

No financial disclosures

Chronic Venous Insufficiency (CVI)

- Most common vascular disorder worldwide
- Venous disease accounts for 2-3% of US healthcare dollars
- Two major pathophysiologic mechanisms of disease:
 - Saphenous reflux
 - lliac vein obstruction

Saphenous Reflux

- First mechanism elucidated as the etiology of CVI Nicolaides et al.
- Non-invasive diagnosis via duplex ultrasound
- Degree of reflux proportional to symptom severity

Treatment options:

- Endovenous thermal ablation
- NTNT chemical ablation
- Vein stripping
- SFJ ligation



Iliac Vein Obstruction (IVO)

- Increase in awareness & research over past 2 decades
- Proper diagnosis involves venography or IVUS (superior)

Recent double-blinded RCT (Rossi et al., 2018) showed improvement of CVI symptoms and QOL with iliac vein stenting compared to conservative therapy alone

Treatment options: Iliac vein stenting Open surgery



Chronic Venous Insufficiency (CVI)

Current therapies aimed at treating CVI address these two disease mechanisms separately.

We wanted to know:

- Are these pathophysiologic processes are related?
- Can correction of IVO with stenting reduce reflux?

Methods – Evaluation and Intervention

Pts with signs and symptoms of CVI had history, physical, and duplex ultrasonography (saphenous reflux >0.5s).

CVI was managed conservatively with compression stockings and NSAIDs for 3 months.

If pts failed conservative Tx, iliac vein interrogation with IVUS +/- venography was offered.

If bilateral intervention was indicated, 2nd procedure was in 1-2 weeks. Assessment: saphenous reflux before and after iliac vein stent.

Methods – Decision to Stent

If IVUS revealed ≥50% stenosis → Wallstent placement





Methods – Other Signs of IVO

Venographic evidence of iliac vein obstruction: • Proximal contrast thinning

• Transpelvic collateralization

As found in various studies, IVUS is superior to venography for diagnosis of IVO.

We use IVUS in all cases.



Results – Patients

2,681 procedures in 1,645 consecutive patients

- 63% female
- Mean age = 66 y

CEAP breakdown

- 25% had edema (C3)
- 51% had skin changes (C4)
- 5% had recently healed ulceration (C5)
- 18% had active venous ulceration (C6)





Limb	Vein Segment	No.	Pre-Stent Average (ms)	Post-Stent Average (ms)	∆ Reflux Average (ms)	p- value
LLE	GSV	96	2333.5 (+/- 1695.30)	1760.3 (+/- 1600.33)	-573.2	0.004
LLE	ASV	40	2320.3 (+/- 2003.65)	1312.6 (+/- 1201.20)	-1007.7	0.21
Limb RLE RLE RLE	Vein Segment GSV SSV ASV	No. 77 30 2	Pre-Stent Average (ms) 1924.8 (+/- 1417.71) 1778.7 (+/- 1642.43) 377.5 (+/- 533.87)	Post-Stent Average (ms) 1878.3 (+/- 1607.69) 1526.5 (+/- 1487.60) 1752.0 (+/- 445.48)	∆ Reflux Average (ms) -46.6 -252.3 1374.5	P* value 0.83 0.56 0.30

 In patients with 	
and IVO, prelin need for furthe	n concomitant superficial venous reflux ninary iliac vein stenting may prevent the r saphenous intervention.
 The majority of or removal of the conduit for reve 	f anti-reflux procedures involve obliteratio. he GSV, which may be needed as a ascularization at a later date.

Limitations & Further Questions

- Retrospective analysis from a single, office-based center
- # of patients excluded from analysis
- Lack of deep reflux measurements
- Why does bilateral stenting have a significant effect, whereas unilateral intervention does not?
- Which patients experience a statistically and clinically significant reduction in saphenous reflux following stenting?