



	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
# of Patients	31,537	47,677	61,985	64,043	73,133	75,952	57,658	61,488	36,904	36,686
Total Payment	\$101m	\$163m	\$216m	\$226m	\$274m	\$297m	\$229m	\$248m	\$154m	\$157m
Average payment/patient	\$3,203	\$3,419	\$3,485	\$3,529	\$3,747	\$3,910	\$3,972	\$4,033	\$4,173	\$4,280

Fig. The volume of each type of procedure by year with payment information.

innovation and advances in technology. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the contemporary trends in the treatment type and treatment-related costs for superficial venous disease.

Methods: Using the Truven MarketScan database (Truven Health Analytics, Ann Arbor, Mich), a comprehensive database of all private insurance claims in the United States, we investigated the treatment of lower extremity venous insufficiency from 2007 to 2016. We extracted *Current Procedural Terminology* codes from the outpatient claims file and classified treatment into five categories: sclerotherapy, laser ablation, radiofrequency ablation, stab phlebectomy, and open venous ligation/stripping. We used multivariate regression to evaluate patients' characteristics and physicians' specialty as it related to treatment reimbursements.

Results: From 2007 to 2016, we identified 448,051 patients who underwent 1,301,565 procedures for lower extremity superficial venous disease. The average (mean ± standard deviation) number of procedures per patient was 3.33 ± 3.56, with a median of 2 procedures per patient (interquartile range, 1-4). The volume of each type of procedure by year is depicted in the Fig. Sclerotherapy consistently had the highest procedure volume, followed by laser ablation. All procedure types saw a decline in volume following a peak in 2012; however, open venous ligation started to see waning volumes beginning in 2010. This decrease in volume corresponded to a decrease in the overall annual total cost of treatment, down to \$157 million in 2016 from its peak of \$297 million in 2012. The average payment per patient per year continued to rise by more than \$1000 from \$3203 in 2007 to \$4280 in 2016. In analyzing physicians' specialty, compared with radiologists, cardiologists were associated with a \$733 decrease in payment per patient, and vascular surgeons were associated with a \$163 decrease in payment per patient.

Conclusions: The treatment of lower extremity venous insufficiency continues to evolve and to favor less invasive open procedures. Although the overall number of procedures for superficial venous disease decreased in patients with private insurance, the average payment per patient has continued to increase, indicating that physicians continue to maximize reimbursements. Further work is needed to evaluate the efficacy of procedural reimbursements, especially in the setting of repeated procedures.

Author Disclosures: N. Itoga: Nothing to disclose; E. George: Nothing to disclose; C. Deslarzes-Dubuis: Nothing to disclose; K. Rothenberg: Nothing to disclose; J. Harris: Nothing to disclose.

Location of Reflux in the Saphenous Vein Does not Affect the Outcomes of Vein Ablation



Afsha Aurshina,¹ Jonathan Cardella,² Kristine Orion,² Bauer Sumpio,² Haoran Zhou,³ Yawei Zhang,³ Alan Dardik,² Cassius Iyad Ochoa Chaar.² ¹General Surgery, Yale University School of Medicine; ²Vascular Surgery, Yale University School of Medicine; ³Yale University School of Public Health

Objective: Varicose veins are commonly caused by valvular reflux in the saphenous vein. Most insurance companies approve venous ablation (VA) for treatment of junctional reflux only and deny therapy for symptomatic patients with significant reflux below the junction of the saphenous vein with the deep system. We hypothesize that there is no difference in outcomes of VA between patients treated for junctional reflux and patients treated for reflux below the junction with the deep system.

Methods: A retrospective single-center review of consecutive patients undergoing VA using radiofrequency in an outpatient office was performed from 2012 to 2016. Patients' electronic medical records were reviewed for characteristics, imaging, and outcomes. A telephone survey inquiring about intensity of symptoms on a numeric rating scale of 0 to 10 before and after treatment was also conducted. Patients were divided on the basis of the location of reflux at the saphenofemoral or saphenopopliteal junction or below the junction. Patients' characteristics and outcomes were compared between the two groups. Clinical success was defined by improvement or resolution of symptoms. Technical success was defined by vein closure on duplex ultrasound.

