respectively. In this non-inferiority trial, 225 patients received the Mobi-C device at two contiguous levels, and 105 patients received two-level ACDF. At 24 months, the follow-up rate was 98.2% for the AIDA group and 94.3% for the ACDF group. At 48 months, the follow-up rate was 89.0% for AIDA and 81.2% for the ACDF group. Both groups showed significant improvement in NDI score, VAS neck pain, and VAS arm pain from baseline to each follow-up point, with Mobi-C meeting the non-inferiority margin. Subsequent testing for superiority showed that AIDA patients had significantly greater improvement than ACDF patients in NDI and had higher NDI success rates (79.3% vs 53.4% at 48 months, $p < 0.000$) and overall success rates (66.0% vs 36.0% at 48 months) at all time points. AIDA resulted in significantly greater improvement in VAS neck pain at three and six months post-operatively, but not at 12, 24, 36, or 48 months. Arm pain scores did not differ between the groups. The Mobi-C group had a lower reoperation rate (4.0% vs 15.2% $p < 0.000$). At 48 months, adjacent-level degeneration was observed in 41.5% of AIDA patients and 85.9% of ACDF patients with available radiographs, while 25.6% of AIDA patients showed clinically relevant heterotopic ossification.

Post hoc analysis of data from the pivotal one- and two-level Mobi-C trials was reported by Bae and colleagues in 2015. Comparison showed no significant difference between one- and two-level AIDA on clinical outcomes (NDI, VAS, SF-12), major complication rates (4.3% for one-level AIDA, 4.0% for two-level AIDA), or subsequent surgery rates (3.0% of one-level, 4.0% of two-level). Clinically relevant heterotopic ossification was observed in 23.8% of one-level patients and 25.7% of two-level patients. Huppert et al. compared outcomes between single- (n=175) and multi-level (2-4 levels, n=56) AIDA with the Mobi-C device in a prospective, multi-center study from Europe. The age of the patients was significantly higher, and the time since symptom onset was significantly longer in the multi-level group. At two years, there was no significant difference between groups for the radicular VAS, cervical VAS, or NDI. Range of motion was similar in the two groups. The overall success rate was 69% for both the single-level group and multilevel group. There was a trend for more patients in the single-level group to return to work (70% versus 46%), and for the return to work to occur sooner (4.8 months versus 7.5 months). A similar percentage of patients underwent adjacent-level surgery (2.3% for single-level and 3.6% for multi-level).

After several years of follow-up, randomized trials of all of the artificial cervical discs met non-inferiority criteria, as measured by the NDI and overall success composite outcome. Mid-term outcomes have been reported on four of the devices (Prestige ST, ProDisc-C, Mobi-C, Bryan discs). The trial results are consistent with continued non-inferiority of AIDA for all devices and lower cumulative reoperation rates at four to five years. Several recent meta-analyses and systematic reviews (Badhiwala et al 2020; Deng et al 2020; Gendreau et al 2020; Goedmakers et al 2020; Zhang

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 15 of 22

et al 2020) have concluded that, while longer-term follow-up is required, mid- to long-term results identify artificial cervical disc arthroplasty as a viable treatment option for patients suffering symptomatic disc degeneration, with similar outcome results to ACDF.

Ten-year outcomes of one- and two- level Mobi-C trials were reported by Kim and colleagues in 2021. At ten years, patients continued to have significant improvement over baseline Neck Disability Index (NDI), neck and arm pain, neurologic function, and segmental range of motion (ROM). NDI and pain outcomes at the 10-year mark were significantly improved from seven-year outcomes. Segmental and global range of motion (ROM) and sagittal alignment also were maintained from seven to ten years. Clinically relevant adjacent segment pathology was not significantly different between seven and ten years. The incidence of motion restricting heterotopic ossification at the ten-year mark was not significantly different between seven years for one-level (30.7% vs. 29.6%) or two-level (41.7% vs. 39.2%) patients. Additionally, only two subsequent surgeries were reported after 7 years.

Currently, there is insufficient literature investigating the safety and efficacy of hybrid procedures. Larger sample populations and longer-term outcomes are necessary to determine the effect of this procedure on health outcomes (Grasso et al 2020; Scott-Young et al 2020; Yang et al 2020).

