Interv Pain Med Neuromod. January-December 2023 ; 3(1):e139135. https://doi.org/10.5812/ipmn-139135.

Published online 2023 October 11. **Review Article**

# Which Percutaneous Lumbar Disc Decompression Technique is More Suitable? Comparing Laser, Radiofrequency, and Quantum Techniques

Saeid-Reza Entezary[1] and Masood Mohseni[1,*]

[1]Pain Research Center, Department of Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine, School of Medicine, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

[*]*Corresponding author*: Pain Research Center, Department of Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine, School of Medicine, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran. Email: masood.mohseni@gmail.com

**Received** 2023 July 15; **Revised** 2023 August 06; **Accepted** 2023 August 18.

**Abstract**

Percutaneous lumbar disc decompression (PLDD) has emerged as an effective and minimally invasive treatment option for lumbar disc herniation. This review aims to provide pain specialists with a comparative overview of Iran's commonly utilized PLDD techniques: Laser, radiofrequency (RF), and quantum PLDD. The review discusses patient selection criteria, procedural characteristics, and outcomes to facilitate informed clinical decision-making.

*Keywords:* Low Back Pain, Intervertebral Disc Displacement, Decompression, Minimally Invasive Surgical Procedures

## 1. Context

The management of lumbar disc herniation has undergone a significant transformation with the advent of percutaneous lumbar disc decompression (PLDD) techniques, which offer less invasive alternatives to traditional surgical interventions (1, 2). Among the various PLDD methods, laser, RF, and quantum PLDD have better clinical evidence. This review compares these three techniques regarding patient selection criteria, procedural characteristics, and outcomes.

## 2. Patient Selection

Successful outcomes in PLDD procedures rely on careful patient selection, as different techniques may be more suitable for specific patient profiles. While the general criteria for patient selection remain consistent across the three methods, there are nuanced considerations:

- Laser PLDD: Laser PLDD is often favored by patients with contained disc herniations, mild-to-moderate symptoms, and a preference for minimally invasive interventions. It may be particularly well-suited for patients with smaller disc protrusions (3, 4). However, patients with larger herniations or extrusions may have lower success rates with laser PLDD.

- Radiofrequency (RF) PLDD: The RF PLDD is commonly employed for patients with contained disc herniations, but it may be preferred for those with larger herniations or extrusions that require more substantial tissue shrinkage (2, 5). Additionally, RF PLDD may be the preferred choice for patients who are not ideal candidates for laser-based interventions due to anatomical considerations or personal preferences.

- Quantum PLDD: Quantum PLDD, a relatively new technique, requires further research to establish comprehensive patient selection criteria. However, its enhanced precision and controlled tissue removal capabilities make it potentially suitable for a broad range of patients, including those with complex disc herniations or recurrent cases. Quantum PLDD may offer particular benefits to patients who have not achieved the desired outcomes with previous PLDD methods (6).

## 3. Procedural Characteristics

Each PLDD method has distinct procedural characteristics:

- Laser PLDD: Laser PLDD involves the insertion of a laser probe into the disc to vaporize a portion of the nucleus pulposus. The aim is to reduce disc pressure and alleviate nerve compression. Although laser PLDD offers the advantages of minimally invasive procedures, outpatient

treatment, and potential fast recovery, it is associated with variable success rates, the risk of disc reherniation, and potential thermal damage to surrounding tissues, including adjacent vertebral end-plates.

- RF PLDD: Radiofrequency utilizes thermal energy generated by a radiofrequency probe to coagulate and shrink the herniated disc. By reducing disc volume and relieving nerve compression, RF PLDD provides a minimally invasive approach with the potential for rapid symptom relief. Both pulsed and conventional RF techniques are employed. Conventional RF delivers continuous thermal energy, while pulsed RF delivers intermittent bursts to modulate neural activity without risk of thermal injury.

- Quantum PLDD: Quantum PLDD represents a newer technique that utilizes advanced technology for precise energy delivery to the disc. This method aims to remove a portion of the disc nucleus, effectively reducing pressure on the nerves. Quantum PLDD offers advantages such as enhanced precision, controlled tissue removal, and the potential for improved outcomes. However, limited availability, high costs, and the need for further research to establish long-term effectiveness are potential limitations.

## 4. Patient Outcomes

Patient outcomes serve as crucial measures of the effectiveness of PLDD methods. While outcomes may vary based on individual patient factors, there are notable differences to consider when comparing the three methods:

- Laser disc decompression: Laser PLDD has shown variable success rates in pain relief and functional improvement. Some studies report favorable outcomes, particularly for contained disc herniations and shorter symptom duration. However, the risk of disc reherniation following Laser PLDD is a concern, and the long-term durability of outcomes remains an area of debate (7, 8).

- RF PLDD: Radiofrequency has demonstrated moderate success rates in terms of pain relief and functional improvement. It has shown efficacy in reducing disc volume and relieving nerve compression, leading to symptom resolution in many patients (2). However, like laser PLDD, there is a risk of disc reherniation, and long-term follow-up studies are needed to ascertain the durability of outcomes (9).

The comparison between conventional RF and pulsed RF techniques in PLDD is still a topic of debate, as clinical evidence comparing the two approaches is limited. Some studies suggest that pulsed RF may offer advantages in reducing the risk of tissue damage and minimizing post-procedural pain compared to conventional RF. However, more high-quality studies are needed to draw definitive conclusions about the comparative effectiveness of these techniques.

