

Surgical and Ablative Procedures for Venous Insufficiency and Varicose Veins (for New Jersey Only)

Policy Number: CS117NJ.U

Effective Date: September 1, 2024

[Instructions for Use](#)

Table of Contents	Page
Application	1
Coverage Rationale	1
Definitions	3
Applicable Codes	4
Description of Services	6
Benefit Considerations	7
Clinical Evidence	7
U.S. Food and Drug Administration	21
References	22
Policy History/Revision Information	27
Instructions for Use	28

Related Policies

- [Cosmetic and Reconstructive Procedures \(for New Jersey Only\)](#)
- [Embolization of the Ovarian and Iliac Veins for Pelvic Congestion Syndrome \(for New Jersey Only\)](#)
- [Outpatient Surgical Procedures – Site of Service \(for New Jersey Only\)](#)

Application

This Medical Policy only applies to the state of New Jersey.

Coverage Rationale

[See Benefit Considerations](#)

Varicose Vein Ablative and Stripping Procedures

The initial and subsequent radiofrequency ablation, endovenous laser ablation, Stripping, Ligation and excision of the Great Saphenous Vein (GSV) and Small Saphenous Veins (SSV) are considered Reconstructive, proven, and medically necessary when all of the following criteria are present:

- Individual must have one of the following Functional or Physical Impairments:
 - Skin ulceration; or
 - Documented episode(s) of frank bleeding of the Varicose Vein due to erosion of/or trauma to the skin; or
 - Documented Superficial Thrombophlebitis; or
 - Documented Venous Stasis Dermatitis causing Functional or Physical Impairment; or
 - Moderate to Severe Pain causing Functional or Physical Impairment
 and
- Venous size:
 - The GSV must be 3.0 mm or greater when measured at the proximal thigh immediately below the saphenofemoral junction via Duplex Ultrasonography
 - The SSV or Accessory Veins must measure 3.0 mm or greater in diameter immediately below the appropriate junction via Duplex Ultrasonography
 and
- Duplex Ultrasound study performed in the standing or reverse Trendelenburg position, shows duration of reflux that meets the following parameters:
 - Greater than or equal to 500 milliseconds (ms) for the GSV, SSV, or principal tributaries
 - Some Duplex Ultrasound readings will describe this as moderate to severe reflux which will be acceptable

Ablation of perforator veins is considered Reconstructive, proven, and medically necessary when the following criteria are present:

- Evidence of perforator Venous Insufficiency measured by recent Duplex Ultrasonography report (refer to the criteria above); and
- Perforator vein size is 3.5 mm or greater; and
- Perforating veins > 500 ms; and
- Perforating vein lies beneath a healed or active venous stasis ulcer

Ligation Procedures

The following procedure is proven and medically necessary:

- Ligation at the saphenofemoral junction, as a stand-alone procedure, when used to prevent the propagation of an active clot to the deep venous system in individuals with ascending Superficial Thrombophlebitis who fail or are intolerant of anticoagulation therapy

The following procedure is proven and medically necessary in certain circumstances:

- Ligation, subfascial, endoscopic surgery for treatment of perforating veins associated with chronic Venous Insufficiency. For medical necessity clinical coverage criteria, refer to the InterQual® CP: Procedures, Ligation, Subfascial, Endoscopic, Perforating Vein.

[Click here to view the InterQual® criteria.](#)

The following procedures are unproven and not medically necessary for treating Venous Reflux due to insufficient evidence of efficacy:

- Ligation of the GSV at the saphenofemoral junction, as a stand-alone procedure
- Ligation of the SSV at the saphenopopliteal junction, as a stand-alone procedure
- Ligation of the Accessory Veins, as a stand-alone procedure
- Ligation at the saphenofemoral junction, as an adjunct to radiofrequency ablation or endovenous laser ablation of the main saphenous veins

Ambulatory Phlebectomy

Ambulatory phlebectomy for treating Varicose Veins is proven and medically necessary in certain circumstances. For medical necessity clinical coverage criteria, refer to the InterQual® CP: Procedures, Ambulatory Phlebectomy, Varicose Vein for:

- Hook Phlebectomy
- Microphlebectomy
- Mini Phlebectomy
- Stab Avulsion
- Stab Phlebectomy

[Click here to view the InterQual® criteria.](#)

Sclerotherapy

- Refer to the [Applicable Codes](#) section for Sclerotherapy (i.e., liquid, foam, ultrasound-guided, endovenous chemical ablation, endovenous microfoam).
- Refer to the [Benefit Considerations](#) section for Cosmetic Sclerotherapy.

Other Procedures

The following procedures are unproven and not medically necessary for treating Venous Reflux due to insufficient evidence of efficacy:

- Endovascular embolization of Varicose Veins using cyanoacrylate-based adhesive
- Endovenous mechanochemical ablation (MOCA) of Varicose Veins
- Porcine bioprosthetic valve (e.g., VenoValve) implantation into the femoral vein for treatment of deep vein reflux associated with chronic Venous Insufficiency

Definitions

Check the definitions within the federal, state, and contractual requirements that supersede the definitions below.

Accessory/Tributary Vein: Axial accessory or tributary saphenous veins indicate any venous segment ascending parallel to the Great Saphenous Vein and located more superficially above the saphenous fascia, both in the leg and in the thigh. These can include the anterior Accessory Vein, the postero-medial vein, circumflex veins (anterior or posterior), intersaphenous veins, Giacomini vein, or posterior (Leonardo), or anterior arch veins (Caggiati, 2002).

Axial Reflux: Axial Reflux of the GSV is defined as uninterrupted retrograde venous flow from the groin to the upper calf. Axial Reflux in the SSV is defined as being from the knee to the ankle. Axial Reflux in the AAGSV and PAGSV is retrograde flow between two measurements, at least five cm apart (Gloviczki, 2023).

Cosmetic Procedures: Cosmetic Procedures are excluded from coverage. Procedures or services that change or improve appearance without significantly improving physiological function (COC, 2018).

Duplex Ultrasonography: Noninvasive imaging that uses sound waves to assess blood flow through the vessels in legs. Combines a B mode scanner with built-in Doppler capability. B-mode imaging permits accurate placement of the pulsed Doppler sample volume, and the addition of color makes it easier to establish obstruction, turbulence, and the direction of venous and arterial flow [National Institutes for Health (NIH), 2023; Gloviczki, 2011].

Endovenous Ablation: A minimally invasive procedure that uses heat generated by radiofrequency (RF) or laser energy to seal off damaged veins (NIH, 2023).

Functional or Physical Impairment: A Functional or Physical or Physiological Impairment causes deviation from the normal function of a tissue or organ. This results in a significantly limited, impaired, or delayed capacity to move, coordinate actions, or perform physical activities and is exhibited by difficulties in one or more of the following areas: physical and motor tasks; independent movement; performing basic life functions (Medicare, 2023).

Great Saphenous Vein (GSV): A long vein that can be seen just in front of the anklebone. This vein travels along the inside of the leg and thigh (about one-half inch beneath the skin in the thigh) until it empties into the deep vein called the common femoral vein in the groin [American Vein & Lymphatic Society (AVLS), 2023].

Ligation: Tying off a vein (AVLS, 2023).

Moderate to Severe Pain: The Venous Clinical Severity Score (VCSS) describes Moderate Pain to be daily pain or other discomfort interfering with, but not preventing, regular daily activities and Severe Pain to be daily pain or discomfort that limits most regular daily activities [Vasquez et al. (American Venous Forum), 2010].

Reconstructive Procedures: Reconstructive Procedures when the primary purpose of the procedure is either of the following:

- Treatment of a medical condition; or
- Improvement or restoration of physiologic function

Reconstructive Procedures include surgery or other procedures which are related to an injury, sickness or congenital anomaly. The primary result of the procedure is not a changed or improved physical appearance.

Procedures that correct an anatomical congenital anomaly without improving or restoring physiologic function are considered Cosmetic Procedures. The fact that you may suffer psychological consequences or socially avoidant behavior as a result of an injury, sickness or congenital anomaly does not classify surgery (or other procedures done to relieve such consequences or behavior) as a reconstructive procedure (COC, 2018).

Reticular Vein: A network of veins parallel to the skin surface and lying between the saphenous fascia and dermis. These veins communicate with either saphenous tributaries or the deep veins through perforators (Meissner, 2005).

Sclerotherapy: Defined by Watson et al. (2017), Sclerotherapy is the intravascular injection of a chemical agent to cause endothelial damage and subsequent vascular occlusion of the target vessel (endovenous chemical ablation).

Small Saphenous Vein: (SSV) A superficial vein that starts at the outside of the foot and travels up the back of the calf where it empties into the deep vein (popliteal vein) in the crease of the knee (AVLS, 2023).

Spider Vein: Spider Veins/Telangiectasias are dilated small superficial veins measuring less than 1.0 mm in diameter and occurring predominantly in the lower extremities (Nukano, 2021).

Superficial Thrombophlebitis: Inflammation of a vein due to a blood clot in a vein just below the skin's surface (AVLS, 2023).

Varicose Veins: Varicose Veins are dilated subcutaneous tributaries ≥ 3 mm in diameter and patients with Varicose Veins belong to clinical stage, etiology, anatomy, pathology (CEAP) Class C2 (Gloviczki, 2023).

Venous Reflux/Insufficiency: Gloviczki et al. (2023) defines Venous Reflux as reversed blood flow in the veins. Abnormal (pathological reflux) times exceed different thresholds depending on the system of veins:

- Deep veins: 1 sec
- Superficial veins: 0.5 sec
- Perforator veins: 0.5 sec

Venous Stasis Dermatitis: A skin inflammation due to the chronic buildup of fluid (swelling) under the skin (MedlinePlus, 2022).

Venous Stripping: Surgical removal of superficial veins (AVLS, 2023).

Applicable Codes

The following list(s) of procedure and/or diagnosis codes is provided for reference purposes only and may not be all inclusive. Listing of a code in this policy does not imply that the service described by the code is a covered or non-covered health service. Benefit coverage for health services is determined by federal, state, or contractual requirements and applicable laws that may require coverage for a specific service. The inclusion of a code does not imply any right to reimbursement or guarantee claim payment. Other Policies and Guidelines may apply.

Coding Clarifications

- According to the American Medical Association (AMA), CPT code 37241 is specific to venous embolization/occlusion and excludes lower extremity venous incompetency. Coding instructions state that 37241 should not be used to request treatment of incompetent extremity veins. For sclerosis of veins or Endovenous Ablation of incompetent extremity veins, refer to 36468-36479 (CPT Assistant, 2014).
- Adherence to AMA coding guidance is required when requesting Endovenous Ablation procedures.

Per AMA coding guidance, the initial incompetent vein treated (e.g., [36475](#)) may only be requested once per extremity. For Endovenous Ablation, treatment of subsequent incompetent veins in the same extremity as the initial vein treated (e.g., [36476](#)), only one add-on code per extremity may be requested, regardless of the number of additional vein(s) treated (CPT Assistant, November 2016).

Therefore, only one primary code may be requested for the initial vein treated, and only one add-on code per extremity may be requested for any subsequent vein(s) treated.

*CPT code 36468 for sclerosant treatment for Spider Veins is considered Cosmetic; does not improve a Functional, Physical, or physiological Impairment (2019 Amendment).

**CPT codes 36465, 36466, 36470, and 36471, are covered for Sclerotherapy up to 3 sessions per leg within a year. More than 3 sessions per leg within a year is considered Cosmetic; does not improve a Functional, Physical or physiological Impairment. Cosmetic Sclerotherapy is excluded (2019 Certificate of Coverage Amendment).

- A session is defined as one date of service in which Sclerotherapy (36465, 36466, 36470, 36471) is performed.
- A year is defined as a rolling 12 months (365 days).

CPT Code	Description
†0744T	Insertion of bioprosthetic valve, open, femoral vein, including duplex ultrasound imaging guidance, when performed, including autogenous or nonautogenous patch graft (e.g., polyester, ePTFE, bovine pericardium), when performed

CPT Code	Description
**36465	Injection of non-compounded foam sclerosant with ultrasound compression maneuvers to guide dispersion of the injectate, inclusive of all imaging guidance and monitoring; single incompetent extremity truncal vein (e.g., great saphenous vein, accessory saphenous vein)
**36466	Injection of non-compounded foam sclerosant with ultrasound compression maneuvers to guide dispersion of the injectate, inclusive of all imaging guidance and monitoring; multiple incompetent truncal veins (e.g., great saphenous vein, accessory saphenous vein), same leg
†*36468	Injection(s) of sclerosant for spider veins (telangiectasia), limb or trunk
†**36470	Injection of sclerosant; single incompetent vein (other than telangiectasia)
†**36471	Injection of sclerosant; multiple incompetent veins (other than telangiectasia), same leg
36473	Endovenous ablation therapy of incompetent vein, extremity, inclusive of all imaging guidance and monitoring, percutaneous, mechanochemical; first vein treated
36474	Endovenous ablation therapy of incompetent vein, extremity, inclusive of all imaging guidance and monitoring, percutaneous, mechanochemical; subsequent vein(s) treated in a single extremity, each through separate access sites (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
36475	Endovenous ablation therapy of incompetent vein, extremity, inclusive of all imaging guidance and monitoring, percutaneous, radiofrequency; first vein treated
36476	Endovenous ablation therapy of incompetent vein, extremity, inclusive of all imaging guidance and monitoring, percutaneous, radiofrequency; subsequent vein(s) treated in a single extremity, each through separate access sites (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
36478	Endovenous ablation therapy of incompetent vein, extremity, inclusive of all imaging guidance and monitoring, percutaneous, laser; first vein treated
36479	Endovenous ablation therapy of incompetent vein, extremity, inclusive of all imaging guidance and monitoring, percutaneous, laser; subsequent vein(s) treated in a single extremity, each through separate access sites (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
36482	Endovenous ablation therapy of incompetent vein, extremity, by transcatheter delivery of a chemical adhesive (e.g., cyanoacrylate) remote from the access site, inclusive of all imaging guidance and monitoring, percutaneous; first vein treated
36483	Endovenous ablation therapy of incompetent vein, extremity, by transcatheter delivery of a chemical adhesive (e.g., cyanoacrylate) remote from the access site, inclusive of all imaging guidance and monitoring, percutaneous; subsequent vein(s) treated in a single extremity, each through separate access sites (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
37500	Vascular endoscopy, surgical, with ligation of perforator veins, subfascial (SEPS)
37700	Ligation and division of long saphenous vein at saphenofemoral junction, or distal interruptions
37718	Ligation, division, and stripping, short saphenous vein
37722	Ligation, division, and stripping, long (greater) saphenous veins from saphenofemoral junction to knee or below
37735	Ligation and division and complete stripping of long or short saphenous veins with radical excision of ulcer and skin graft and/or interruption of communicating veins of lower leg, with excision of deep fascia
37765	Stab phlebectomy of varicose veins, one extremity; 10-20 stab incisions
37766	Stab phlebectomy of varicose veins, one extremity; more than 20 incisions
37780	Ligation and division of short saphenous vein at saphenopopliteal junction (separate procedure)
37785	Ligation, division, and/or excision of varicose vein cluster(s), one leg
37799	Unlisted procedure, vascular surgery

CPT® is a registered trademark of the American Medical Association

Codes labeled with a dagger (†) are not on the State of New Jersey Medicaid Fee Schedule and therefore may not be covered by the State of New Jersey Medicaid Program.

Description of Services

Varicose Veins are enlarged veins that are swollen and raised above the surface of the skin. They can be dark purple or blue, and look twisted and bulging. Varicose Veins are commonly found on the backs of the calves or on the inside of the leg. Veins have one-way valves that help keep blood flowing towards the heart. When the valves become weak or damaged and do not close properly, blood can back up and pool in the veins causing them to get larger. The resulting condition is known as Venous Insufficiency or Venous Reflux. Varicose Veins may lead to complications such as pain, blood clots, or skin ulcers.

