

Significant Pain Relief and Treatment Satisfaction Following Radiofrequency Ablation - Prospective, Multicenter Study (RAPID)

David Provenzano¹, Bradley Holt², Michael Danko³, Joseph Atallah⁴, Maaz Iqbal⁵, Binit Shah⁶, Albert Singh⁷, Harsh Sachdeva⁸, Ella Ver Donck⁹, Bart Liebrand¹⁰, Erik Shaw¹¹, Sherri Haas¹², Rajat Sekhar¹³, Yu Pei¹⁴, Nilesch Patel¹⁴

1. Pain Diagnostics and Interventional Care, Sewickley, PA USA 2. Tucson Orthopaedic Institute, Tucson, AZ USA 3. Premier Pain Treatment Institute, Loveland OH, USA 4. The Toledo Clinic, Toledo, OH USA 5. Elite Pain and Spine Institute, Mesa, AZ USA 6. Carolinas Pain Center, Huntersville, NC USA 7. Quincy Medical Group, Quincy, IL USA 8. UC Health Pain Medicine, Cincinnati, OH USA 9. AZ Sint-Jan, Bruges, Belgium 10. St Anna Hospital, Geldrop, The Netherlands 11. Shepherd Center, Shepherd Pain Institute, Atlanta, GA, USA 12. Twin Cities Pain Clinic & Surgery Center, Edina, MN USA 13. St. Vincent's Medical Center, Bridgeport, CT USA 14. Boston Scientific Neuromodulation, Valencia, CA USA


BACKGROUND

Patients suffering with chronic pain typically undergo a variety of treatment approaches including medications, physical therapy, and surgery. Notably however, a recent meta-analysis of 96 randomized trials involving over 26,000 subjects with chronic pain demonstrated that use of opioid drugs was not associated with significant improvements in pain and physical function, nor associated with outcomes that were significantly better than that achieved using conventional treatments (i.e., antidepressants, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, anticonvulsants, cannabinoids, or usual care).¹ Radiofrequency ablation (RFA) is minimally invasive, outpatient treatment that has been demonstrated to alleviate pain, improve function, decrease healthcare utilization, and eliminate the need for opiates.²⁻⁶ Additionally, RFA has been progressing as a key approach to managing chronic pain. Here, we assess patients treated with RFA for chronic pain as part of a prospectively-enrolled multicenter, international study.

METHODS

Study Design	Multicenter, Prospective, International Outcomes Study with consecutive enrollment
Study Device	Commercially-approved RFA Systems (Boston Scientific)
Subjects	289 enrolled subjects at 11 sites; 281 patients with initial RFA procedure completed
Study Eligibility Criteria	Key Inclusion Criteria: Study candidate is scheduled to be treated with a commercially approved Boston Scientific RF system for pain per local Directions for Use (DFU) Key Exclusion Criteria: Meets any contraindications per locally applicable Directions for Use (DFU)

STUDY SCHEMATIC




RESULTS

Baseline Characteristics (n = 289)

Gender - Females (%)	56.4% (n = 163/289)
Age (years) [Mean (SD)]	61.4 ± 12.9 years (n = 289)
Pain Duration (years) [Mean (SD)]	12.86 ± 12.63 years (n = 281)
Baseline Targeted Pain Score [Mean (SD)]	6.63 ± 1.76 (n = 258)
Number of Study RF Procedures [Mean (SD)]	1.97 ± 0.99 procedures (n = 281)
Regions treated with RF (with initial procedure completed)	Lumbar – 69.8% (n = 196/281)
	Cervical – 24.2% (n = 68/281)
	Sacroiliac – 21.0% (n = 59/281)
	Hip – 9.25% (n = 26/281)
	Knee – 13.5% (n = 38/281)
Follow-up Duration [Mean (SD)]	353.2 ± 202.5 days (n = 281)

Targeted Pain is the area of pain intended to be treated with RF


Targeted Pain Scores up to 1-year post-procedure



At 12-months post-procedure:


- Significant improvement ($p < 0.0001$) in pain scores was noted. –3.58-point improvement ($6.63 \rightarrow 3.02$) at 3-months and sustained long-term ($\Delta = 3.2$ -point improvement)
- High Responder rates were noted

Patient Satisfaction (PGIC) post-procedure



Over 85% of patients reported improvement (very much, much, or minimally improved) up to 12-months post-procedure

Responder Rates (Targeted Pain) post-procedure



CONCLUSIONS

• Data from this prospective, multicenter, real-world outcomes radiofrequency ablation (RFA) study of 289 enrolled patients (281 patients with initial RFA procedure complete) shows significant improvement in pain scores up to 12-months post-procedure.

• High responder rates and high patient satisfaction was noted during long term follow up.

➤ More than 85% of patients reported very much, much or minimally improved at 12-month post-procedure follow-up.

REFERENCES

1. Busse JW, Wang L, Kamaleldin M, Craigie S, et al. Opioids for Chronic Noncancer Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA. 2018 Dec 18;320(23):2448-2460.
2. Cohen SP, Bhaskar A, Bhatia A, Buvanendran A, et al. Consensus practice guidelines on interventions for lumbar facet joint pain from a multispecialty, international working group. Reg Anesth Pain Med. 2020 Jun;45(6):424-467.
3. Hurley RW, Adams MCB, Barad M, Bhaskar A, Bhatia A, et al. Consensus practice guidelines on interventions for cervical spine (facet) joint pain from a multispecialty international working group. Pain Med. 2021 Nov 26;22(11):2443-2524.
4. MacVicar J, Borowczyk JM, MacVicar AM, Loughnan BM, Bogduk N. Lumbar medial branch radiofrequency neurotomy in New Zealand. Pain Med. 2013 May;14(5):639-45.
5. Starr JB, Gold LS, McCormick Z, Suri P, Friedly J. Repeat procedures and prescription opioid use after lumbar medial branch nerve radiofrequency ablation in commercially insured patients. Spine J. 2020 Mar;20(3):344-351.
6. Loh E, Reid JN, Alibrahim F, Welk B. Retrospective cohort study of healthcare utilization and opioid use following radiofrequency ablation for chronic axial spine pain in Ontario, Canada. Reg Anesth Pain Med. 2019 Mar;44(3):398-405.

DISCLOSURES

This study is sponsored by Boston Scientific. Drs. Atallah, Shah, and Provenzano have consulting agreements with Boston Scientific. Yu Pei and Nilesch Patel are employees of Boston Scientific.