Partial disc replacement systems are in the earliest stages of investigation. Partial disc replacement systems are considered investigational due to the lack of FDA approval and lack of long-term studies of these devices that demonstrate their safety and improvement on patient health outcomes over standard fusion procedures.

Tobacco Use

Tobacco use is considered a risk factor for poor healing and is associated with non-union. It is well-established that smoking is a preventable cause of morbidity and mortality. In most situations, this is considered an elective surgery; it is strongly recommended that individuals be in their best physical condition prior to undergoing surgery.

PROFESSIONAL GUIDELINE(S)

North American Spine Society (NASS) coverage policy for Cervical Artificial Disc Replacement from 2015 (revised Feb 2024) indicate that cervical artificial disc replacement may be indicated for the following diagnoses with qualifying criteria, when appropriate:

- Radiculopathy related to nerve root compression from one- or two- level degenerative disease (either herniated disc or spondylotic osteophyte) from C3-7 in the following scenarios:
 - o Persistent symptoms despite at least 6 weeks of nonoperative management.
 - o Progressive or functionally limiting weakness correlating with the compressed nerve root.
 - o Inability to perform normal work duties or necessary activities of daily living because of severity of symptoms, despite nonoperative management.
- Myelopathy or myeloradiculopathy related to central spinal stenosis from one- or two-level degenerative disc disease from (either herniated disc or spondylotic osteophyte) C3-4.
- There is no significant evidence at this time to support the following:

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 16 of 22

- o Its use for 3 or more levels.
- o Its use for isolated axial neck pain. Neck pain, in addition to radiculopathy/myeloradiculopathy, is not an exclusionary criterion. There is early evidence for use in treatment of adjacent segment disease following an index fusion.

The American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons (AAOS) 2010 strongly recommends avoiding use of and exposure to tobacco products, due to the severe and negative impact on the musculoskeletal system, including the bones, muscles, tendons, and ligaments.

REGULATORY STATUS

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulates cervical artificial discs as medical devices. All cervical artificial discs including related components require FDA approval before marketing and use in the United States to ensure they are safe and effective for human use. Refer to the FDA Medical Device website. Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices> [accessed 2026 May 18]

The FDA lists the most serious type of medical device recalls as well as early alert communications about corrective actions being taken by companies that the FDA believes are likely to be the most serious type of recalls. Available from: [Medical Device Recalls](#) [accessed 2026 May 18]

The Mobi-C Cervical Disc Prosthesis received FDA approval in August 2013. is indicated for use in skeletally mature patients for reconstruction of the disc at either one or two levels level from C3-C7 following discectomy for intractable radiculopathy (arm pain and/or a neurological deficit) with or without neck pain, or myelopathy due to diseased discs at one level or two adjacent levels.

The PCM Cervical Disc (NuVasive), which received five-year FDA approval in October 2012. Continued FDA approval is contingent on the submission of annual reports, which should include the number of devices sold, analysis of all explanted discs, and seven-year follow-up of the pre-market cohort with an evaluation of overall success. In addition, NuVasive will conduct 10-year enhanced surveillance of device-related adverse events.

The SECURE-C Artificial Cervical Disc received FDA approval 2013 is intended to be used in skeletally mature patients to replace a cervical disc (from C3 to C7) following removal of the disc for conditions that result from a diseased or bulging disc (intractable radiculopathy or myelopathy) at only one level.

The Bryan Cervical Disc System received FDA approval based on PMA clearance in May 2009. Based on the information provided from the manufacturer and the FDA premarket approval, the device is indicated in skeletally mature patients for reconstruction of the discs from C3-C7 following single-level discectomy for intractable radiculopathy and/or myelopathy.

ProDisc-C received approval from the FDA in 2007 based on a pre-market approval application (PMA).

Medtronic received FDA approval to market its Prestige Cervical Disc System in July 2007 for use in skeletally mature patients, for reconstruction of the discs from C3-C7 following single-level discectomy for intractable radiculopathy and/or myelopathy.