Duplex Ultrasound is considered the gold standard for diagnosis of superficial venous incompetence. The CEAP (clinical, etiology, anatomy, pathophysiology) classification system is used to describe the degree of varicosity. The “C” part of CEAP classification is more useful and practical in rating the severity of Varicose Veins:

- C0: No visible or palpable signs of venous disease
- C1: Telangiectasis (Spider Veins) or Reticular Veins
- C2: Varicose Veins (diameter of vein is > 3 mm)
- C3: Edema
- C4a: Pigmentation and eczema
- C4b: Lipodermatosclerosis and atrophie blanche
- C5: Healed venous ulcer
- C6: Active venous ulcer

[Lurie et al. American Venous Forum (AVF), 2020]

Venous clinical severity scoring has been used to measure clinical improvement after treatment of Varicose Veins. Other venous severity scoring methods include Venous Severity Score, Venous Clinical Severity Score, Venous Segmental Disease Score [Lurie et al. (AVF), (2020)].

Preoperative venous Duplex Ultrasound is used to evaluate patients for Venous Insufficiency symptoms or suspected DVT; it can provide a road map of vein anatomy similar to contrast venography, as well as essential hemodynamic information about the presence of proximal obstruction, vein valve function, and Venous Reflux (Lin et al., 2015).

Varicose Veins are treated with lifestyle changes and medical procedures done either to remove the veins or to close them. Endovenous Ablation therapy uses lasers or radiofrequency energy to create heat to close off a Varicose Vein. Vein Stripping and Ligation involves tying shut and removing the veins through small cuts in the skin [National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (NHLBI), 2014].

Endomechanical ablation uses a specialized, rotating catheter (e.g., ClariVein) to close off a Varicose Vein by damaging the vessel lining prior to injecting a sclerosing agent. This technique is also referred to as mechanochemical ablation (MOCA), mechanochemical Endovenous Ablation (MCEA) and mechanically enhanced endovenous chemical ablation (MEECA).

Endovascular embolization using cyanoacrylate-based adhesive (e.g., VenaSeal™ Closure System) is a minimally invasive, non-thermal, and non-sclerosant procedure that does not require tumescent anesthesia. The medical adhesive is used to close the lower extremity superficial truncal veins, such as the Great Saphenous Vein, in individuals with symptomatic Venous Reflux disease.

Endovascular embolization using endovenous foam Sclerotherapy with polidocanol endovenous microfoam (PEM) [e.g., Varithena™ (Provensis Ltd.)], is a prescribed proprietary canister that generates a sterile, uniform, stable, low-nitrogen polidocanol 1% microfoam sclerosant intended for ultrasound-guided intravenous (IV) injection for treating venous incompetence and varicosities (Hayes, 2022). The aim of ultrasound-guided foam Sclerotherapy for Varicose Veins is to damage the endothelial surface of the vein causing scarring and leading to blockage of the treated Varicose Veins. Sclerosant, in the form of a foam, is intended to have good surface area contact with the vein walls [National Institute of Health and Care Excellence (NICE), 2013].

Benefit Considerations

Coverage Limitations and Exclusions

The following procedures are excluded from coverage:

- Treatments for Spider Veins and/or Telangiectasias are considered to be Cosmetic and therefore excluded from coverage.
- Endovenous Ablation (radiofrequency and/or laser) of either Reticular or Telangiectatic Veins is not Reconstructive and not medically necessary and therefore excluded from coverage.

Sclerotherapy Treatment of Veins

- Cosmetic Sclerotherapy is excluded.

Clinical Evidence

Hamel-Desnos et al. (2023) conducted a multicenter, randomized controlled trial (RCT) to compare endovenous laser ablation (EVLA) and ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy (UGFS) for treatment in patients with small saphenous vein (SSV) incompetence. One hundred and sixty-one patients were randomly selected to EVLA (n = 79) or UGFS (n = 82). The absence of SSV reflux (> 0.5 second) was the primary outcome, secondary outcomes were QOL scores and clinical scores. Assessments were performed at eight days, six months, and one, two, and three years. Only 3% of patients who received UGFS had the second (allowed) treatment and 86% of patients completed the three year study. Forty-one and 19 tributary treatments (by sclerotherapy) were performed in 27 UGFS patients (33%) and 15 EVLA patients (19%), respectively. The complete absence of reflux at three years was significantly better after EVLA (86%) than after UGFS (56%). Two deep vein thromboses (DVTs) and one endovenous heat induced thrombosis occurred in the EVLA group. Seven DVTs were seen in the UGFS group, including two partial popliteal DVTs and five gastrocnemius vein thromboses (four asymptomatic and incidental on day 8 screening). At three years, there was no difference between groups for the following: rate of visible varices (p = .87), revised Venous Clinical Severity Score (p = .28), and QoL (p = .59). Patient satisfaction scores were high in both groups. Symptoms were significantly improved in both groups. The authors note technical outcomes were better for EVLA than for UGFS, despite an allowance for a second UGFS treatment at six weeks for the foam group. Clinical scores were similarly improved in both groups; however, more patients had tributary treatment after UGFS and more venous thromboembolism events occurred after UGFS. The authors concluded this study supports EVLA as the first choice treatment for SSV incompetence. Limitations include the trial was not powered to study factors such as influence of SSV diameters and POL concentrations. Additionally, venous thromboembolism (VTE) prophylaxis and criteria for offering tributary treatment were left to the discretion of the investigator.

A single-center RCT with a follow-up time of 10 years was completed by F et al. (2021) to evaluate the long-term results of saphenofemoral ligation and stripping (SFL/S) compared with 980 nm bare fiber EVLA for the treatment of great saphenous vein (GSV) incompetence. Patients with GSV incompetence were randomized to undergo SFL/S or EVLA under tumescent anesthesia. Inclusion criteria were, among others: GSV and SFJ incompetence defined as reflux lasting more than 0.5 seconds on ultrasound imaging after calf compression and release or after the Valsalva maneuver, over an intrafascial length of 15 cm or more measured from the SFJ downward, with a GSV diameter of 3 mm or more or 15 mm or less. The primary outcome was recurrence of groin-related varicose veins seen on duplex ultrasound imaging and clinical examination. The secondary outcomes were (changes or improvement in) CEAP clinical class, venous symptoms, cosmetic results, quality of life, reinterventions, and complications. Between June 2007 and December 2008, 122 patients (130 limbs) were included; of these, 68 limbs were treated with SFL/S and 62 limbs with EVLA. The 10-year estimated freedom from groin recurrence as seen on duplex ultrasound imaging was higher in the SFL/S group (73% vs. 44% in the EVLA group; p = .002), and the same trend was seen for clinically evident recurrence (77% vs. 58%, respectively; p = .034). Nine reinterventions (17%) were deemed necessary in the SFL/S group vs. 18 (36%) in the EVLA group (p = .059). All re-interventions in the SFL/S group consisted of foam sclerotherapy. Re-interventions in the EVLA group included foam sclerotherapy (n = 5), crosssection (n = 2), and endovenous procedures (n = 11). There were no significant differences in quality of life and relief of venous symptoms. Cosmetic appearance improved, with a better cosmetic rating in the SFL/S group compared with the EVLA group (p = .026). One patient in the SFL/S group had a persisting neurosensory deficit remaining at 10 years. The authors concluded that the study showed no clear long-term advantage of EVLA with a 980 nm wavelength and bare-tip fiber over high ligation and stripping of the GSV under local tumescent anesthesia.

In a meta-analysis, Hamann et al. (2017) compared the long-term efficacy of different treatment modalities for varicose veins: high ligation with stripping (HL+S), endovenous thermal ablation (EVTA), mainly consisting of EVLA or radiofrequency ablation (RFA), and UGFS. Three RCTs and 10 follow-up studies of RCTs with follow-up ≥ 5 years were

included. In total, 611 legs were treated with EVLA, 549 with HL+S, 121 with UGFS, and 114 with HL+EVLA. UGFS had significantly lower pooled anatomical success rates than HL+S, EVLA, and EVLA with high ligation: 34% (95% CI 26-44) versus 83% (95% CI 72-90), 88% (95% CI 82-92), and 88% (95% CI 77-100) respectively; $p \leq .001$. The pooled recurrent reflux rate at the saphenofemoral junction (SFJ) was significantly lower for HL+S than UGFS (12%, 95% CI 7-20, vs. 29%, 95% CI 21-38; $p \leq .001$) and EVLA (12%, 95% CI 7-20, vs. 22%, 95% CI 14-32; $p = .038$). Venous Clinical Severity Score (VCSS) were pooled for EVLA and HL+S, which showed similar improvements. Based on the results of the meta-analysis, EVLA and HL+S show higher success rates than UGFS five years after GSV treatment. Recurrent reflux rates at the SFJ were significantly lower in HL+S than UGFS and EVLA. VCSS scores were similar between EVLA and HL+S. Rass et al. (2015), Gauw et al. (2016), and Flessenkämper et al. (2016), which were previously cited in this policy, are included in this meta-analysis.

Boersma et al. (2016) performed a systematic review and meta-analysis of treatment modalities for small saphenous vein (SSV) insufficiency. The review included 49 studies (5 RCTs, 44 cohort studies) reporting on the different treatment modalities: surgery ($n = 9$), EVLA ($n = 28$), RFA ($n = 9$), UGFS ($n = 6$) and MOCA ($n = 1$). The primary outcome of anatomical success was defined as closure of the treated vein on follow-up duplex ultrasound imaging. Secondary outcomes were technical success and major complications. The pooled anatomical success rate was 58.0% for surgery in 798 veins, 98.5% for EVLA in 2,950 veins, 97.1% for RFA in 386 veins and 63.6% for UGFS in 494 veins. One study reported results of MOCA, with an anatomical success rate of 94%. Neurologic complications were most frequently reported after surgery and thermal ablation. Deep venous thrombosis was a rare complication. The authors concluded that EVLA and RFA are preferred to surgery and foam sclerotherapy in the treatment of SSV insufficiency. Although data on nonthermal techniques is still sparse, the potential benefits, especially the reduced risk of nerve injury, might be of considerable clinical importance. Theivacumar et al. (2007) and O'Hare et al. (2008), which were previously cited in this policy, are included in this meta-analysis.

Go et al. (2016) reviewed the cases of 24 limbs of 17 patients who underwent EVLA between 2004 and 2007, that were examined with duplex ultrasonographic scans at a mean follow-up of 66 months. There were five recurrences of SFJ reflux. The occlusion rate was 79.2% at a mean follow-up of 66.1 months. There were 14 recanalizations and five recurrences of the GSV. Five partial and nine total recanalizations were observed. The authors concluded that EVLA is an effective and minimally invasive treatment for varicose veins and although their long-term result was acceptable, the result was not outstanding. A study limitation was the small patient population and lack of comparison group.

In a systematic review and meta-analysis of RCTs of endovenous ablation (EVA) of the GSV, O'Donnell et al. (2016) evaluated recurrence and cause of varicose veins after surgery (REVAS). Seven RCTs provided eight comparisons (one study compared both types of EVA to a comparator arm): three used RFA, and five employed EVLA. Overall recurrent varicose veins developed in 125 limbs after EVA (22%), with no difference in the incidence vs the ligation and stripping (L&S) group (22%) based on the number of limbs available at the time of the development of recurrence for both groups, but this incidence is dependent on the length of follow-up after the initial treatment. Neovascularization occurred in only two limbs (2%) after EVA vs. 18 (18%) in the L&S group. Recanalization was the most common cause of REVAS for EVA (32%; 40 of 125 limbs), followed by the development of anterior accessory saphenous vein incompetence (19%; 23 of 125 limbs). The authors concluded that there is no difference in the incidence of REVAS for EVA vs. L&S, but the causes of REVAS are different with L&S.

In a systematic review and meta-analysis to compare traditional surgery and EVLA for the treatment of venous insufficiency of the GSVs, Quarto et al. (2016) evaluated 756 legs treated with a conventional surgical procedure and 755 legs treated with EVLA. Only RCTs based at least on six months follow-up were considered eligible in the study. The authors did not find a statistically significant difference in the presence or absence of reflux between the two techniques and noted that although EVLA did not prove to be superior in terms of recurrence to the surgical technique, EVLA remains a viable treatment option in patients with impaired GSV, reducing postoperative pain and hospital stay.

Woźniak et al. (2016) conducted a cohort study of complications and failure of EVLA and RFA in a 5-year follow-up. One hundred ten adult participants with varicose veins clinical grade C2 to C6, treated for isolated GSV or SSV insufficiency in a single lower extremity in 2009 to 2010, were enrolled and subdivided into EVLA ($n = 56$) and RFA ($n = 54$) groups. Both groups were compared for demography, disease stage, affected veins, perioperative, and postoperative complications as well as treatment efficacy. The perioperative and postoperative complications were statistically insignificant. Treatment efficacy, expressed as the number of participants with recurrent varicosity and recanalization, was comparable in both groups. The clinically significant recanalization rate was 3.6% and 5.6% in EVLA and RFA groups, respectively. The authors concluded that EVLA and RFA for the management of lower extremity varicose vein offer comparable efficacy and safety in a 5-year follow-up. The findings are, however, limited by lack of randomization and a sample size that might have been too small to detect clinically significant differences between the two procedures.

Theivacumar et al. (2011) conducted a cohort study to assess the effectiveness and safety of EVLA in the management of recurrent varicose veins (RVVS). One-hundred four limbs (95 patients) undergoing EVLA for RVVS were grouped according to pattern of reflux. For patients with recurrent SFJ/GSV (Group GR) and SPJ/SSV (Group SR) varicosities ablation rates and quality of life (QoL) using the Aberdeen Varicose Vein Severity Scores (AVVSS) were compared with those for age/sex matched patients undergoing EVLA for primary GSV/SSV dependent varicose veins (Groups GP and SP). In patients with RVVS the axial vein was ablated in 102/104 (98%) limbs while two GSVs (Group GR) partially recanalized by three months [GSV ablated in 49/51 (96%) limbs versus 50/51 (98%) limbs in GP ($p = 0.2$)]. Improvements in AVVSS at three months [median GR: 14.2 (inter-quartile range {IQR} 10.2-18.9) to 3.2 (1.2-6.4), $p < 0.001$; GP: median 15.9 (IQR 11.4-22.7) to 3.8 (1.1-5.6), $p < 0.001$, Mann-Whitney u-test] were similar (78% versus 76%, $p = 0.23$). The SSV was ablated in 24/24 limbs in groups SR and SP and the % improvement in AVVSS was 83% [median 14.4 (IQR 8.2-19.4) to 2.4 (1.9-4.6), $p < 0.001$, Mann-Whitney u-test] and 84% [median 13.8 (IQR 6.3-17.5) to 2.2 (1.2-5.1), $p < 0.001$] respectively ($p = 0.33$). These improvements persisted at one year follow-up. A further 29 limbs with isolated anterior accessory great saphenous vein (AAGSV) or segmental GSV/SSV reflux were successfully ablated. Complication rates for primary and RVVS were similar. The authors concluded that EVLA is a safe and effective option for the treatment of RVVS and could be a preferred option for suitable patients.

In a systematic review, Darwood and Gough (2009) found that adjunctive saphenofemoral ligation is not necessary to achieve success with endovenous laser therapy of the GSV. Similarly, a RCT conducted by Disselhoff et al. (2008) found that the addition of saphenofemoral ligation to endovenous ablation made no difference to the short-term outcome of varicose vein treatment. Long-term follow-up at five years found similar results (Disselhoff et al. 2011). Further studies with larger patient populations are needed to establish the superiority of adjunctive saphenofemoral ligation in improving long-term outcomes.