Results: There were 265 patients (junctional reflux, 224 [84.5%]; reflux below junction, 41 [15.5%]) who underwent VA of 343 veins. The mean age of the patients was 58.8 ± 15 years. There was no difference in age ($P = .59$), sex ($P = .61$), or race ($P = .88$) between the groups. Patients with junctional reflux were significantly more likely to undergo bilateral treatment (33.3% vs 12.2%; $P = .006$). There was no difference in Clinical, Etiology, Anatomy, and Pathophysiology (CEAP) score ($P = .67$), laterality ($P = .66$), or type of vein treated ($P = .59$). On ultrasound, veins with junctional reflux were noted to have significantly larger diameters ($P = .004$); however, veins with reflux below the junction had higher reflux time ($P < .0001$). The clinical success ($P = .98$), technical success ($P = .12$), and complications ($P = .29$) were not different between groups. The survey results demonstrated no difference in improvement in pain ($P = .24$) or swelling ($P = .07$) and recurrence of pain ($P = .32$) or swelling ($P = .84$) after 2 years.

Conclusions: The location of reflux in the saphenous vein does not affect the patient's presentation or outcomes of VA. Absence of junctional reflux should not be used by insurance companies as a criterion for denial of VA.

Author Disclosures: A. Aurshina: Nothing to disclose; J. Cardella: Nothing to disclose; K. Orion: Nothing to disclose; B. Sumpio: Nothing to disclose; H. Zhou: Nothing to disclose; Y. Zhang: Nothing to disclose; A. Dardik: Nothing to disclose; C. I. O. Chaar: Nothing to disclose.

Segmental Saphenous Ablation for Chronic Venous Disease Management



Sergio Ganesini, Erica Menegatti, Savino Occhionorelli, Maria Grazia Sibilla, Jacopo Salviato, Paolo Zamboni, University of Ferrara

Objective: Endovenous thermal ablation for chronic venous disease treatment is recommended over traditional surgery by international guidelines. Nevertheless, the indication is associated with its mini-invasiveness rather than with the recurrence rate, which remains the same despite the constant technical evolution of the different devices. Indeed, the strategy remains the same ablative one of the surgical stripping. In a 2015 Cochrane analysis, venous hemodynamics application in a saphenous-sparing strategy was associated with a decreased recurrence rate compared with traditional stripping. The aim of this investigation was to assess the safety and efficacy of a 6-cm endovenous segmental ablation of the saphenofemoral junction in a saphenous-sparing strategy.

Methods: Eighty-five lower limbs of 79 patients (mean age, 55 ± 10 years; 30 men and 49 women) affected by chronic venous disease (C₃E_pA₅P_R) were included. All the patients underwent a 6-cm great saphenous vein (GSV) ablation distal to the superficial epigastric vein confluence. Of these patients, 41 were operated on by radiofrequency (ClosureFast; Covidien, Mansfield, Mass) and 38 patients by laser (LASEmaR 1500; Eufoton, Trieste, Italy). The procedure was indicated in case of terminal valve incompetence with presence of a re-entry perforator along the GSV. Incompetent tributaries along the leg were flush ligated. Follow-up was performed at 1 year by clinical and ultrasound evaluation. Venous Clinical Severity Score (VCSS) and Aberdeen Varicose Vein Questionnaire (AVVQ) were filled in before the procedure and at 1 year.