CODE(S)

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 17 of 22

- Codes may not be covered under all circumstances.
- Code list may not be all inclusive (AMA and CMS code updates may occur more frequently than policy updates).
- (E/I) =Experimental/Investigational
- (NMN)=Not medically necessary/appropriate

CPT Codes

Code	Description
22856	Total disc arthroplasty (artificial disc), anterior approach, including discectomy with end plate preparation (includes osteophylectomy for nerve root or spinal cord decompression and microdissection), single interspace, cervical
22858	Total disc arthroplasty (artificial disc), anterior approach, including discectomy with end plate preparation (includes osteophylectomy for nerve root or spinal cord decompression and microdissection); second level, cervical (list separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
22861	Revision including replacement of total disc arthroplasty (artificial disc), anterior approach, single interspace, cervical
22864	Removal of total disc arthroplasty (artificial disc), anterior approach, single interspace, cervical
0095T	Removal of total disc arthroplasty (artificial disc), anterior approach, each additional interspace, cervical
0098T	Revision including replacement of total disc arthroplasty (artificial disc), anterior approach, each additional interspace, cervical (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

Copyright © 2026 American Medical Association, Chicago, IL

HCPCS Codes

Code	Description
Not Applicable	

ICD10 Codes

Code	Description
M50.00- M50.023	Cervical disc disorder with myelopathy (code range)
M50.10- M50.123	Cervical disc disorder with radiculopathy (code range)

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 18 of 22

Code	Description
M54.12	Radiculopathy, cervical region

REFERENCES

American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons [Internet]. Information Statement: Tobacco use and orthopaedic surgery. 2016 Feb [accessed 2026 May 18] Available: [1047-tobacco-use-and-orthopaedic-surgery-3.pdf \(aaos.org\)](#)

Badhiwala JH, et al. Cervical disc arthroplasty versus anterior cervical discectomy and fusion: a meta-analysis of rates of adjacent-level surgery to 7-year follow-up. J Spine Surg. 2020 Mar;6(1):217-232.

Bae HW, et al. Comparison of clinical outcomes of 1- and 2-level total disc replacement: four-year results from a prospective, randomized, controlled, multicenter IDE clinical trial. Spine. 2015 Jun 1;40(11):759-66.

Boody BS, et al. Functional outcomes associated with adjacent-level ossification disease 10 years after cervical disc arthroplasty or ACDF. Clin Spine Surg. 2020 Nov;33(9):E420-E425.

Burkus JK, et al. Clinical and radiographic analysis of an artificial cervical disc: 7-year follow-up from the prestige prospective randomized controlled clinical trial. J Neurosurg Spine. 2014 Oct;21(4):516-28.

Byvaltsev VA, Stepanov IA, Riew DK. Mid-Term to Long-Term Outcomes After Total Cervical Disk Arthroplasty Compared with Anterior Discectomy and Fusion: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. Clin Spine Surg. 2020 Jun;33(5):192-200.

Davis RJ, et al. Cervical total disc replacement with the Mobi-C cervical artificial disc compared with anterior discectomy and fusion for treatment of 2-level symptomatic degenerative disc disease: a prospective, randomized, controlled multicenter clinical trial. J Neurosurg Spine. 2013 Nov;19(5):532-45.

Davis RJ, et al. Two-level total disc replacement with Mobi-C cervical artificial disc versus anterior discectomy and fusion: a prospective, randomized, controlled multicenter clinical trial with 4-year follow-up results. J Neurosurg Spine. 2015 Jan;22(1):15-25.

Delamarter RB, et al. Five-year reoperation rates, cervical total disc replacement versus fusion, results of a prospective randomized clinical trial. Spine. 2013 Apr;38(9):711-7.

Deng Y, et al. Mid- to long-term rates of symptomatic adjacent-level disease requiring surgery after cervical total disc replacement compared with anterior cervical discectomy and fusion: a meta-analysis of prospective randomized clinical trials. J Orthop Surg Res. 2020 Oct 12;15(1):468.