Theivacumar et al. (2009) compared 33 patients (21 women and 12 men) undergoing AAGSV EVLA alone (group A) and 33 age/sex-matched controls undergoing GSV EVLA (group B) to assess the short-term efficacy (abolition of reflux on duplex ultrasound) of EVLA of the AAGSV with preservation of a competent GSV in the treatment of varicose veins occurring due to isolated AAGSV incompetence. Comparisons included ultrasound assessment of SFJ competence, successful axial vein ablation, Aberdeen Varicose Vein Symptom Severity Scores (AVVSS) and a visual analogue patient-satisfaction scale. At the 1-year follow-up, EVLA had successfully abolished the target vein reflux AAGSV: median length 19 cm (inter-quartile range, IQR: 14-24 cm) vs. GSV: 32 cm (IQR 24-42 cm) and had restored SFJ competence in all patients. Twenty of the 33 patients (61%) in group A and 14 of the 33 (42%) in group B ($p = 0.218$) required post-ablation sclerotherapy at six weeks post-procedure for residual varicosities. The AVVSS at 12 months follow-up had improved from the pre-treatment scores in both the groups [group A: median score 4.1 (IQR 2.1-5.2) vs. 11.6 (IQR: 6.9-15.1) $p < 0.001$; group B: median score 3.3 (IQR 1.1-4.5) vs. 14.5 (IQR 7.6-20.2), $p < 0.001$], with no significant difference between the groups. The authors concluded that AAGSV EVLA abolishes SFJ reflux, improves symptom scores and is, therefore, suitable for treating varicose veins associated with AAGSV reflux.

Theivacumar et al. (2008) conducted a RCT to assess whether more extensive GSV ablation enhances resolution and influences symptom improvement in patients with previous above-knee (AK) GSV EVLA. Sixty-eight limbs (65 patients) with varicosities and above and below-knee GSV reflux were randomized to Group A: AK-EVLA ($n = 23$); Group B: EVLA mid-calf to groin ($n = 23$); and Group C: AK-EVLA, concomitant below-knee GSV foam sclerotherapy ($n = 22$). Primary outcomes were residual varicosities requiring sclerotherapy (six weeks), improvement in Aberdeen varicose vein severity scores (AVVSS, 12 weeks), patient satisfaction, and complication rates. EVLA ablated the treated GSV in all limbs. Sclerotherapy requirements were Group A: 14/23 (61%); Group B: 4/23 (17%); and Group C: 8/22 (36%); $\chi^2 = 9.3$ (2 df) $p = .01$ with $p(A-B) = 0.006$; $P(B-C) = 0.19$; $P(A-C) = 0.14$. AVVSS scores improved in all groups as follows: A: 14.8 (9.3-22.6) to 6.4 (3.2-9.1), ($p < .001$); B: 15.8 (10.2-24.5) to 2.5 (1.1-3.7), ($p < .001$); and C: 15.1 (9.0-23.1) to 4.1 (2.3-6.8), ($p < .001$) and $P(A-B) = 0.011$, $P(A-C) = 0.042$. Patient satisfaction was highest in Group B. BK-EVLA was not associated with saphenous nerve injury. The authors concluded that extended EVLA is safe, increases spontaneous resolution of varicosities, and has a greater impact on symptom reduction.

Wichers et al. (2005) performed a systematic review of randomized trials evaluating the safety and efficacy of medical (anticoagulants) or surgical (ligation or stripping of the affected veins) treatments of superficial vein thrombosis (SVT) for the prevention of deep vein thrombosis (DVT) and pulmonary embolism (PE). Five studies were included. Pooling of the data was not possible due to the heterogeneity among the studies. Three studies had major methodological drawbacks limiting the clinical applicability of the results. One of the remaining (pilot) studies showed a non-significant trend in favor of high-compared to low-dose unfractionated heparin for the prevention of venous thromboembolism (VTE). The last remaining study showed a non-significant trend in favor of short-term treatment with low-molecular-weight heparin (LMWH), or a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) as compared to placebo shortly after treatment with respect to VTE, but the apparent benefit disappeared after three months of follow-up. More RCTs are needed before any evidence-based recommendations on the treatment of SVT for the prevention of VTE can be given. With the lack of solid evidence,

the authors suggest treating patients with at least intermediate doses of LMWH. Surgical treatment of SVT may be considered when varicose veins are involved.

In a literature review of long-term results following high ligation supplemented by sclerotherapy, Recek (2004) found that ligation of the SFJ alone provokes a higher recurrence rate in comparison with high ligation and stripping. The hemodynamic improvement achieved immediately after high ligation deteriorates progressively during the follow-up owing to recurrent reflux.

In 2004, Winterborn conducted an 11-year follow-up study to a randomized clinical trial (Jones, et al. 1996). The objective of the Jones et al. (1996) trial was to determine whether routine stripping of the long saphenous vein reduced recurrence after varicose vein surgery. Two years after the procedure, 81 patients (113 legs: 53 strip, 60 ligated) with a mean follow-up of 31-months (range 28-33 months) were reassessed with a satisfaction questionnaire, clinical exam and duplex scanning. Eighty-nine percent were satisfied with their results, although 35% had recurrent veins on clinical examination. Recurrence was reduced from 43% to 25% in patients who had their long saphenous vein stripped ($p = 0.04$). Neovascularization (serpentine tributaries arising from the ligated SFJ) was detected in 52% of limbs and was the commonest cause of recurrence. Most tributaries were less than 3 mm in diameter and only caused recurrence if the long saphenous vein or a major thigh vein was intact. Twelve patients had tributaries greater than 3 mm diameter, and all had recurrent varicose veins. Winterborn et al. (2004) reported that a cumulative total of 83 legs had developed clinically recurrent varicose veins by 11 years (62%). There was no statistically significant difference between the ligation-only and the stripping groups. Reoperation was required for 20 of 69 legs that underwent ligation alone compared with seven of 64 legs that had additional long saphenous vein stripping. Freedom from reoperation at 11 years was 70% after ligation, compared with 86% after stripping. The presence of neovascularization, an incompetent superficial vessel in the thigh or an incompetent SFJ on duplex imaging at two years postoperatively increased the risk of a patient's developing clinically recurrent veins. Results from the study indicate that stripping the long saphenous vein is recommended as part of routine varicose vein surgery as it reduces the risk of reoperation after 11 years, although it did not reduce the rate of visible recurrent veins.

Labropoulos et al. (2003) conducted a prospective study to determine the upper limits of normal for duration and maximum velocity of retrograde flow (RF) in lower extremity veins. Eighty limbs in 40 healthy subjects and 60 limbs in 45 patients with chronic venous disease were examined with duplex scanning in the standing and supine positions. Each limb was assessed for reflux at 16 venous sites, including the common femoral, deep femoral, and proximal and distal femoral veins; proximal and distal popliteal veins; gastrocnemial vein; anterior and posterior tibial veins; peroneal vein; GSV, at the SFJ, thigh, upper calf, and lower calf; and lesser saphenous vein, at the SPJ and mid-calf. Perforator veins along the course of these veins were also assessed. In the healthy volunteers, 1,553 vein segments were assessed, including 480 superficial vein segments, 800 deep vein segments, and 273 perforator vein segments; and in the patients, 1,272 vein segments were assessed, including 360 superficial vein segments, 600 deep vein segments, and 312 perforator vein segments. Detection and measurement of reflux were performed at duplex scanning. Standard pneumatic cuff compression pressure was used to elicit reflux. Duration of RF and peak vein velocity were measured immediately after release of compression. Based on the results, the authors observed that the cutoff value for reflux in the superficial and deep calf veins is greater than 500 ms. However, in their opinion the reflux cutoff value for the femoropopliteal veins should be greater than 1,000 ms. Outward flow in the perforating veins should be considered abnormal at greater than 350 ms. Reflux testing should be performed with the patient standing.

Proebstle et al. (2003) studied 85 consecutive patients with clinical stage C(2-6) E(P,S) A(S,P,D) P(R) disease to establish the incidence of early recanalization after endovenous laser treatment (ELT) and evaluate the histopathologic features of reperfused and excised GSV. Twelve months of follow-up with duplex scanning at regular intervals was possible in 104 treated veins (95.4%) in 82 patients (96.5%). Recanalized vessels were removed surgically and examined at histopathology. ELT-induced occlusion proved permanent at duplex scanning over 12 months of follow-up in 94 of 104 GSV (90.4%) in 73 patients. In four patients, five GSV (4.8%) were recanalized completely after one week, after three months ($n = 3$), or after 12 months. Another five GSV (4.8%) in five patients exhibited incomplete proximal recanalization over the 12 months of follow-up. Finally, nine recanalized vessels (8.6%) required further treatment with high ligation and stripping. The authors concluded that early recanalization requiring retreatment is observed in less than 10% of GSV after ELT. The histopathologic pattern mimics recanalization after thrombotic occlusion.

Sullivan et al. (2001) performed a systematic review of the literature evaluating surgical and medical management of above-knee superficial thrombophlebitis (AK-STP) not involving the deep venous system. Six studies were included for a total of 246 patients in the surgical arm and 88 patients in the medical arm. Surgical treatment modalities halt the progression of thrombus into the deep venous system through the SFJ and reduce the incidence of PE. The two types of surgical treatment were ligation of the GSV at the SFJ or ligation in combination with stripping of the phlebotic vein. Medical therapy consisted of initial intravenous heparin followed by warfarin therapy for a duration varying between six

weeks and six months. The authors offered no definitive conclusions due to reporting of varied outcomes, different follow-up criteria and the retrospective nature of the studies. The differences between the surgical and medical groups were small. The review concludes that medical management with anticoagulants is superior for minimizing complications and preventing subsequent DVT and PE development as compared to surgical treatment with ligation of the GSV at the SFJ or ligation and stripping.

Chandler et al. (2000) conducted a prospective, comparative study to evaluate the effect of extended SFJ ligation when the GSV has been eliminated from participating in thigh reflux by means of endovenous obliteration. Sixty limbs treated with SFJ ligation and 120 limbs treated without high ligation were selected from an ongoing, multicenter, endovenous obliteration trial on the basis of their having primary varicose veins, GSV reflux, and early treatment dates. Five (8%) high-ligation limbs and seven (6%) limbs without high ligation with patent veins at six weeks or less were excluded as unsuccessful obliterations. Treatment significantly reduced symptoms and CEAP clinical class in both groups ($p = .0001$). Recurrent reflux developed in one (2%) of 49 high-ligation limbs and eight (8%) of 97 limbs without high ligation by 6 months ($p = .273$). New instances of reflux did not appear thereafter in 57 limbs followed to 12 months. Recurrent varicose veins occurred in three high-ligation limbs and four limbs without high ligation by six months and in one additional high-ligation limb and two additional limbs without high ligation by 12 months. Actuarial recurrence curves were not statistically different with or without SFJ ligation ($p > .156$), predicting greater than 90% freedom from recurrent reflux and varicosities at one year for both groups. According to the authors, these early results suggest that extended SFJ ligation may add little to effective GSV obliteration, but their findings are not sufficiently robust to warrant abandonment of SFJ ligation as currently practiced in the management of primary varicose veins associated with GSV vein reflux.

Dwerryhouse et al. (1999) reported the five-year results of a RCT conducted on patients who were randomized to stripping of the long saphenous vein versus saphenofemoral ligation alone during routine varicose vein surgery. Originally, 100 patients, 133 legs were included in the study. After five years, 78 patients (110 legs) participated in a clinical review and duplex scan. Sixty-five patients remained pleased with the results of their surgery (35 of 39 stripped vs. 30 of 39 ligated; $p = .13$). Reoperation, either done or awaited, for recurrent long saphenous veins was necessary for three of 52 of the legs that underwent stripping versus 12 of 58 ligated legs. Neovascularization at the SFJ was responsible for 10 of 12 recurrent veins that underwent reoperation and also was the cause of recurrent saphenofemoral incompetence in 12 of 52 stripped veins versus 30 of 58 ligated legs. The authors concluded that after five years follow-up, stripping reduced the risk of reoperation by two thirds and should be routine for primary long saphenous varicose vein treatment.

Endovenous Mechanochemical Ablation

Evidence in peer review literature evaluating endovenous mechanochemical ablation (MOCA) for the treatment of venous insufficiency and varicose veins is limited. Future robust RCTs are warranted along with long-term outcomes to establish the safety and efficacy of this procedure.

Lim et al. (2023) conducted a meta-analysis to compare outcomes from RCTs regarding MOCA versus endovenous thermal ablation (EVTA) in the treatment of adult patients with symptomatic or complicated superficial venous incompetence of CEAP classes 2-6. Occlusion rate, QOL, procedural and postprocedural pain, and rates of venous thromboembolism were the outcomes assessed. Four RCTs were included in the meta-analysis comprised of 654 patients. The anatomical occlusion rate at one year was lower after MOCA than EVTA (risk ratio 0.85, 95 percent c.i. 0.78 to 0.91; $p < 0.001$). No significant differences were detected in procedural pain (mean difference -3.25, -14.25 to 7.74; $p = 0.560$) or postprocedural pain (mean difference -0.63, -2.15 to 0.89; $p = 0.420$). There were no significant differences in Aberdeen Varicose Vein Questionnaire score at one year (mean difference 0.06, -0.50 to 0.62; $p = 0.830$) or in incidence of venous thromboembolism (risk ratio 0.72, 95 percent c.i. 0.14 to 3.61; $p = 0.690$). The authors concluded there was no difference in procedural and postprocedural pain between the interventions but the success rate of occlusion after MOCA was significantly lower than after EVTA. Additionally, the authors note this study supports existing international guidelines which advocate EVTA as the preferred first-line treatment for superficial venous incompetence in the majority of patients. The authors state additional long-term studies are needed to evaluate the impact of reduced vein occlusion rate on quality of life and reinterventions. Mohamed et al. (2021) which was previously cited in this policy, is included in this review.

A systematic review and meta-analysis consisting of eight RCTs was conducted by Shahzad et al. (2023) who compared the technical success, complications, and QOL after thermal versus non-thermal EVLA for the treatment of superficial venous incompetence. Vein occlusion rate up to four weeks and one to two years from procedure was the primary outcome. Peri-procedural pain, nerve injury, endothermal heat induced thrombosis, and QOL were the secondary outcomes measured. The study comprised a total of 1,956 patients, endovenous thermal ablation was received by 1,042 individuals and 915 underwent endovenous non-thermal ablation. There was no statistically significant difference in occlusion rate at all time points. Relative risk at four weeks and one to two years was 0.99 and 0.95 respectively. Non-thermal ablation was tolerated better and had less risk of nerve injury. There was no statistically significant difference in risk of endothermal heat induced thrombosis (EHIT). There was improvement in QOL scores post-procedure but there

was no statistically significant difference in thermal vs. non-thermal ablation. The quality of evidence assessed using GRADE methodology showed high quality for occlusion rate at four weeks and one to two years, moderate quality for nerve injury and peri-procedural pain, and low quality for EHIT. The authors concluded there is no statistically significant difference in vein occlusion rates between thermal and glue ablation of truncal varicose veins, QOL after both thermal and non-thermal endovenous ablation are similar and non-thermal endovenous ablation resulted in less pain and less risk of nerve injury. However, the occlusion rate using MOCA, considered in isolation, is statistically significantly worse than for thermal ablation. Limitations include the impact of stab phlebectomies and compression therapy to endovenous ablation was not explored, the lack of information on differences in heat energy and laser wavelengths used in trials, and individual modalities within each group were not separately evaluated. Bootun et al. (2016), Holewijn et al. (2019), Mohamed et al. (2021), and Vähäaho et al. (2019), which were previously cited in this policy, are included in this review.

A Hayes Health Technology Assessment states MOCA with the ClariVein infusion catheter appears safe and effective over the short-term but the low-quality body of evidence does not allow conclusions to be drawn regarding the long-term durability of the procedure. The report states that MOCA resulted in slightly poorer technical outcomes and higher rates of recanalization than thermal ablation and surgical procedures. The report recommends future well-designed trials with larger sample sizes that compare MOCA using the ClariVein infusion catheter with clinical alternatives with a long-term follow-up. The updated annual review recommends no change in the current (Hayes, 2022; updated 2023).