Combination techniques exploring the added potential of conventional RF and pulsed RF have also undergone scrutiny. The rationale underlying these integrated techniques lies in merging the tissue ablation prowess of conventional RF with the neuromodulatory effects of pulsed RF. These combined approaches aim to deliver comprehensive relief from pain by addressing both the physical compression of nerves and the modulation of pain signals. Nonetheless, the available evidence supporting the effectiveness of such combination techniques is limited, necessitating further studies to establish their clinical efficacy and safety.

- Quantum PLDD: Being a nascent approach, there exists only a modest body of data pertaining to patient outcomes in quantum PLDD. Nevertheless, this technique's precision and controlled tissue removal capabilities offer promising prospects for enhanced results. Preliminary studies indicate favorable pain relief and functional improvement, possibly accompanied by a reduced risk of disc reherniation. Extensive research is warranted to ascertain its long-term effectiveness and to compare it with other PLDD methods.

It is imperative to underscore that various factors, including the severity of disc herniation, pre-existing conditions, and patient compliance with post-procedural rehabilitation, may influence patient outcomes. Therefore, a comprehensive assessment of patient characteristics and expectations is critical when determining the most suitable PLDD technique.

## 5. Conclusions

In summary, laser, RF, and quantum PLDD techniques present viable alternatives to traditional open discectomy. While laser and RF PLDD have been extensively studied, quantum PLDD exhibits promising potential that necessitates further investigation. Pain specialists must carefully consider patient selection criteria, procedural characteristics, and patient outcomes when making a choice regarding the PLDD technique. In a country with limited resources like Iran, economic issues also play an important role in choosing the applicable method for patients (10). A comprehensive understanding of these considerations will assist pain specialists in selecting the most appropriate PLDD method for individual patients.

## Footnotes

**Authors' Contribution:** S.R.E. revised the manuscript. M.M. drafted the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

**Conflict of Interests:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**Funding/Support:** No funding or financial support.

## References

1. Gelalis I, Gkiatas I, Spiliotis A, Papadopoulos D, Pakos E, Vekris M, et al. Current Concepts in Intradiscal Percutaneous Minimally Invasive Procedures for Chronic Low Back Pain. *Asian J Neurosurg*. 2019;**14**(3):657–69. [PubMed ID: 31497082]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC6703031]. https://doi.org/10.4103/ajns.AJNS_119_17.
2. Fasoli F, Gandini R, Scaggiante J, Bartolo M, Capobianco SV, Cerone G. Minimally-invasive percutaneous treatments for low back pain and leg pain: a randomized controlled study of thermal disc decompression versus mechanical percutaneous disc decompression. *Spine J*. 2022;**22**(5):709–15. [PubMed ID: 34929381]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spinee.2021.12.008.
3. Gazzeri R, Tribuzi S, Galarza M, Occhigrossi F. Percutaneous Laser Disc Decompression (PLDD) for the Treatment of Contained Lumbar Disc Herniation. *Surg Technol Int*. 2022;**41**. [PubMed ID: 36269671]. https://doi.org/10.52198/22.STI.41.NS1639.
4. Ong D, Chua NH, Vissers K. Percutaneous Disc Decompression for Lumbar Radicular Pain: A Review Article. *Pain Pract*. 2016;**16**(1):111–26. [PubMed ID: 25354274]. https://doi.org/10.1111/papr.12250.
5. Kim NH, Hong Y, Lee SH. Two-year clinical outcomes of radiofrequency focal ablation using a navigable plasma disc decompression device in patients with lumbar disc herniation: efficacy and complications. *J Pain Res*. 2018;**11**:2229–37. [PubMed ID: 30349349]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC6186770]. https://doi.org/10.2147/JPR.S170704.
6. Canos-Verdecho A, Robledo R, Izquierdo R, Bermejo A, Gallach E, Argente P, et al. Preliminary evaluation of the efficacy of quantum molecular resonance coablative radiofrequency and microdiscectomy. *Pain Manag*. 2022;**12**(8):917–30. [PubMed ID: 36196857]. https://doi.org/10.2217/pmt-2022-0039.
7. Terai H, Tamai K, Iwamae M, Kaneda K, Katsuda H, Shimada N, et al. Characteristics and Short-Term Surgical Outcomes of Patients with Recurrent Lumbar Disc Herniation after Percutaneous Laser Disc Decompression. *Medicina (Kaunas)*. 2021;**57**(11):1225. [PubMed ID: 34833443]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC8623925]. https://doi.org/10.3390/medicina57111225.
8. Hashemi M, Falsafi M, Razzaghi MR, Dadkhah P, Taheri M, Delshad MH, et al. The Long-term Effects of Percutaneous Laser Disc Decompression (PLDD) Treatment on Lumbar Disc Protrusion: A 2-Year Follow-up. *J Lasers Med Sci*. 2020;**11**(4):427–32. [PubMed ID: 33425293]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC7736942]. https://doi.org/10.34172/jlms.2020.67.
9. Nie HY, Qi YB, Li N, Wang SL, Cao YX. Comprehensive comparison of therapeutic efficacy of radiofrequency target disc decompression and nucleoplasty for lumbar disc herniation: a five year follow-up. *Int Orthop*. 2018;**42**(4):843–9. [PubMed ID: 29090325]. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-017-3661-5.
10. Mohseni M, Imani F. The emerging Burden of Low Back Pain in the Iranian Population: A Warning About Resource Limitations. *Interv Pain Med Neuromod*. 2023;**3**(1):e136055. https://doi.org/10.5812/ipmn-136055.