Food and Drug Administration [Internet]. M6-C Artificial Cervical Disc. [accessed 2026 May 18] Available: [Q200722 - M6-C Artificial Cervical Disc Instrumentation - Accessory Classification Request \(fda.gov\)](#)

Food and Drug Administration [Internet]. Mobi-C cervical disc prosthesis. [accessed 2026 May 18]

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 19 of 22

Available: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf11/P110002b.pdf

Food and Drug Administration [Internet]. PCM cervical disc system. [accessed 2026 May 18]

Available: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf10/P100012B.pdf

Food and Drug Administration [Internet]. Secure-C artificial cervical disc. [accessed 2026 May 18]

Available: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf10/P100003b.pdf

Food and Drug Administration [Internet]. Simplify® Cervical Artificial Disc – P200022/S003 | FDA

[accessed 2026 May 18] Available: [Simplify® Cervical Artificial Disc - accessdata.fda.gov](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf11/P110002b.pdf)

Food and Drug Administration [Internet]. Summary of Safety and Effectiveness: Prestige LP Cervical Disc. PMA Number P090029/S003. 2016 [accessed 2026 May 18] Available:

http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf9/p090029s003b.pdf

Gendreau JL, et al. Outcomes after cervical disc arthroplasty versus stand-alone anterior cervical discectomy and fusion: a meta-analysis. *Global Spine J.* 2020 Dec;10(8):1046-1056.

Goedmakers CMW, et al. Cervical radiculopathy: is a prosthesis preferred over fusion surgery? A systematic review. *Eur Spine J.* 2020 Nov;29(11):2640-2654.

Grasso G, et al. Does hybrid surgery improve quality of life in multilevel cervical degenerative disk disease? Five- year follow-up study. *World Neurosurg.* 2020 Aug;140:527-533.

Heller JG, et al. Comparison of BRYAN cervical disc arthroplasty with anterior cervical decompression and fusion: clinical and radiologic results of a randomized, controlled, clinical trial. *Spine* 2009 Jan 15;34(2):101-7.

Huppert J, et al. Comparison between single-and multi-level patients: clinical and radiological outcomes 2 years after cervical disc replacement. *Eur Spine J.* 2011 Sep;20(9):1417-26.

Jacob, Kevin C, et al. Level-specific perioperative and clinical outcome comparison: cervical disk replacement versus anterior cervical discectomy and fusion at C5-C6 in patients with myeloradiculopathy. *JAAOS.* 2022;30(17):e1137-e1147.

Johansen, Tonje O, et al. Effect of arthroplasty vs fusion for patients with cervical radiculopathy: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2021 Aug 2;4(8).

Kim K, et al. Ten-year outcomes of 1- and 2-level cervical disc arthroplasty from the Mobi_C investigational device exemption clinical trial. *Neurosurgery.* 2021 Mar; 88 (3): 497-505.

Kumar C, et al. Long-term comparison of health care utilization and reoperation rates in patients undergoing cervical disc arthroplasty and anterior cervical discectomy and fusion for cervical degenerative disc disease. *World Neurosurg.* 2020 Feb;134:e855-e865.

Loidolt T, et al. Comparison of adverse events between cervical disc arthroplasty and anterior cervical discectomy and fusion: a 10-year follow-up. *Spine J.* 2020 Oct 17;S1529-9430(20)31170-0.

Malham GM, et al. Cervical artificial disc replacement with ProDisc-C: clinical and radiographic outcomes with long-term follow-up. *J Clin Neurosci.* 2014 Jun;21(6):949-53.

Murrey D, et al. Results of the prospective, randomized, controlled multicenter Food and Drug

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 20 of 22

Administration investigational device exemption study of the ProDisc-C total disc replacement versus anterior discectomy and fusion for the treatment of 1-level symptomatic cervical disc disease. Spine J 2009 Apr;9 (4):275-286.National Institute for Health and Excellence [Internet]. Prosthetic intervertebral disc replacement in the cervical spine. IPG341. 2010 May [accessed 2026 May 18] Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg341>

North American Spine Society (NASS). Coverage policy recommendation. Cervical artificial disc replacement. 2024 Feb.

Nunley PD, et al. Adjacent segment pathology after treatment with cervical disc arthroplasty or anterior cervical discectomy and fusion, part 2: clinical results at 7-year follow-up. Int J Spine Surg. 2020 Jun 30;14(3):278-285.

Phillips FM, et al. Prospective, multicenter clinical trial comparing M6-C compressible six degrees of freedom cervical disc with anterior cervical discectomy and fusion for the treatment of single-level degenerative cervical radiculopathy: 2-year results of an FDA investigational device exemption study. Spine J. 2020 Oct 21;S1529-9430(20)31171-2.