In an updated Cochrane review, Whing et al. (2021) compared interventions for treating varicosities of the GSV. The review included 24 RCTs with 5,135 participants who underwent EVLA, RFA, EVSA, UGFS, cyanoacrylate glue, MOCA, or high ligation and stripping. The authors found there was no clear difference in technical success or recurrence between RFA compared to MOCA; however, long-term data were not available, and the confidence intervals of the combined data were broad, making these findings largely inconclusive. Additionally, the authors noted all the trials had some risk of bias concerns. The authors determined there were a relatively small number of studies for comparison and differences in outcome definitions and time points reported limited their conclusions. Future studies which provide more evidence on the breadth of treatments are recommended by the authors. Bootun et al. (2016), Lane et al. (2017), Holewijn et al. (2019), Vähäaho et al. (2019), which were previously cited in this policy, are included in this review.

Kim et al. (2017) evaluated in a case series whether early efficacy in endovenous MOCA is maintained at 24 months. Patients with reflux in the GSV involving the SFJ and no previous venous interventions were included. The occlusion rate of treated veins was assessed with duplex ultrasound. Patient clinical improvement was assessed by CEAP class and VCSS. Of the initial 126 patients, there were 65 patients with 24-month follow-up. Of these 65 patients, 70% were female, with a mean age of 70 ± 14 years and an average BMI of 30.5 ± 6 . The mean GSV diameter in the upper thigh was 7.6 mm and the mean treatment length was 39 cm. Adjunctive treatment of the varicosities was performed in 14% of patients during the procedure. Closure rates were 100% at one week, 98% at three months, 95% at 12 months, and 92% at 24 months. There was one patient with complete and four with partial recanalization ranging from seven to 12 cm (mean length 9 cm). There was significant improvement in CEAP and VCSS ($p < .001$) for all time intervals. Early high occlusion rate with MOCA is associated with significant clinical improvement, which was maintained at 24 months. According to the authors, this finding is suggestive of a good option for the treatment of GSV incompetence. Longer-term outcomes are needed to evaluate MOCA's efficacy. The study is limited by lack of comparison group and large loss to follow-up.

Vos et al. (2017) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to evaluate the efficacy of MOCA and cyanoacrylate vein ablation (CAVA) for GSV incompetence. Eligible articles were prospective studies that included patients treated for GSV incompetence and described the primary outcome. Exclusion criteria were full text not available, case reports, retrospective studies, small series ($n < 10$), reviews, abstracts, animal studies, studies of SSV incompetence, and recurrent GSV incompetence. Primary outcome was anatomic success. Secondary outcomes were initial technical success, VCSS, AVVQ score, and complications. Fifteen articles met the inclusion criteria. Pooled anatomic success for MOCA and CAVA was 94.7% and 94.8% at six months and 94.1% and 89.0% at one year, respectively. VCSS and AVVQ score significantly improved after treatment with MOCA and CAVA. The authors conclude that both of these non-thermal techniques are promising that could serve as alternatives for thermal ablation techniques. However, to determine their exact role in clinical practice, high-quality RCTs comparing these novel modalities with well-established techniques are required. This study is limited by inclusion of mostly uncontrolled studies to assess the efficacy and safety of MOCA. Elias and Raines (2012) and Bishawi et al. (2014), which were previously cited in this policy, are included in this meta-analysis.

Witte et al. (2017a) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of MOCA of saphenous veins using the ClariVein to report on the anatomical, technical, and clinical success. The literature search identified 759 records, of which 13 were included, describing 10 unique cohorts. A total of 1,521 veins (1,267 GSV and 254 SSV) were included, with cohort sizes ranging from 30 to 570 veins. The pooled anatomical success rate after short-term follow up was 92% (95% CI 90-94%) ($n = 1,314$ veins). After six and 12 months these numbers were 92% (95% CI 88-95%) ($n = 284$) and 91% (95% CI 86-94%) ($n = 228$), respectively. The long-term anatomical success rates at two and three years were 91% (95% CI 85-95%)

(n = 136) and 87% (95% CI 75-94%) (n = 48), respectively. Major complications and especially nerve injury were very rare ($\leq 0.2\%$). All studies were of moderate or good quality using the methodological index for non-randomized studies (MINORS) scoring scale. The authors concluded that MOCA using the ClariVein in combination with liquid sclerosant is associated with an anatomical success rate ranging from 87% to 92% and good clinical success. However, they reported that no RCTs are available studying the anatomical success after MOCA compared to the endothermal ablation.

Witte et al. (2017b) reported midterm results of MOCA for treating GSV insufficiency. In a 1-year period, 85 consecutive patients undergoing MOCA with polidocanol in 104 limbs were enrolled in a prospective registry. The patients were evaluated at baseline and during follow-up (four weeks and one, two, and three years) using duplex ultrasound, the CEAP classification, the VCSS, the RAND Short Form 36-Item Health Survey (RAND-SF36), and the AVVQ. Primary outcome measures were clinical and anatomic success. Secondary outcome measures included general and disease-specific QoL and re-interventions. After a median follow-up of 36 months (interquartile range 12.5, 46.3), recanalization occurred in 15 (15%) of 102 successfully treated vein segments. Anatomic success was 92%, 90%, and 87% after one, two, and three years, respectively. The VCSS improved at all time intervals compared to the preprocedural median. The clinical success at three years was 83%. The AVVQ and RAND-SF36 scores showed an improvement at all time intervals compared to baseline values. Between 12 and 36 months, however, a significant deterioration was observed in VCSS, which was accompanied by worsening of disease-specific and general QoL. Although the authors concluded that MOCA demonstrated to be an effective treatment modality for GSV insufficiency at midterm follow-up, clinical results seemed to drop over time. Additionally, these findings are limited by lack of comparison group undergoing a different treatment.

Vun et al. (2015) assessed the efficacy of the ClariVein system for the treatment of superficial vein incompetence. Fifty-one GSVs and six SSVs were treated. Duplex showed a technical success rate of 91%. Comparison with 50 RFA and 40 EVLA procedures showed procedure times were significantly less for ClariVein than for either RFA or EVLA. Median pain scores were significantly lower for ClariVein than for RFA and EVLA. No major complications or deep vein thromboses were reported. Study limitations included small sample size, lack of randomization and short-term follow-up. Further data on long-term clinical outcomes is needed.

In a pilot study, van Eekeren et al. (2011) evaluated the feasibility and safety of endovenous MOCA for the treatment of GSV incompetence. Thirty limbs in 25 patients (18 women; mean age 52 years) with GSV incompetence were treated with the ClariVein® device. Initial technical success, complications, patient satisfaction and classification by VCSS were assessed 6 weeks after the treatment. Initial technical success of MOCA was 100%. There were no major adverse events. Duplex ultrasonography at six weeks showed 26 (87%) of 30 veins were completely occluded. Three veins showed partial recanalization in the proximal and distal GSV. One patient had full segment recanalization and was successfully retreated. The VCSS significantly improved at six weeks. Patient satisfaction was high, with a median satisfaction of 8.8 on a 0-10 scale. The authors concluded that endovenous MOCA is feasible and safe in the treatment of GSV incompetence. Larger studies with a prolonged follow-up are indicated to prove the efficacy of this technique. This study is limited by lack of comparison group undergoing a different treatment approach.

Endovascular Embolization With Cyanoacrylate-Based Adhesive

Quality evidence in peer review literature evaluating endovascular embolization with cyanoacrylate-based adhesive for the treatment of venous insufficiency and varicose veins is limited. Future robust RCTs are warranted along with long-term outcomes to establish the safety and efficacy of this procedure. An ongoing RCT may provide more definitive findings about this technology (NCT03820947).

Amshar et al. (2022) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to evaluate the efficacy, intervention time, and safety of cyanoacrylate embolization (CAE) in comparison to EVLA in treatment of saphenous vein insufficiency. Efficacy was determined by venous closure rate one year post-intervention and VCSS one year post-intervention. Safety was determined by rates of periprocedural pain, skin pigmentation, nerve damage, phlebitis, DVT and ecchymosis. Two randomized-controlled trials and three cohort studies were included in this review. The total number of individuals was 1,432 (710 CAE and 722 EVLA). Venous closure rates and VCSS did not differ significantly between CAE group and EVLA group. Pooled data showed that CAE group was associated with less periprocedural pain score ($p < 0.001$), lower skin pigmentation rates (0.60% vs. 4.46%; $p = 0.008$), and lower nerve damage rates (0% vs. 3.94%; $p = 0.007$). Rates of phlebitis, DVT, and ecchymosis did not differ significantly between the two groups. In addition, intervention time was significantly faster in CAE group compared to EVLA group ($p < 0.001$). The authors concluded CAE was not inferior to EVLA in terms of efficacy and CAE showed less adverse effects occurrence rates of periprocedural pain, skin pigmentation, and nerve damage complications. Additionally, intervention time is stated to be faster with CAE compared to EVLA. The authors note that future RCTs with larger sample sizes and longer post-procedural follow-up time are needed. Additionally, efficacy outcomes were limited to one year and longer-term outcome data may provide additional evidence of efficacy. Bozkurt and Yilmaz (2016), and Eroglu and Yasim (2018) which were previously cited in this policy,

are included in this review. Currently, the VariClose Vein Sealing System (Biolas, FG Grup, Turkey) is under research in countries other than the United States and has neither been approved nor cleared for marketing by the FDA.

A 2022 Hayes Health Technology Assessment evaluated nine clinical studies on the efficacy and safety of cyanoacrylate embolization with the VenaSeal Closure System. The evidence included three RCTs and six retrospective comparative studies. The conclusion states that a low-quality body of evidence suggests VenaSeal has a high level of successful venous closure for at least one year that may result in reduced symptom severity and improved QoL. Efficacy and safety may be comparable to RFA, EVLA, and MOCA; however, substantial uncertainty remains regarding its effectiveness due to the lack of well-designed comparative studies and limited follow-up beyond one year. The authors' overall conclusion is that cyanoacrylate embolization with the VenaSeal Closure System has potential but unproven benefits. The updated Hayes, 2023 summary makes no change to the current rating.

Joh et al. (2021) conducted an open-label, multicenter, prospective, RCT that compared the clinical outcomes of cyanoacrylate closure (CAC) and surgical stripping (SS) for the treatment of incompetent great saphenous veins. One hundred and twenty-six patients were randomized into two groups (63 with CAC and 63 with SS). Target vein occlusion was assessed on the third day and one, three, six, and 12 months postoperatively using duplex ultrasound. The primary endpoint of the study was to evaluate complete closure of the target vein at three months. Echymosis grades, VCSS, AVVQ scores and pain were also assessed as secondary outcomes. Postoperative pain scores were significantly better in the CAC group than in the SS group. In addition, the mean echymosis grade was 0.3 ± 0.5 in the CAC group and 1.1 ± 1.1 in the SS group ($p < .001$). The VCSS and QoL had improved equally in both groups. Most complications were minor (nine events in CAC group and 20 events in SS group) with one major complication occurring in a patient who had undergone the SS procedure. Complete occlusion of the target vein at three months was achieved by both procedures. Postoperative pain and echymosis grades were significantly lower in the CAC group. The authors concluded that CAC has a high success rate with few complications. Limitations noted by the authors include lack of information on patient return to work and daily activities, pain scores during the procedure and immediately after the procedure were not obtained, the 2X2 factorial design with 1:1 randomization, could contribute to differences in gender distribution and VCSSs in the two groups and concomitant phlebectomy could have also influenced the occurrence of complications. Additionally, lack of masking could have introduced a bias in the findings.

A systematic review by Dimech and Cassar (2020) was performed to assess the efficacy of *n*-butyl-2-cyanoacrylate (NBCA) glue in ablating primary truncal varicose veins and eliminating reflux compared with existing endovascular techniques. Secondary outcomes include complications and quality of life. PRISMA was used as a guide, and studies were screened for risk of bias and methodological quality. Subjects had to be ≥ 18 years of age and followed-up post-treatment with color duplex ultrasound (DUS). Eligibility criteria included SFJ or SPJ incompetence with reflux down truncal veins lasting > 0.5 seconds on DUS interrogation and a Clinical, Etiological, Anatomical, and Pathophysiological classification of venous disorders ranging between C1 and C6. Out of 2,910 patients (3,220 veins) in 17 studies, 1,981 were administered NBCA, 445 radiofrequency ablation (RFA), and 484 EVLA with mean procedure times of 25.7, 23.2, and 28.7 minutes, respectively. Mean recruitment period was nine months (1-36 months) and followed-up for an average of 12.3 months (1-36 months). The majority were C2 to C3. Two-year occlusion rates were 93.7, 90.9, and 91.5% for NBCA, RFA, and EVLA, respectively. NBCA-treated patients experienced the least complications, with bruising, phlebitis, and pain being the most prevalent. Quality of life improved equally in all three modalities. The authors concluded that NBCA is simple to administer, safe, and effective even without compression stockings. The review was limited by lack of randomization for most included studies, and inclusion of products not currently FDA-approved. Further studies are required to assess longer-term benefit and the effect of anticoagulation on vein obliteration.

The VenaSeal Saphen Closure System Pivotal Study (VeClose) is a multicenter RCT that compared cyanoacrylate closure CAC to RFA for the treatment of incompetent great saphenous veins. In this trial, 222 subjects with symptomatic GSV incompetence were randomly assigned to receive either CAC ($n = 108$) with the VenaSeal Saphen Closure System or RFA ($n = 114$). The primary endpoint was closure of the target vein at month three, as assessed by duplex ultrasound. To determine non-inferiority of CAE to RFA, the investigators used a predetermined margin of 10%. Secondary endpoints included subject-rated pain experienced during the procedure (i.e., pain experienced after vein access but before all treatment/access catheters were removed), investigator-rated echymosis at day three, adverse events, and details of adjunctive procedures. Patient follow-up visits were on day three and at months one, three, six, 12, 24, and 36. For the extension study, patients who were successfully contacted and were interested in participation provided written informed consent for the 60-month follow-up visit. Assessments tools included the VCSS, AVVQ and EuroQoL-Five Dimension (EQ-5D) quality of life survey. This trial has generated multiple publications that reported outcomes with various follow-up periods e.g., three months (Morrison, 2015), 12 months (Morrison, 2017) 24 months (Gibson, 2018a) 36 months (Morrison, 2019), and 60 months (Morrison, 2020), as well as a publication with results of a roll-in phase analysis, which included 20 additional patients treated with CAC (Kolluri, 2016). Design limitations of this study and the resulting publications included lack of blinding of the subjects or assessors to the intervention. Furthermore, the primary endpoint of

the study was complete closure of the target vein at three months after index treatment, thus the study may not have been powered to detect clinically significant differences between treatments groups for important outcomes and at different times of follow-up. These studies were also included in the Hayes report (2022). The individual studies are listed below:

- Morrison et al. (2015) reported 3-month outcomes from the VeClose trial. No adjunctive procedures such as phlebectomy and UGFS were allowed until after the month three visit. The closure rates were 99% for VenaSeal and 96% for RFA. Pain experienced during the procedure was reported as mild and was similar between treatment groups. Good safety profiles were reported with both treatments. The authors concluded that cyanoacrylate ablation did not require tumescent anesthesia, was associated with less post procedure ecchymosis, and was noninferior to RFA for the treatment of incompetent GSVs at month three after the procedure.
- Morrison et al. (2017) reported 12-month outcomes from the VeClose trial. Of 222 randomized patients, a 12-month follow-up was obtained for 192 (95 CAC and 97 RFA; total follow-up rate, 86.5%). The complete occlusion rate was nearly identical in both groups (97.2% in the CAC group and 97.0% in the RFA group). Twelve-month freedom from recanalization was similar in the CAC and RFA groups, although there was a trend toward greater freedom from recanalization in the CAC group ($p = .08$). The authors reported that patient symptoms and QoL improved equally in both groups.
- Twenty-four-month outcomes from the VeClose trial were reported by Gibson et al (2018a). One hundred and seventy-one patients completed the 24-month follow-up, which included 87 from the CAC group and 84 from the RFA group. The 24-month GSV closure rate was 95.3% in the CAC group and 94.0% in the RFA group. Symptoms and QoL improved similarly in both groups. No clinically significant device- or procedure-related late adverse events were reported. The authors concluded that both CAC and RFA were effective in closure of the target GSV, resulting in similar and significant improvements in the patient's QoL through 24 months.
- One hundred and forty-six patients completed the 36-month follow-up to the VeClose trial, which included 72 patients from the CAC group and 74 patients from the RFA group, with outcomes reported by Morrison et al. (2019). The 36-month GSV closure rate was 94.4% for the CAC group and 91.9% for the RFA group. Stable improvement in symptoms and QoL was observed in both groups. Adverse event rates between the 24- and 36-month visits were similar between the groups as were serious adverse events which were infrequent and judged unrelated to either the device or the procedure in both groups. The authors surmised the results of this trial continue to demonstrate the safety and efficacy of CAC for the treatment of GSV incompetence with vein closure rate at 36 months similar to that of RFA. The findings are limited by the loss to follow up (34%), which could have introduced biases in the findings.
- Morrison et al. (2020) reported 60-month outcomes from the VeClose trial with a total of 89 patients in the original study completing the 60-month visit. Of those, 47 patients were from the CAC group, 33 patients were from the RFA group, and nine patients were from the roll-in CAC group. No new recanalization events were observed between 36 and 60 months of follow-up. Kaplan-Meier estimates for freedom from recanalization in the randomized CAC and RFA groups were 91.4% and 85.2%, respectively. Both groups demonstrated sustained improvements in EuroQoL-5 Dimension (EQ-5D) and QoL. Whereas patients assigned to C0 or C1 clinical class were excluded from the original study, more than half of all returning patients [64% (57/89)] were now assigned to C0 or C1, suggesting an improved clinical class from baseline. Furthermore, 41.1% of returning CAC patients and 39.4% of returning RFA patients at least two CEAP clinical classes lower than at baseline. The authors concluded that CAC and RFA were effective in achieving complete target vein closure of the GSV at long-term follow-up. CAC was also associated with sustained improvements in symptoms and QoL, lower CEAP class, and high level of patient satisfaction without serious adverse effects between 36 and 60 months. The limitations of this publication included the small rate of successful follow up i.e., 36% of the original study randomized population, which could have introduced biases in the findings.