Results: At a mean 12 ± 1 months of follow-up, a recanalization was recorded in 5 of 85 (5.8%) cases (2 radiofrequencies, 3 lasers), of which just 2 (1 radiofrequency, 1 laser) showed also a reflux recurrence. No

significant differences in recurrence rate were reported in the comparison between radiofrequency and laser. AVVQ score improved from 18.0 ± 4.1 to 4.7 ± 3.0 in the radiofrequency group and from 17.4 ± 4.6 to 3.9 ± 2.0 in the laser group ($P < .0001$). VCSS improved from 6.9 ± 0.8 to 2.0 ± 1.5 in the radiofrequency group and from 7.0 ± 0.9 to 2.6 ± 1.6 in the laser group ($P < .0001$). No significant differences between the radiofrequency and laser groups were reported in the AVVQ and VCSS postoperative variation. No significant complications were reported.

Conclusions: A 6-cm segmental GSV shrinkage is safe and feasible by both radiofrequency and 1470-nm laser, without significant differences between the two devices. One-year follow-up reported a recurrence rate that is competitive with the traditional ablation of all the GSV trunk, paving the way for innovations both in technology and in strategy.

Author Disclosures: **S. Gianesini:** Nothing to disclose; **E. Menegatti:** Nothing to disclose; **S. Occhionorelli:** Nothing to disclose; **M. G. Sibilla:** Nothing to disclose; **J. Salviato:** Nothing to disclose; **P. Zamboni:** Nothing to disclose.

Venous Diameters, Clinical Severity, and Quality of Life: Does Size Really Matter?



Matthew Tan, Sharon Sutanto, Sarah Onida, **Alun Davies**. Imperial College London

Objective: Chronic venous disease (CVD) leads to a significant impact on health-related quality of life (HRQoL). Truncal vein diameter is often recorded as part of the duplex ultrasound assessment and has been used as a measure to ration interventions. Studies have correlated truncal vein diameter to clinical severity and HRQoL scores in small populations, but the relationship is currently unclear. A review is required to synthesize the evidence regarding these relationships to better inform CVD management.

Methods: A systematic review was performed. MEDLINE and Embase databases were searched from 1946 to August 31, 2018. Reference lists of included studies were also searched to identify relevant papers.

Database searches (title, abstract, and full-text screens) and reference searches were performed by two independent reviewers. Full-text studies in English reporting on the relationship between great and small saphenous vein diameters and clinical severity or HRQoL scores as measured using validated instruments were included. Excluded were non-English studies; papers reporting only duplex ultrasound findings, clinical severity, or HRQoL without assessing their relationship; and papers focusing on nontruncal superficial veins.

Results: Eleven eligible studies were identified, reporting on a total of 2732 symptomatic limbs with C0 or C1 disease and limbs with C2 to C6 disease (range, 22-681). Four studies reported correlations between truncal vein diameter and both clinical severity and HRQoL, whereas seven reported the relationship with clinical severity only. Multiple validated classification systems and instruments were used for both HRQoL (Aberdeen Varicose Vein Questionnaire, Chronic Venous Insufficiency Questionnaire, Venous Insufficiency Epidemiological and Economic Study on Quality of Life/Symptoms, Varicose Vein Symptoms Questionnaire) and clinical severity (Clinical, Etiology, Anatomy, and Pathophysiology [CEAP], Venous Clinical Severity Score [VCSS]). Seven studies reported correlations between vein diameters and CEAP stage, with the majority of studies observing a trend of increasing diameter with increasing clinical severity. Weak correlations were observed in four studies between diameters and VCSS, with one study reporting correlations to individual components of the VCSS. However, no significant relationship between truncal diameters and HRQoL scores was reported in any study included in this review.

Conclusions: Whereas more studies are required to improve the available evidence, included studies suggest that truncal vein diameter correlates with disease severity. Truncal diameters appear to be a weak predictor of HRQoL and have no relationship to patients' perceived impact of CVD. As such, vein diameter should not be used as a measure to decide who needs venous intervention.

Author Disclosures: **M. Tan:** Nothing to disclose; **S. Sutanto:** Nothing to disclose; **S. Onida:** Nothing to disclose; **A. Davies:** Nothing to disclose.