Sasso RC, et al. Artificial disc versus fusion: a prospective, randomized study with 2-year follow-up on 99 patients. Spine. 2007 Dec 15;32(26):2933-40.

Sasso RC, et al. Results of cervical arthroplasty compared with anterior discectomy and fusion: four-year clinical outcomes in a prospective, randomized controlled trial. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2011 Sep 21;93(18):1684-92.

Scott-Young M, et al. Clinical outcomes of cervical hybrid reconstructions: a prospective study. Int J Spine Surg. 2020 Aug;14(s2):S57-S66.

Shafshak TS, Elnemr R. The visual analogue scale versus numerical rating scale in measuring pain severity and predicting disability in low back pain. J Clin Rheumatol. 2020;27(7):1.

Shah NV, et al. Comparing predictors of complications after anterior cervical discectomy and fusion, total disk arthroplasty, and combined anterior cervical discectomy and fusion-total disk arthroplasty with a minimum 2-year follow-up. J Am Acad Orthop Surg. 2020 Sep 1;28(17):e759-e765.

Shariff S, et al. Acute back pain: the role of medication, physical medicine and rehabilitation: WFNS spine committee recommendations. World Neurosurgery. 2024 July;23:1-11.

Wahood W, et al. Artificial discs in cervical disc replacement: a meta-analysis for comparison of long-term outcomes. World Neurosurg. 2020 Feb;134:598-613.e5.

Yang YD, et al. A comparison study between hybrid surgery and anterior cervical discectomy and fusion for the treatment of multilevel cervical spondylosis. Bone Joint J. 2020 Aug;102-B(8):981-996.

Yilmaz M, et al. Anterior hybrid construction of multilevel cervical disc disease and spondylotic spinal stenosis: surgical results and factors affecting adjacent segment problems. Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery and Research. 2021 May; 16 (298):1-10.

Zhang J, et al. Comprehensive analysis of hybrid surgery and anterior cervical discectomy and fusion in cervical diseases. Medicine. 2020;99(5):e19055.

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 21 of 22

Zhang Y, et al. Comparison of cervical disc arthroplasty and anterior cervical discectomy and fusion for the treatment of cervical disc degenerative diseases on the basis of more than 60 months of follow-up: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Neurol. 2020 Apr 20;20(1):143.

Zigler JE, et al. ProDisc C and ACDF as surgical treatment for single level cervical symptomatic degenerative disc disease: Five-year results of an FDA study. Spine. 2013 Feb;38(3):203-209.

SEARCH TERMS

Not Applicable

CENTERS FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES (CMS)

Artificial cervical intervertebral disc is not addressed in National or Regional Medicare coverage determinations or policies.

PRODUCT DISCLAIMER

- Services are contract dependent; if a product does not cover a service, medical policy criteria do not apply.
- If a commercial product (including an Essential Plan or Child Health Plus product) covers a specific service, medical policy criteria apply to the benefit.
- If a Medicaid product covers a specific service, and there are no New York State Medicaid guidelines (eMedNY) criteria, medical policy criteria apply to the benefit.
- If a Medicare product (including Medicare HMO-Dual Special Needs Program (DSNP) product) covers a specific service, and there is no national or local Medicare coverage decision for the service, medical policy criteria apply to the benefit.
- If a Medicare HMO-Dual Special Needs Program (DSNP) product DOES NOT cover a specific service, please refer to the Medicaid Product coverage line.

POLICY HISTORY/REVISION

Committee Approval Dates

03/20/08, 04/16/09, 03/18/10, 01/20/11, 01/19/12, 01/17/13, 01/16/14, 02/19/15, 01/21/16, 02/16/17, 12/21/17, 06/21/18, 12/20/18, 07/18/19, 01/16/20, 02/18/21, 02/17/22, 02/16/23, 05/18/23, 10/17/24, 06/26/25, 06/18/26

Date	Summary of Changes
06/18/26	• Annual review; policy intent unchanged.
06/26/25	• Annual review; removed the ACDF criteria from the policy.
01/01/25	• Summary of changes tracking implemented.

Medical Policy: Artificial Cervical Intervertebral Disc

Policy Number: 7.01.80

Page: 22 of 22

03/20/08	• Original effective date
----------	---