Kolluri et al. (2020) conducted a meta-analysis designed to compare VenaSeal closure system with EVLA, RFA, MOCA, sclerotherapy, and surgical management of chronic venous insufficiency achieve complete closure of the treated vein within six months after intervention. Secondary outcomes were QOL, VCSS, pain scores, and adverse effects. Twenty RCTs comprising 4,570 patients were analyzed. For the primary outcome measure of anatomic success, VenaSeal system had the highest probability of being ranked first ($p = .980$); RFA was ranked second ($p = .365$), EVLA third ($p = .397$), surgery fourth ($p = .290$), MOCA fifth ($p = .695$), and sclerotherapy sixth ($p = .982$). For secondary outcome measures, VenaSeal system ranked third for VCSS ($p = .332$), fifth for EuroQoL-5 Dimension ($p = .420$), and third for Aberdeen Varicose Vein Questionnaire ($p = .300$). Although, VenaSeal system was slightly inferior to some of the other interventions for health-related QOL, the 95% credible interval of log odds ratio indicated insufficient evidence for any concrete conclusion to be drawn. VenaSeal system ranked first in reduction of postoperative pain score from baseline ($p = .690$) and was lowest in occurrence of adverse events ($p = f .650$). Odds of occurrence of adverse events was 3.3 times in the sclerotherapy arm, 2.7 times in the EVLA arm, 1.6 times with surgery, and 1.1 times with RFA vs. VenaSeal system arm. The authors concluded VenaSeal was a promising option for treatment for patients with CVI due to superior outcomes as assessed by anatomic success, reduction of pain score, and smaller chance of occurrence of adverse events when compared with other interventions. Limitations include short-term follow-up and restricted data availability in terms of time points and pooling of data.

Gibson et al. (2018b) reported three-month outcomes from a post-market case series study of endovenous cyanoacrylate closure by the VenaSeal system (the WAVES study). Fifty subjects with symptomatic GSV, SSV, and/or accessory saphenous vein incompetence were treated with the VenaSeal system with no post procedure compression stockings. Concomitant procedures were not allowed as part of the original study protocol. Treating physicians predicted the type and nature of any concomitant procedures that they would usually perform at the time of ablation, if not limited by the constraints of the study. Evaluations were performed at one week, one and three months and included duplex ultrasound, numeric pain rating scale, revised VCSS, the AVVQ, and time to return to work and normal activities. At the three-month visit, the need for and type of adjunctive procedures were recorded. Complete closure at three months was achieved in 70 (99%) of the treated veins (48 GSVs, 14 accessory saphenous veins, eight SSVs). Revised VCSS improved from 6.4 ± 2.2 to 1.8 ± 1.5 ($p < .001$) and AVVQ from 17.3 ± 7.9 to 6.5 ± 7.2 ($p < .0001$). Sixty-six percent of patients underwent tributary treatment at three months. The percentage of patients who required adjunctive treatments at three months was lower than had been predicted by the treating physicians (65% versus 96%, $p = .0002$). The authors reported that closure rates were high in the absence of the use of compression stockings or side branch treatment. Improvement in QoL was significant, and the need for and extent of concomitant procedures was significantly less than had been predicted by the treating physicians. Additional studies with larger patient populations are needed to further evaluate the need for concomitant procedures with the VenaSeal system. These findings are limited by lack of comparison group undergoing a different treatment. This study was also included in the Hayes report (2022).

Gibson and Ferris (2017b) reported results of a prospective case series study (the WAVES study) of cyanoacrylate closure for the treatment of GSVs, SSVs, and/or accessory saphenous veins up to 20 mm in diameter ($n = 50$). Compression stockings post-procedure were not utilized. Patients returned at one week and one month for follow-up. All treated veins (48 GSV, 14 accessory saphenous veins, and eight SSVs) had complete closure by duplex ultrasound at seven days and one month. Mean time to return to work and normal activities was 0.2 ± 1.1 and 2.4 ± 4.1 days, respectively. The revised VCSS was improved to 1.8 ± 1.4 ($p < .001$) and AVVQ score to 8.9 ± 6.6 ($p < .001$) at one month. Phlebitis in the treatment area or side branches occurred in 10 subjects (20%) and completely resolved in all but one subject (2%) by one month. The authors concluded that cyanoacrylate closure is safe and effective for the treatment of one or more incompetent saphenous or accessory saphenous veins, closure rates were high even in the absence of the use of compression stockings or side branch treatment. Time back to work or normal activities was short and improvements in venous severity scores and QOL were in the authors' opinion significant, comparing favorably with alternative treatment methods. RCTs with a larger patient population and longer follow-up periods are needed to validate findings. The findings of this study are limited by lack of comparison group undergoing a different treatment approach. This study was also included in the Hayes report (2022).

Almeida et al. (2015) evaluated the safety and effectiveness of endovenous cyanoacrylate-based embolization of incompetent GSVs in a case series study of 38 patients. At 12 months, 36 patients were available for follow-up and 24 patients at 24 months. Complete occlusion of the treated GSV was confirmed by duplex ultrasound in all patients except for one complete and two partial recanalization's observed at, one, three and six months of follow-up, respectively. Kaplan-Meier analysis yielded an occlusion rate of 92.0% (95% CI 0.836-1.0) at 24 months follow-up. VCSS improved in all patients from a mean of 6.1 ± 2.7 at baseline to 1.3 ± 1.1 , 1.5 ± 1.4 and 2.7 ± 2.5 at six, 12 and 24 months, respectively ($p < .0001$). Edema improved in 89% of legs ($n = 34$) at 48 hours follow-up. At baseline, only 13% were free from pain. At six, 12 and 24 months, 84%, 78% and 64% were free from leg pain, respectively. In a follow-up study, Almeida et al. (2017) evaluated the long-term safety and effectiveness of endovenous cyanoacrylate (CA)-based closure of incompetent GSV on the twenty-nine individuals that were available for the 36-month follow-up. Complete occlusion of the treated veins was confirmed by ultrasound in all subjects with the exception of two subjects showing recanalization at month one and month three. Kaplan-Meier analysis revealed an occlusion rate at month 36 of 94.7%. The mean VCSS improved from 6.1 ± 2.7 at baseline to 2.2 ± 0.4 at month 36 ($p < .0001$). Pain, edema, and varicosities (VCSS subdomains) improved in 75.9%, 62.1%, and 41.4% of subjects, respectively, at month 36. Overall adverse events were self-limited and mild or moderate. The authors concluded cyanoacrylate adhesive had no reported serious adverse events, had long-term occlusion rates comparable to other thermal and nonthermal methods, and appears to be safe and effective for saphenous vein closure. Small sample size and lack of comparison groups are limitations to this study.

An ECRI clinical evidence assessment (2015) suggests that VenaSeal is safe and as effective as RFA for treating varicose veins in patients with venous reflux disease. However, how well VenaSeal works compared with other treatment modalities cannot be determined because the systematic review assessed too few patients for each comparison and no studies in the systematic review performed head-to-head comparisons. The report determined the evidence was somewhat favorable but RCTs are needed to compare VenaSeal with other treatment modalities. Limitations of the reviewed studies include risk for lack of blinding, single-center focus, and lack of randomization (ECRI, updated 2021).

A prospective, multicenter case series study was conducted on 78 patients with GSV reflux using cyanoacrylate embolization (Proebstle et al., 2015). Clinical examination, QoL assessment and duplex ultrasound were performed at two

days, one, three, six, and 12 months. 68 (97.1%) were available for 12-month follow-up. Two-day follow-up showed one proximal and one distal partial recanalization. Three additional proximal recanalizations were observed at 3-month (n = 2) and 6-month (n = 1) follow-up. Cumulative 12-month survival free from recanalization was 92.9% (95% confidence interval, 87.0%-99.1%). Mean (standard deviation) VCSS improved from 4.3 ±2.3 at baseline to 1.1 ±1.3 at 12 months. AVVQ score showed an improvement from 16.3 at baseline to 6.7 at 12 months (p < .0001). Side effects were generally mild; a phlebotic reaction occurred in eight cases (11.4%) with a median duration of 6.5 days (range, 2-12 days). Pain without a phlebotic reaction was observed in five patients (8.6%) for a median duration of 1 day (range, 0 -12 days). No serious adverse event occurred. Paresthesia was not observed. The authors concluded that endovenous CA embolization of refluxing GSVs is safe and effective without the use of tumescent anesthesia or compression stockings. Additional studies are needed to validate the effectiveness of cyanoacrylate embolization.

Endovenous Foam Sclerotherapy

In an updated Cochrane review, Whing et al. (2021) compared interventions for treating varicosities of the GSV. The review included 24 RCTs with 5,135 participants who underwent EVLA, RFA, EVSA, UGFS, cyanoacrylate glue, MOCA, or high ligation and stripping. The review compared EVLA and UGFS and found technical success may be better in EVLA patients up to five years and over five years. Recurrence rates had no clear difference up to three years and at five years. The authors state there were a relatively small number of studies for comparison and differences in outcome definitions and time points reported limited their conclusions. Future studies which provide more evidence on the breadth of treatments are recommended by the authors. Lawaetz et al. (2017) and Vähäaho et al. (2018), which were previously cited in this policy, are included in this review.

A Hayes Health Technology Assessment (2019) researched six clinical studies (n = 77-399) that evaluated the efficacy or safety of polidocanol endovenous microfoam (PEM) 1% in treating varicose veins. Eligible studies included five RCTs and one case series. The patients included in the studies had SFJ, GSV or SSV incompetence. The assessment concluded there was a low-quality body of evidence that suggested PEM 1% may provide relief of symptoms and result in occlusion and elimination of reflux. The authors concluded that this approach has potential but unproven benefit. Additionally, substantial uncertainty remains regarding the effectiveness of PEM 1% in relation to other sclerosants and other surgical approaches. The authors overall conclusion is that PEM has potential but unproven benefits. The report recommended more well-designed, independent RCTs to further establish the comparative safety and effectiveness of PEM 1%, identify optimal patient selection, and determine the durability of its beneficial effects. (Hayes, 2019; updated 2022).

Gibson et al. (2017a) conducted a randomized, placebo-controlled, multicenter study to evaluate the safety and efficacy of PEM [1%, Varithena® (polidocanol injectable foam)]. Patients (n = 77) with symptomatic, visible varicose veins were randomized to treatment with either Varithena 1% or placebo. Patients were assessed at baseline and weeks one, four, eight, and 12 post-treatment. The data showed that Varithena provided greater mean changes from baseline in patient-reported assessments of symptoms [e.g., heaviness, achiness, swelling, throbbing, itching (HASTI®) score 30.7 points vs. 16.7 points, p = 0.0009, primary endpoint; and modified Venous Insufficiency Epidemiological and Economic Study-Quality-of-Life/Symptoms (m-VEINES-QOL/Sym; p < 0.001)], physician-assessed VCSS, and physician- and patient-assessed appearance compared with placebo. The HASTI score correlated highly with the modified-VEINES-QOL/Sym and Chronic Venous Insufficiency Questionnaire-2 scores (r = 0.7 to > 0.9, p ≤ 0.001). Adverse events included contusion, incision-site hematoma, and limb discomfort. Venous thrombus adverse events were reported as mild and generally resolved without sequelae. Large RCTs with longer-term outcomes and comparisons to established treatments for varicose veins are needed to evaluate the clinical utility of this procedure. The findings of this study are limited by the short follow up and lack of comparison with an established therapy.

Lal et al. (2017) evaluated the relationship between patient-reported symptoms and functional and psychological impact of varicose veins following treatment with PEM1%. Data were pooled from two randomized trials on varicose vein treatment. In 221 patients (109 PEM 1%; 112 placebo), PEM 1% was associated with median improvements of 2.5 points and 4.0 points on the m-VEINES-QOL/Sym functional limitations and m-VEINES-QOL/Sym psychological limitations scores, compared to 0 and 1.0 point. Cumulative distribution function curves revealed that 20-30% more patients in the PEM 1% group achieved clinically meaningful functional and psychological improvement versus placebo group. Patients with above-average symptom improvement had better functional and psychological improvement. PEM 1% treatment had higher odds of clinically meaningful functional and psychological improvement. Length of post-procedure follow-up was not provided. Furthermore, this study did not compare endovenous microfoam to established treatment for varicose veins.

In a multicenter, randomized, placebo-controlled, blinded study in patients with GSV incompetence and symptomatic and visible superficial venous disease, Vasquez et al. (2017) evaluated the efficacy and safety of PEM 0.5%, 1.0%, or placebo each administered with endovenous thermal ablation. Co-primary endpoints were physician-assessed, and patient-assessed appearance change from baseline to week eight. A total of 117 patients received treatment (38 placebo, 39 PEM 0.5%, 40 PEM 1%). Physician-rated vein appearance at week eight was significantly better with PEM (p = 0.001 vs.

placebo); patient-assessed appearance trended similarly. In the authors' opinion, PEM provided improvements in clinically meaningful change in patient-assessed and physician-assessed appearance ($p < 0.05$), need for additional treatment ($p < 0.05$), SFJ reflux elimination, symptoms, and QOL. In PEM recipients, the most frequent adverse event was superficial thrombophlebitis (35.4%). While these results appear promising, PEM outcomes were compared with placebo and with a short follow-up period. Additional RCTs comparing PEM outcomes with other established varicose vein treatment outcomes, and with a longer follow-up period are needed.

In an ECRI Clinical Evidence Assessment (2015), Varithena injectable foam was found to improve symptoms and appearance of varicose veins when compared to placebo or other unspecified sclerotherapy agents. Evidence was based on three double-blind and one open-label, multicenter, RCTs. A small open-label extension of one of the RCTs found Varithena's beneficial effects were sustained at 1-year follow-up. A separate cohort study found patients had better vein occlusion rates with high ligation surgery than with Varithena at 1-year follow-up. Adverse effects included pain, thrombophlebitis, bruising and thrombus in nontarget vessels and were considered minor. The report notes that longer-term, independent RCTs would be useful to confirm results and to compare Varithena with other varicose vein treatments because no data were available on RFA or laser therapy (ECRI, 2015; updated 2020).

King et al. (2015) reported a multicenter, parallel group study (VANISH-1), to determine if a single administration of ≤ 15 mL of pharmaceutical-grade PEM (Varithena [polidocanol injectable foam]) could alleviate symptoms and improve appearance of varicose veins in a typical population of patients with moderate to very severe symptoms of superficial venous incompetence and visible varicosities of the GSV system. The primary endpoint was patient-reported venous symptom improvement measured by change from baseline to week 8 in 7-day average VVSymQ score. Patients ($n = 279$) were randomized to five groups: PEM 0.125% (control), 0.5%, 1%, 2%, or placebo. At week 8, VVSymQ scores for the pooled PEM group (0.5% + 1% + 2%; $p < .0001$) and individual dose concentrations ($p < .001$) were greater as compared to placebo. Most adverse events were mild and resolved without sequelae. No pulmonary emboli were reported. The authors concluded that this study demonstrated that a single administration of up to 15 mL of PEM is a safe, effective, and convenient treatment for the symptoms of superficial venous incompetence and the appearance of visible varicosities of the GSV system. Doses of 0.5%, 1%, and 2% PEM appear to have an acceptable risk-benefit ratio. Additional studies with comparisons to other varicose vein treatments and over a longer period of time are needed before determining the safety and efficacy of this procedure.

In the VANISH-2 trial, Todd et al. (2014) evaluated the efficacy and safety of PEM in treatment of symptoms and appearance in patients with SFJ incompetence due to reflux of the GSV or major accessory veins. Patients were randomized equally to receive PEM 0.5%, PEM 1.0% or placebo. In 232 treated patients, PEM 0.5% and PEM 1.0% were superior to placebo, with a larger improvement in symptoms VVSymQ (-6.01 and -5.06, respectively, versus -2.00; $p < 0.0001$) and greater improvements in physician and patient assessments of appearance ($p < 0.0001$). These findings were supported by the results of duplex ultrasound and other clinical measures. Of the 230 PEM-treated patients (including open-label patients), 60% had an adverse event compared with 39% of placebo; 95% were mild or moderate. The authors concluded that PEM provided clinically meaningful benefit in treating symptoms and appearance in patients with varicose veins. However, longer-term outcomes with comparisons between PEM and other established treatments for varicose veins are needed to evaluate the clinical utility of this procedure. In 2015, Todd et al. assessed the durability of response to treatment and the long-term safety of patients treated with PEM 1% foam. The primary outcome was the efficacy and safety data from the day after visit five/week eight through the one-year study visit. Of the 230 patients who completed visit five/week eight, 56 received PEM 1% at visit two/week zero and were subsequently assessed for efficacy at visit five/week eight and visit ten/one year (one patient of the 57 who completed visit five/week eight received a nonpolidocanol endovenous microfoam intervention and was not included in the assessment). At one year after the first study treatment, patients treated with PEM demonstrated consistent, durable, and clinically meaningful improvements in symptoms, as measured by reductions in mean VVSymQ score; appearance, as measured by IPR-V3 (clinician assessment) and PA-V3 (patient self-assessment) scores; disease severity, as measured by the Venous Clinical Severity Score; and quality of life, as measured by the VEINESQOL score. At one year, there were no new venous thrombus adverse events (VTAEs) and no clinically important sequelae in patients who had a VTAE in the study. In addition, there were no serious adverse events that were determined by the investigator to be related to the study drug. No new safety signals were identified. In patients who previously had a VTAE, none had a recurrence of thrombus or evidence of post-thrombotic syndrome at 1 one year. The authors concluded the one-year data for individuals in VANISH-2 showed venous thrombus after treatment with PEM 1% does not result in important clinical sequelae and is clinically manageable.

VenoValve

Evidence in peer review literature evaluating VenoValve porcine bioprosthetic valve for the treatment of chronic venous insufficiency is limited. Future robust RCTs are warranted along with long-term outcomes to establish the safety and efficacy of this procedure.

A 2022 Hayes Emerging Technology Report states published evidence is limited to publications reporting 6-month and 1-year outcomes for 11 patients. The VenoValve will be the first porcine bioprosthetic valve to reach the market in the U.S., and the first device approved to treat CVI, if eventually FDA-approved. VenoValve is currently under investigation in the Surgical Anti-Reflux Venous Valve Endoprosthesis (SAVVE) trial (NCT04943172).

Ulloa and Glickman (2021) conducted a single-center, prospective, non-randomized, first-in-human trial using a prosthetic venous valve, VenoValve, for patients with severe chronic venous insufficiency (C4b-C6 disease). Ten patients had the prosthetic valve surgically implanted into the femoral vein. Follow-up examinations were conducted postoperatively at two and 14 days and then every 30 days for six months to evaluate feasibility, initial safety and performance outcomes of the VenoValve. Six patients had required bovine patch angioplasty of the vein. Four adverse events occurred, including one case of hematoma at the incision site that was aspirated, two cases of superficial wound infection in C6 patients treated with antibiotics, and one case of a bleeding complication due to warfarin anticoagulation. One patient's VenoValve had thrombosed at five months due to nontherapeutic anticoagulation. Improvements in all five patients who had reached the 6-month follow-up mark with the VenoValve were demonstrated during the study period by decreases in the VCSS (61% decrease from baseline), visual analog scale for pain scores (57% decrease), and reflux time (40% decrease) and a statistically significant improvement in the VEINES-QOL/Sym questionnaire. The patient with the occluded VenoValve had experienced improvements in all areas except for the reflux time. The authors concluded that VenoValve showed promising results with improvements noted in QOL and clinical outcomes. The authors recommended further follow-up and larger studies in the future. Ulloa et al. (2023) reported on two-year follow-up results aimed to evaluate the long-term clinical safety and performance of the eleven patients who were implanted with the VenoValve into the midthigh femoral vein. All eleven implant procedures were successful. Two-year follow-up data was obtained for eight subjects: one patient died of non-device related causes, one was lost to follow-up, and one refused to follow-up due to the COVID-19 pandemic. No device-related adverse events occurred between the first and second years of follow-up. Reported two-year clinical performance outcomes included significant decreases in mean reflux times of the mid-popliteal vein (61%), and significant improvements in mean scores for disease severity rVCSS (56%) and VAS pain (87%). The authors surmised the long-term safety and performance of the VenoValve was sustained as the patients obtained wound healing without ulcer recurrence. Additionally, there were significant improvements in reflux time, disease severity, pain scores and patients diagnosis were reclassified from severe to mild disease. The authors endorse continued long-term follow-up, future larger, multi-center studies, and note the clinical trial NCT04943172 currently underway.

Clinical Practice Guidelines

American College of Phlebology

The American College of Phlebology Guidelines Committee (Gibson et al., 2017c) performed a systematic review of the literature regarding the clinical impact and treatment of incompetent accessory saphenous veins. They developed a consensus opinion that patients with symptomatic incompetence of the accessory great saphenous veins (anterior and posterior accessory saphenous veins) be treated with EVTA (laser or radiofrequency) or UGFS to eliminate symptomatology (Recommendation Grade 1C).

The American College of Phlebology Guidelines Committee (2016) updated their evidence-based recommendations for treatment of superficial venous disease of the lower leg. They recommend that named veins [GSV, SSV, AAGSV, posterior accessory of the great saphenous vein (PAGSV), intersaphenous vein (vein of Giacomini)] must have a reflux time > 500 msec regardless of the reported vein diameter (Grade 1A).

EVTA (laser and radiofrequency) is the Committee's preferred treatment for saphenous and accessory saphenous (GSV, SSV, AAGSV, PAGSV) vein incompetence (Grade 1B). They suggest mechanical/chemical ablation may also be used to treat truncal venous reflux (Grade 2B). They further comment that open surgery is appropriate in veins not amenable to endovenous procedures but otherwise is not recommended because of increased pain, convalescent time, and morbidity (Grade 1B).

European Society for Vascular Surgery (ESVS)

The ESVS released a clinical practice guideline for management of chronic venous disease (De Maeseneer et al., 2022). The guidelines state that for patients with GSV and SSV incompetence requiring treatment endovenous thermal ablation is recommended as the first choice treatment, in preference to high ligation/stripping and UGFS. However, UGFS may be considered for treating saphenous trunks with a diameter less than 6 mm. The guidelines note that in long term follow up of comparative studies, treatment with UGFS has been substantially less effective than EVLA, RFA, and surgery in terms of occlusion or absence rates. Additionally, foam sclerotherapy is the technique of choice for anatomical configurations that make endovenous cannulation or advancing the ablation device challenging, and is suitable for treating tortuous, recurrent varicose veins. Mechanochemical ablation and cyanoacrylate adhesive closure may be considered when a non-thermal technique is preferred for patients with GSV incompetence. For patients with GSV incompetence, high

ligation/stripping should be considered, if endovenous thermal ablation options are not available. Endovenous non-thermal non tumescent ablation methods may be considered for treatment of SSV incompetence. Additionally, endovenous thermal ablation and UGFS may be considered for anterior accessory saphenous vein requiring treatment.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)

In 2020, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) released an update to their Guidance on Cyanoacrylate Glue Occlusion for Varicose Veins. The updated guidance states that current evidence on the safety and efficacy of cyanoacrylate glue occlusion for varicose veins is adequate to support the use of this procedure provided that standard arrangements are in place for clinical governance, consent and audit. In addition, the guideline states physicians should: 1) only perform the procedure after appropriate training and experience in the use of venous ultrasound; 2) discuss the available options with the patient before making a decision; and 3) follow their hospital's policies regarding performing procedures and monitoring results.

In an updated guideline on endovenous MOCA for varicose veins, NICE (2016) states that current evidence on the safety and efficacy of endovenous MOCA for varicose veins appears adequate to support the use of this procedure provided that standard arrangements are in place for consent, audit and clinical governance. Clinicians are encouraged to collect longer-term follow-up data.

The NICE 2013 interventional procedure guidance on UGFS specifies that if symptoms related to varicose veins are severe, the main treatment options include endovenous laser treatment and radiofrequency ablation, and surgery (ligation and stripping of the GSVs or ligation with or without stripping of the SSVs, and phlebectomy). The NICE 2013 clinical guideline on the diagnosis and treatment of varicose veins adds that if endovenous ablation is unsuitable, offer UGFS.

Society for Vascular Surgery (SVS)/American Venous Forum (AVF)/American Vein and Lymphatic Society (AVLS)/Society of Interventional Radiology (SIR)

Gloviczki et al. 2023 published Part II of the guidelines for the management of varicose veins of the lower extremities which focuses on patients with compression, treatment with drugs and nutritional supplements, evaluation and treatment of varicose tributaries, superficial venous aneurysms, and on the management of complicated varicose veins.

Recommendations of the guideline are summarized as follows (not all-inclusive):

- In symptomatic patients with C2 disease suggestion is made against using truncal vein diameter to determine which patients need venous ablation. Grade of recommendation, 2 (weak), quality of evidence, B (moderate).
- For patients with symptomatic telangiectasias and reticular veins, sclerotherapy with liquid or foam is recommended. Grade of recommendation, 1 (strong), quality of evidence, B (moderate).
- For treatment of symptomatic varicose tributaries, miniphlebectomy or ultrasound-guided sclerotherapy using physician-compounded foam (PCF) or PEM is recommended. Grade of recommendation, 1 (strong), quality of evidence, B (moderate).
- For patients with symptomatic reflux in the GSV or SSV and associated varicosities, ablation of the refluxing venous trunk and concomitant phlebectomy or UGFS of the varicosities with PCF or PEM is recommended. Grade of recommendation, 1 (strong), quality of evidence, C (low to very low).
- For patients with symptomatic reflux in the AAGSV or PAGSV, suggestion is made for simultaneous ablation of the refluxing venous trunk and phlebectomy or UGFS of the varicosities with PCF or PEM. Grade of recommendation, 2 (strong), quality of evidence, C (low to very low).
- For patients with varicose veins (CEAP class C2) who have significant, symptomatic axial reflux of the GSV or SSV, recommendation is made against treatment of incompetent perforating veins concomitant with initial ablation of the saphenous veins. Grade of recommendation, 1 (strong), quality of evidence, C (low to very low).
- For patients with varicose veins (CEAP class C2) who have significant, symptomatic axial reflux of the AAGSV or PAGSV, suggestion is made against treatment of incompetent perforating veins concomitant with initial ablation of the superficial truncal veins. Grade of recommendation, 2 (weak), quality of evidence, C (low to very low).

The SVS, AVF, and AVLS collaborated to update the 2011 SFS/AVF clinical practice guideline to provide evidence-based recommendations for treating patients with varicose veins of the lower limbs (Gloviczki. et al., 2022). Recommendations of the guideline are summarized as follows (not all-inclusive):

- For patients with CVD of the lower extremities, duplex ultrasound scanning is the diagnostic test of choice for evaluation of venous reflux.
- Reflux is defined as a minimum value > 500 ms of reversed flow in the superficial truncal veins and the tibial, deep femoral, and perforating veins.
- Axial reflux is defined as uninterrupted retrograde venous flow from the groin to the calf, and junctional reflux is limited to the SFJ or SPJ.
- Use of the 2020 upgraded CEAP classification of chronic venous disorders is recommended.

- “Pathologic” perforating veins in patients with varicose veins (CEAP clinical class C2) includes those with an outward flow duration of ≥ 500 ms and a diameter of ≥ 3.5 mm on duplex ultrasound.
- For patients with symptomatic varicose veins and axial reflux in the GSV and SSV, treatment with endovenous ablation over high ligation and stripping is recommended due to less post procedure pain and morbidity, and an earlier return to regular activity; if the technology or expertise in endovenous ablation is not available or the venous anatomy precludes endovenous treatment, ligation and stripping is recommended.
- For patients with symptomatic varicose veins and axial reflux in the AAGSV or PAGSV, treatment with ligation and stripping of the accessory saphenous vein, with additional phlebectomy, if needed, if technology or expertise in endovenous ablations is not available or if the venous anatomy precludes endovenous treatment is suggested.
- For patients with symptomatic varicose veins and axial reflux in the GSV, SSV, who place a high priority on the long-term outcomes of treatment (QoL and recurrence), treatment with EVLA, RFA, or high ligation and stripping over physician-compounded UGFS is suggested.
- For patients with symptomatic axial reflux, both thermal and nonthermal ablation of the GSV and SSV are recommended depending on the available expertise of the treating physician and the preference of the patient.
- In patients with symptomatic reflux in the GSV or SSV and associated varicosities, ablation of the refluxing venous trunk, and concomitant phlebectomy, or UGFS of the varicosities with physician-compounded foam or commercial PEM is recommended.
- In patients with symptomatic reflux in the GSV or SSV, ablation of the refluxing venous trunk, and staged or UGFS of the varicosities is recommended only if anatomic or medical reasons are present.

The SVS, AVF, AVLS, and SIR developed the appropriate use criteria (AUC) for chronic lower extremity venous disease using the RAND/UCLA Appropriateness Method incorporating best available evidence with expert opinion and engaging a panel of experts in the field through a modified Delphi exercise (Masuda et al. 2020). The consensus does not appear to be based on a systematic review of the literature. One hundred and nineteen scenarios were rated on a scale of one to nine by an expert panel, with one being never appropriate and nine being appropriate. The panelists rated ablation for axial reflux of the GSV, with or without SFJ reflux, in symptomatic patients, CEAP classes 2-6 as appropriate. Per the AUC, when accompanied by no SFJ reflux (the junction is either assumed or proven to be competent or previously interrupted and communicates with the GSV through incompetent thigh perforators or other sources of collateral flow) the remaining refluxing GSV may be the source of recurrent symptoms. Therefore, for axial GSV reflux, ablating the GSV will likely lead to decreased recurrence even if the SFJ shows no reflux. The mean number of saphenous vein ablations per person ranges from 1.3 to 1.9. However, occasionally, treatment requiring three or more ablations in a limb is needed. The authors note that the AUC statements were intended to serve as a guide to patient care, particularly in areas where high quality evidence is lacking and was not meant to be a guide that addresses all clinical situations.

The SVS and AVF released joint clinical practice guidelines regarding the care of patients with venous leg ulcers (O'Donnell et al., 2014). For patients with a venous leg ulcer (C6), and incompetent superficial veins that have reflux to the ulcer bed in addition to pathological perforating veins (> 500 ms reflux duration and diameter of > 3.5 mm), that are located beneath or associated with the ulcer bed, the guideline recommends ablation of both the incompetent superficial veins and perforator veins in addition to standard compressive therapy to aid in ulcer healing and prevent recurrence. For patients who are at risk for a venous leg ulcer (C4b), or have a healed venous ulcer (C5), and have axial reflux directed to the bed of the affected skin/ulcer, the guidelines recommend ablation of the incompetent superficial veins in addition to standard compressive therapy.

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

This section is to be used for informational purposes only. FDA approval alone is not a basis for coverage.

Vein ligation surgery is a procedure and therefore not subject to FDA regulation.

The ClariVein® infusion catheter (Vascular Insights) received FDA approval (K071468) on March 20, 2008. The device is designed to introduce physician-specified medicaments into the peripheral vasculature. Refer to the following website for more information: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf7/K071468.pdf. (Accessed December 15, 2023)

The VenaSeal™ Closure System received the FDA's pre-market approval (PMA) on February 20, 2015 (P140018). The device is indicated for the permanent closure of lower extremity superficial truncal veins, such as the GSV, through endovascular embolization with coaptation. VenaSeal is intended for use in adults with clinically symptomatic venous reflux as diagnosed by duplex ultrasound (DUS). Refer to the following website for more information: <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpma/pma.cfm?id=P140018>. (Accessed December 15, 2023)

Varithena (polidocanol injectable foam) (Provensis Ltd.) received FDA approval on November 25, 2013, as a sclerosing agent indicated for the treatment of incompetent great saphenous veins, accessory saphenous veins and visible varicosities of the GSV system above and below the knee. Refer to the following websites for more information:

- https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/applletter/2013/205098Orig1s000ltr.pdf
- https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2013/205098s000lbl.pdf

(Accessed December 15, 2023)

Sclerotherapy

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has approved various sclerosing agents to treat varicose veins of the lower extremities. Two most commonly used include sodium tetradecyl sulfate and polidocanol. Asclera® (polidocanol) is a sclerosing agent approved by the FDA in March 2010, and is indicated to treat small spider veins and uncomplicated reticular veins (varicose veins 1 to 3 mm in diameter) in the lower extremity. It has not been studied in larger varicose veins > 3 mm in diameter. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/nda/2010/021201s000_Medr.pdf.

(Accessed December 15, 2023)

References

Almeida JI, Javier JJ, Mackay EG, et al. Thirty-sixth-month follow-up of first-in-human use of cyanoacrylate adhesive for treatment of saphenous vein incompetence. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord*. 2017 Sep;5(5):658-666.

Almeida JI, Javier JJ, Mackay EG, et al. Two-year follow-up of first human use of cyanoacrylate adhesive for treatment of saphenous vein incompetence. *Phlebology*. 2015 Jul;30(6):397-404.

American College of Phlebology. Practice guidelines. Superficial venous disease. Treatment of superficial venous disease of the lower leg. October 2014. Updated February 2016.

American Medical Association. Current Procedural Terminology: CPT Professional Edition. AMA Press.

Amshar M, Nugraha RA, Batubara EAD, et al. Cyanoacrylate embolization versus endovenous laser ablation in treating saphenous vein insufficiency: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Vasc Surg*. 2022 Mar;80:313-324.

Bishawi M, Bernstein R, Boter M, et al. Mechanochemical ablation in patients with chronic venous disease: a prospective multicenter report. *Phlebology*. 2014 Jul;29(6):397-400.

Boersma D, Kornmann VN, van Eekeren RR, et al. Treatment modalities for small saphenous vein insufficiency: systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Endovasc Ther*. 2016 Feb;23(1):199-211.

Bootun R, Lane T, Dharmarajah B, et al. Intra-procedural pain score in a randomized controlled trial comparing mechanochemical ablation to radiofrequency ablation: the multicenter Venefit™ versus ClariVein® for varicose veins trial. *Phlebology*. 2016 Feb;31(1):61-5.

Bozkurt AK, Yılmaz MF. A prospective comparison of a new cyanoacrylate glue and laser ablation for the treatment of venous insufficiency. *Phlebology*. 2016 Mar;31(1 Suppl):106-13.

Caggiati A, Bergan JJ, Gloviczki P, et al. International Interdisciplinary Consensus Committee on venous anatomical terminology. Nomenclature of the veins of the lower limbs: an international interdisciplinary consensus statement. *J Vasc Surg*. 2002 Aug;36(2):416-22.

Chandler JG, Pichot O, Sessa C, et al. Defining the role of extended saphenofemoral junction ligation: a prospective comparative study. *J Vasc Surg*. 2000 Nov;32(5):941-53.

ClariVein website. Vascular Insights, LLC. Available at: <http://clarivein.com/>. Accessed December 15, 2023.

CPT Assistant. Correct coding of endovascular treatment for low extremity venous incompetency. October 2014.

CPT Assistant. Therapy for incompetent veins. November 2016.

Darwood RJ, Gough MJ. Endovenous laser treatment for uncomplicated varicose veins. *Phlebology*. 2009;24 Suppl 1:50-61.

De Maeseneer MG, Kakkos SK, Aherne T, et al. Editor's Choice - European Society for Vascular Surgery (ESVS) 2022 Clinical Practice Guidelines on the management of chronic venous disease of the lower limbs. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*. 2022 Feb;63(2):184-267.

Dwerryhouse S, Davies B, Harradine K, Earnshaw JJ. Stripping the long saphenous vein reduces the rate of reoperation for recurrent varicose veins: five-year results of a randomized trial. *J Vasc Surg*. 1999 Apr;29(4):589-92.

Dimech AP, Cassar K. Efficacy of cyanoacrylate glue ablation of primary truncal varicose veins compared to existing endovenous techniques: a systematic review of the literature. *Surg J (NY)*. 2020 Jun 19;6(2):e77-e86.

Disselhoff BC, der Kinderen DJ, Kelder JC, et al. Five-year results of a randomized clinical trial of endovenous laser ablation of the great saphenous vein with and without ligation of the saphenofemoral junction. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2011 May;41(5):685-90.

Disselhoff BC, der Kinderen DJ, Kelder JC, et al. Randomized clinical trial comparing endovenous laser ablation of the great saphenous vein with and without ligation of the sapheno-femoral junction: 2-year results. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2008 Dec;36(6):713-8.

ECRI. Varithena Injectable Foam (Boston Scientific Corp.) for treating varicose veins. Plymouth Meeting (PA): ECRI; 2015 Jan16. (Clinical Evidence Assessment). Updated December 11, 2020.

ECRI. VenaSeal Closure System (Medtronic plc.) for embolizing varicose veins. Plymouth Meeting (PA): ECRI; 2015 March 10. (Clinical Evidence Assessment). Updated Feb 4, 2021.

Eggen CAM, Alozai T, Pronk P, et al. Ten-year follow-up of a randomized controlled trial comparing saphenofemoral ligation and stripping of the great saphenous vein with endovenous laser ablation (980 nm) using local tumescent anesthesia. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord.* 2021 Aug 25:S2213-333X(21)00418-2.

Elias S, Raines JK. Mechanochemical tumescent-less endovenous ablation: final results of the initial clinical trial. *Phlebology.* 2012 Mar;27(2):67-72.

Eroglu E, Yasim A. A randomized clinical trial comparing n-butyl cyanoacrylate, radiofrequency ablation and endovenous laser ablation for the treatment of superficial venous incompetence: two year follow up results. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2018 Oct;56(4):553-560.

Farah MH, Nayfeh T, Urtecho M,. A systematic review supporting the Society for Vascular Surgery, the American Venous syForum, and the American Vein and Lymphatic Society guidelines on the management of varicose veins. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord.* 2022 Sep;10(5):1155-1171.

Flessenkämper I, Hartmann M, Hartmann K et al. Endovenous laser ablation with and without high ligation compared to high ligation and stripping for treatment of great saphenous varicose veins: results of a multicenter randomized controlled trial with up to 6 years follow-up. *Phlebology.* 2016 Feb;31(1):23-33.

Gauw SA, Lawson JA, van Vlijmen-van Keulen CJ et al. Five-year follow-up of a randomized, controlled trial comparing saphenofemoral ligation and stripping of the great saphenous vein with endovenous laser ablation (980 nm) using local tumescent anesthesia. *J Vasc Surg.* 2016 Feb;63(2):420-8.

Gibson K, Ferris B. Cyanoacrylate closure of incompetent great, small and accessory saphenous veins without the use of post-procedure compression: initial outcomes of a post-market evaluation of the VenaSeal System (the WAVES Study). *Vascular.* 2017b Apr;25(2):149-156.

Gibson K, Kabnick L; Varithena® 013 Investigator Group. A multicenter, randomized, placebo-controlled study to evaluate the efficacy and safety of Varithena® (polidocanol endovenous microfoam 1%) for symptomatic, visible varicose veins with saphenofemoral junction incompetence. *Phlebology.* 2017a Apr;32(3):185-193.

Gibson K, Khilnani N, Schul M, et al. American College of Phlebology Guidelines - treatment of refluxing accessory saphenous veins. *Phlebology.* 2017c Aug;32(7):448-452.

Gibson K, Minjarez R, Gunderson K, et al. Need for adjunctive procedures following cyanoacrylate closure of incompetent great, small and accessory saphenous veins without the use of post procedure compression: three-month data from a post market evaluation of the VenaSeal System (the WAVES Study). *Phlebology.* 2018b Sep 18:268355518801641.

Gibson K, Morrison N, Kolluri R, et al. Twenty-four-month results from a randomized trial of cyanoacrylate closure versus radiofrequency ablation for the treatment of incompetent great saphenous veins. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord.* 2018a Sep;6(5):606-613.

Gloviczki P, Comerota AJ, Dalsing MC, et al.; Society for Vascular Surgery; American Venous Forum. The care of patients with varicose veins and associated chronic venous diseases: clinical practice guidelines of the Society for Vascular Surgery and the American Venous Forum. *J Vasc Surg.* 2011 May;53(5 Suppl):2S-48S.

Gloviczki P, Lawrence PF, Wasan SM, et al. The 2022 Society for Vascular Surgery, American Venous Forum, and American Vein and Lymphatic Society clinical practice guidelines for the management of varicose veins of the lower extremities. Part I. Duplex scanning and treatment of superficial truncal reflux: Endorsed by the Society for Vascular Medicine and the International Union of Phlebology. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord.* 2022 Oct 12:S2213-333X(22)00417-6.

Gloviczki P, Lawrence PF, Wasan SM, et al. The 2023 Society for Vascular Surgery, American Venous Forum, and American Vein and Lymphatic Society clinical practice guidelines for the management of varicose veins of the lower extremities. Part II: endorsed by the Society of Interventional Radiology and the Society for Vascular Medicine. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord.* 2023 Aug 29:S2213-333X(23)00322-0.

Go SJ, Cho BS, Mun YS, et al. Study on the long-term results of endovenous laser ablation for treating varicose veins. *Int J Angiol*. 2016 Jun;25(2):117-20.

Hamel-Desnos C, Nyamekye I, Chauzat B, et al. FOVELASS: A randomised trial of endovenous laser ablation versus polidocanol foam for small saphenous vein incompetence. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*. 2023 Mar;65(3):415-423.

SAS, Giang J, De Maeseneer MGR, et al. Five-year results of great saphenous vein treatment: a meta-analysis. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*. 2017 Dec;54(6):760-770.

Hayes, Inc. Hayes Emerging Technology Report. VenoValve for chronic venous insufficiency. Lansdale, PA: Hayes, Inc.; May, 2022.

Hayes, Inc. Hayes Health Technology Assessment. Cyanoacrylate Embolization With the VenaSeal Closure System (Medtronic Inc.) for the Treatment of Varicose Veins. Hayes, Inc.; September 2022. Updated September 2023.

Hayes, Inc. Hayes Health Technology Assessment. Mechanochemical endovenous ablation (MOCA) with the ClariVein Infusion Catheter Nonthermal Vein Ablation System (Merit Medical Systems Inc.) for treatment of varicose veins. Hayes, Inc.; February, 2022. Updated March, 2023.

Hayes, Inc. Hayes Health Technology Assessment. Polidocanol endovenous microfoam (Varithena) 1% for treatment of varicose veins. Hayes, Inc.; September 2019. Updated November 2022.

Holewijn S, van Eekeren RRJP, Vahl A, et al. Two-year results of a multicenter randomized controlled trial comparing mechanochemical endovenous ablation to radiofrequency ablation in the treatment of primary great saphenous vein incompetence (MARADONA trial). *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord*. 2019 May;7(3):364-374.

Joh JH, Lee T, Byun SJ, et al. A multicenter randomized controlled trial of cyanoacrylate closure and surgical stripping for incompetent great saphenous veins. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord*. 2022 Mar;10(2):353-359.

Jones L, Braithwaite BD, Selwyn D, et al. Neovascularisation is the principal cause of varicose vein recurrence: results of a randomized trial of stripping the long saphenous vein. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*. 1996 Nov;12(4):442-5.

Kim PS, Bishawi M, Draughn D, et al. Mechanochemical ablation for symptomatic great saphenous vein reflux: a two-year follow-up. *Phlebology*. 2017;32(1):43-48.

Kim PS, Elias S, Gasparis A, Labropoulos N. Results of polidocanol endovenous microfoam in clinical practice. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord*. 2021 Jan;9(1):122-127.

King JT, O'Byrne M, Vasquez M, et al. Treatment of truncal incompetence and varicose veins with a single administration of a new polidocanol endovenous microfoam preparation improves symptoms and appearance. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*. 2015 Dec;50(6):784-93.

Kolluri R, Chung J, Kim S, et al. Network meta-analysis to compare VenaSeal with other superficial venous therapies for chronic venous insufficiency. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord*. 2020 May;8(3):472-481.e3.

Kolluri R, Gibson K, Cher D, et al. Roll-in phase analysis of clinical study of cyanoacrylate closure for incompetent great saphenous veins. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord*. 2016 Oct;4(4):407-15.

Labropoulos N, Kang SS, Mansour MA, et al. Primary superficial vein reflux with competent saphenous trunk. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*. 1999 Sep;18(3):201-6.

Labropoulos N, Tiongson J, Pryor L, et al. Definition of venous reflux in lower-extremity veins. *J Vasc Surg*. 2003 Oct;38(4):793-8.

Lal BK, Mallick R, Wright D. Improvement in patient-reported outcomes of varicose veins following treatment with polidocanol endovenous microfoam. *Phlebology*. 2017 Jun;32(5):342-354.

Lane T, Bootun R, Dharmarajah B, et al. A multi-center randomized controlled trial comparing radiofrequency and mechanical occlusion chemically assisted ablation of varicose veins – final results of the Venefit versus ClariVein for varicose veins trial. *Phlebology*. 2017 Mar;32(2):89-98.

Lawaetz M, Serup J, Lawaetz B, et al. Comparison of endovenous ablation techniques, foam sclerotherapy and surgical stripping for great saphenous varicose veins. Extended 5-year follow-up of a RCT. *Int Angiol*. 2017 Jun;36(3):281-288.

Lim AJM, Mohamed AH, Hitchman LH et al. Clinical outcomes following mechanochemical ablation of superficial venous incompetence compared with endothermal ablation: meta-analysis. *Br J Surg*. 2023 Apr 12;110(5):562-567.

Lin F, Zhang S, Sun Y, et al. The management of varicose veins. *Int Surg*. 2015 Jan; 100(1): 185-189.

Lurie F, Passman M, Meisner M, et al. The 2020 update of the CEAP classification system and reporting standards. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord*. 2020 May;8(3):342-352. Erratum in: *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord*. 2021 Jan;9(1):288.

Masuda E, Ozsvath K, Vossler J, et al. The 2020 appropriate use criteria for chronic lower extremity venous disease of the American Venous Forum, the Society for Vascular Surgery, the American Vein and Lymphatic Society, and the Society of Interventional Radiology. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord*. 2020 Jul;8(4):505-525.e4.

Medicare Coverage Database. Local Coverage Determination. Sacroiliac joint injections and procedures L39462. 2023. <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/view/lcd.aspx?lcdid=39462>. Accessed November 15, 2023.

MedlinePlus [Internet]. Bethesda (MD): National Library of Medicine (US); [updated 2020 Jun 24]. Stasis dermatitis and ulcers; [reviewed 2022 Nov 18]. Available at: <https://medlineplus.gov/heartattack.html>. Accessed November 28, 2023.

Meissner MH. Lower extremity venous anatomy. *Semin Intervent Radiol*. 2005 Sep;22(3):147-56.

Mohamed AH, Leung C, Wallace T, et al. A randomized controlled trial of endovenous laser ablation versus mechanochemical ablation with ClariVein in the management of superficial venous incompetence (LAMA trial). *Ann Surg*. 2021 Jun 1;273(6):e188-e195.

Morrison N, Gibson K, McEnroe S, et al. Randomized trial comparing cyanoacrylate embolization and radiofrequency ablation for incompetent great saphenous veins (VeClose). *J Vasc Surg*. 2015 Apr;61(4):985-94.

Morrison N, Gibson K, Vasquez M, et al. Five-year extension study of patients from a randomized clinical trial (VeClose) comparing cyanoacrylate closure versus radiofrequency ablation for the treatment of incompetent great saphenous veins. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord*. 2020 Nov;8(6):978-989.

Morrison N, Gibson K, Vasquez M, et al. VeClose trial 12-month outcomes of cyanoacrylate closure versus radiofrequency ablation for incompetent great saphenous veins. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord*. 2017 May;5(3):321-330.

Morrison N, Kolluri R, Vasquez M, et al. Comparison of cyanoacrylate closure and radiofrequency ablation for the treatment of incompetent great saphenous veins: 36-month outcomes of the VeClose randomized controlled trial. *Phlebology*. 2019 Jul;34(6):380-390.2018 7.

National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (NHLBI). Varicose veins. February 2014. Available at: <https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/varicose-veins>. Accessed December 15, 2023.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Clinical guideline [CG168]. Varicose veins: diagnosis and management. July 2013.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Cyanoacrylate glue occlusion for varicose veins. *Interventional procedure guidance [IPG670]*. March 2020.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). *Interventional procedures guidance (IPG557) Endovenous mechanochemical ablation for varicose veins*. May 2016.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). *Interventional procedures guidance [IPG 440]. Ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy for varicose veins*. February 2013.

National Institutes of Health (NIH). Varicose Veins. Available at: <https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/varicose-veins>. Accessed January 19, 2023.

O'Donnell TF, Balk EM, Dermody M, et al. Recurrence of varicose veins after endovenous ablation of the great saphenous vein in randomized trials. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord*. 2016 Jan;4(1):97-105.

O'Donnell TF Jr, Passman MA, Marston WA, et al.; Society for Vascular Surgery; American Venous Forum. Management of venous leg ulcers: clinical practice guidelines of the Society for Vascular Surgery® and the American Venous Forum. *J Vasc Surg*. 2014 Aug;60(2 Suppl):3S-59S.

O'Hare JL, Vandebroek CP, Whitman B, et al. A prospective evaluation of the outcome after small saphenous varicose vein surgery with one-year follow-up. *J Vasc Surg*. 2008 Sep;48(3):669-73; discussion 674.

Proebstle TM, Alm J, Dimitri S, et al. The European multicenter cohort study on cyanoacrylate embolization of refluxing great saphenous veins. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord*. 2015 Jan;3(1):2-7.

Proebstle TM, Gül D, Lehr HA, et al. Infrequent early recanalization of greater saphenous vein after endovenous laser treatment. *J Vasc Surg*. 2003 Sep;38(3):511-6.

Quarto G, Amato B, Giani U, et al. Comparison of traditional surgery and laser treatment of incompetent great saphenous vein. Results of a meta-Analysis. *Ann Ital Chir*. 2016;87:61-7.

Rass K, Frings N, Glowacki P, et al. Same site recurrence is more frequent after endovenous laser ablation compared with high ligation and stripping of the great saphenous vein: 5-year results of a randomized clinical trial (RELACS study). *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*. 2015 Nov;50(5):648-56.

Recek C. Saphenofemoral junction ligation supplemented by postoperative sclerotherapy: a review of long-term clinical and hemodynamic results. *Vasc Endovascular Surg.* 2004 Nov-Dec;38(6):533-40.

Shahzad N, Elsherif M, Obaidat I, Brar R. A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials comparing thermal versus non-thermal endovenous ablation in superficial venous incompetence. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2023 Nov;66(5):687-695.

Sullivan V, Denk PM, Sonnad SS, et al. Ligation versus anticoagulation: treatment of above-knee superficial thrombophlebitis not involving the deep venous system. *J Am Coll Surg.* 2001 Nov;193(5):556-62.

Theivacumar NS, Beale RJ, Mavor AI, Gough MJ. Initial experience in endovenous laser ablation (EVLA) of varicose veins due to small saphenous vein reflux. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2007 May;33(5):614-8.

Theivacumar NS, Darwood RJ, Gough MJ. Endovenous laser ablation (EVLA) of the anterior accessory great saphenous vein (AAGSV): abolition of sapheno-femoral reflux with preservation of the great saphenous vein. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2009 Apr;37(4):477-81.

Theivacumar NS, Dellagrammaticas D, Mavor AI, et al. Endovenous laser ablation: does standard above-knee great saphenous vein ablation provide optimum results in patients with both above- and below-knee reflux? A randomized controlled trial. *J Vasc Surg.* 2008 Jul;48(1):173-8.

Theivacumar NS, Gough MJ. Endovenous laser ablation (EVLA) to treat recurrent varicose veins. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2011 May; 41(5):691-6.

Todd KL 3rd, Wright DI; VANISH-2 Investigator Group. Durability of treatment effect with polidocanol endovenous microfoam on varicose vein symptoms and appearance (VANISH-2). *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord.* 2015 Jul;3(3):258-264.e1.

Todd KL 3rd, Wright DI, VANISH-2 Investigator Group. The VANISH-2 study: a randomized, blinded, multicenter study to evaluate the efficacy and safety of polidocanol endovenous microfoam 0.5% and 1.0% compared with placebo for the treatment of saphenofemoral junction incompetence. *Phlebology.* 2014 Oct;29(9):608-18.

Ulloa JH, Cifuentes S, Figueroa V, Glickman M. Two-year results of a first-in-human study in patients surgically implanted with a bioprosthetic venous valve, the VenoValve in patients with severe chronic venous insufficiency. *Vasc Endovascular Surg.* 2023 Aug;57(6):547-554.

Ulloa JH, Glickman M. Human trial using the novel bioprosthetic VenoValve in patients with chronic venous insufficiency. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord.* 2021 Jul;9(4):938-944.

UnitedHealthcare Insurance Company Generic Certificate of Coverage 2018.

Vähäaho S, Halmesmäki K, Albäck A, et al. Five-year follow-up of a randomized clinical trial comparing open surgery, foam sclerotherapy and endovenous laser ablation for great saphenous varicose veins. *Br J Surg.* 2018 May;105(6):686-691.

Vähäaho S, Mahmoud O, Halmesmäki K, et al. Randomized clinical trial of mechanochemical and endovenous thermal ablation of great saphenous varicose veins. *Br J Surg.* 2019 Apr;106(5):548-554.

van Eekeren RR, Boersma D, Elias S, et al. Endovenous mechanochemical ablation of great saphenous vein incompetence using the ClariVein device: a safety study. *J Endovasc Ther.* 2011 Jun;18(3):328-34.

Varithena® website. Boston Scientific. Available at: <https://www.varithena.com/en-us/home.html>. Accessed December 15, 2023.

Vasquez M, Gasparis AP, Varithena® 017 Investigator Group. A multicenter, randomized, placebo-controlled trial of endovenous thermal ablation with or without polidocanol endovenous microfoam treatment in patients with great saphenous vein incompetence and visible varicosities. *Phlebology.* 2017 May;32(4):272-281.

Vasquez MA, Rabe E, McLafferty RB, et al. Revision of the venous clinical severity score: Venous outcomes consensus statement: Special communication of the American Venous Forum Ad Hoc Outcomes Working Group. *J Vasc Surg.* 2010 Nov;52(5):1387-96.

VenaSeal™ Closure System website. Medtronic. Available at: <https://www.medtronic.com/us-en/patients/treatments-therapies/varicose-vein-therapies/our-treatments/venaseal-closure-system.html>. Accessed December 15, 2023.

Vos CG, Ünlü C, Bosma J, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of two novel techniques of nonthermal endovenous ablation of the great saphenous vein. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord.* 2017 Nov;5(6):880-896.

Vun SV, Rashid ST, Blest NC, Spark JI. Lower pain and faster treatment with mechanico-chemical endovenous ablation using ClariVein®. *Phlebology.* 2015 Dec;30(10):688-92.

Watson JJ, Mansour MA. Cosmetic sclerotherapy. *J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord.* 2017 May;5(3):437-445.

Whing J, Nandhra S, Nesbitt C, Stansby G. Interventions for great saphenous vein incompetence. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2021 Aug 11;8(8):CD005624.

Wichers IM, Di Nisio M, Büller HR, Middeldorp S. Treatment of superficial vein thrombosis to prevent deep vein thrombosis and pulmonary embolism: a systematic review. *Haematologica.* 2005 May;90(5):672-7.

Winterborn, RJ, Foy C, Earnshaw JJ. Causes of varicose vein recurrence: late results of a randomized controlled trial of stripping the long saphenous vein. *J Vasc Surgery.* 2004 Oct 40(4): 634-9.

Witte ME, Holewijn S, van Eekeren RR, et al. Midterm outcome of mechanochemical endovenous ablation for the treatment of great saphenous vein insufficiency. *J Endovasc Ther.* 2017b Feb;24(1):149-155.

Witte ME, Zeebregts CJ, de Borst GJ, et al. Mechanochemical endovenous ablation of saphenous veins using the ClariVein: A systematic review. *Phlebology.* 2017a Dec;32(10):649-657.

Woźniak W, Mlosek RK, Ciostek P. Complications and failure of endovenous laser ablation and radiofrequency ablation procedures in patients with lower extremity varicose veins in a 5-year follow-up. *Vasc Endovascular Surg.* 2016 Oct;50(7):475-483.

Policy History/Revision Information

Date	Summary of Changes
09/01/2024	<p>Related Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added reference link to the Medical Policy titled <i>Outpatient Surgical Procedures -Site of Service (for New Jersey Only)</i> <p>Coverage Rationale</p> <p>Varicose Vein Ablative and Stripping Procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised coverage criteria for initial and subsequent radiofrequency ablation, endovenous laser ablation, Stripping, Ligation, and excision of the Great Saphenous Vein (GSV) and Small Saphenous Veins (SSV): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removed criterion requiring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ablative therapy for the GSV or SSV only if junctional reflux is demonstrated in these veins Ablative therapy for Accessory Veins only if anatomically-related persistent junctional reflux is demonstrated after the GSV or SSV have been removed or ablated Replaced criterion requiring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “The venous size of the GSV must be 5.5 mm or greater when measured at the proximal thigh immediately below the saphenofemoral junction via Duplex Ultrasonography” with “the venous size of the GSV must be 3.0 mm or greater when measured at the proximal thigh immediately below the saphenofemoral junction via Duplex Ultrasonography” “The venous size of the SSV or Accessory Veins must measure 5 mm or greater in diameter immediately below the appropriate junction” with “the venous size of the SSV or Accessory Veins must measure 3.0 mm or greater in diameter immediately below the appropriate junction <i>via Duplex Ultrasonography</i>” “Duration of reflux, in the standing or reverse Trendelenburg position, that meets the [listed] parameters” with “<i>Duplex Ultrasound study performed</i> in the standing or reverse Trendelenburg position, <i>shows</i> duration of reflux that meets the [listed] parameters” Revised coverage criteria for ablation of perforator veins; replaced criterion requiring “perforating veins > 350 ms” with “perforating veins > 500 ms” Removed language indicating Adherence to American Medical Association (AMA) coding guidance is required when requesting coverage of Endovenous Ablation procedures; only one primary code may be requested for the initial vein treated and only one add-on code per extremity may be requested for any subsequent vein(s) treated <p>Ligation Procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added language to indicate Ligation of the Accessory Veins, as a stand-alone procedure, is unproven and not medically necessary for treating Venous Reflux due to insufficient evidence of efficacy

Date	Summary of Changes
	<p>Sclerotherapy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added instruction to refer to the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Applicable Codes</i> section [of the policy] for Sclerotherapy (i.e., liquid, foam, ultrasound-guided, endovenous chemical ablation, endovenous microfoam) <i>Benefit Considerations</i> section [of the policy] for Cosmetic Sclerotherapy <p>Other Procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removed language indicating endovenous low-nitrogen foam Sclerotherapy of incompetent GSV, lesser saphenous veins, and accessory saphenous veins is unproven and not medically necessary for treating Venous Reflux due to insufficient evidence of efficacy <p>Definitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added definition of “Axial Reflux” Removed definition of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Congenital Anomaly Junctional Reflux Sickness Telangiectasia Updated definition of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cosmetic Procedures Duplex Ultrasonography Functional or Physical Impairment Great Saphenous Vein (GSV) Reticular Vein Small Saphenous Vein (SSV) Spider Vein Varicose Veins Venous Reflux/Insufficiency Venous Stripping <p>Applicable Codes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added notation to indicate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CPT codes 36465 and 36466 are covered for Sclerotherapy up to 3 sessions per leg within a year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than 3 sessions per leg within a year is considered Cosmetic; does not improve a functional, physical, or physiological impairment Cosmetic Sclerotherapy is excluded CPT codes 36470 and 36471 are not on the State of New Jersey Medicaid Fee Schedule and therefore may not be covered by the State of New Jersey Medicaid Program <p>Benefit Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removed language pertaining to Sclerotherapy session limitations; refer to the <i>Applicable Codes</i> section of the policy for details <p>Supporting Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated <i>Clinical Evidence</i>, <i>FDA</i>, and <i>References</i> sections to reflect the most current information Archived previous policy version CS117NJ.T

Instructions for Use

This Medical Policy provides assistance in interpreting UnitedHealthcare standard benefit plans. When deciding coverage, the federal, state or contractual requirements for benefit plan coverage must be referenced as the terms of the federal, state or contractual requirements for benefit plan coverage may differ from the standard benefit plan. In the event of a conflict, the federal, state or contractual requirements for benefit plan coverage govern. Before using this policy, please check the federal, state or contractual requirements for benefit plan coverage. UnitedHealthcare reserves the right to modify its Policies and Guidelines as necessary. This Medical Policy is provided for informational purposes. It does not constitute medical advice.

UnitedHealthcare may also use tools developed by third parties, such as the InterQual® criteria, to assist us in administering health benefits. The UnitedHealthcare Medical Policies are intended to be used in connection with the

independent professional medical judgment of a qualified health care provider and do not constitute the practice of medicine or medical advice.