

Table II

<p>Operative procedure</p>	<p>Reference <i>Abstracts corresponding to references can be found using the listing "RCTs by alphabetical order" or "RCTs by topic."</i></p>	<p>Summary</p>
<p>Open surgery +/- SEPS and compression therapy <i>versus</i> isolated compression therapy in C₅-C₆ or C₆ patients</p>	<p>Barwell JR, Davies CE, Deacon J, Harvey K, Minor M, Sassano A; Taylor M et al. Comparison of surgery and compression with compression alone in chronic venous ulceration (ESCHAR study): randomised controlled trial. <i>Lancet</i>. 2005;363:1854-9.</p>	<p>500 lower limbs classified C₆ Group I :OS + compression therapy <i>versus</i> Group II: isolated compression therapy Results at 24 weeks of follow-up: 40 patients lost to follow-up <i>Venous ulcer healing:</i> healing rates similar in both groups Results at 1 year of follow-up: <i>Venous ulcer recurrences:</i> recurrence rate reduced by 28% in Group I <i>versus</i> 12% in Group II ; hazard ratio, -2.7; 65% CI-1.78 to 4.27; P <0, 0001</p>
	<p>Guest M, Smith JJ, Tripuraneni G, Howard A, Madden P, Greenhalgh RM, Davies AH. Randomized clinical trial of varicose vein surgery with compression <i>versus</i> compression alone for the treatment of venous ulceration. <i>Phlebology</i>. 2003;18:130-36.</p>	<p>76 patients assigned C₆ of the CEAP Group I (N=39): Four-layer bandaging <i>versus</i> Group II (N=37): OS + Four-layer bandaging Results at 24 weeks of follow-up: <i>Venous ulcer healing:</i> no difference between the two groups in terms of - healing rate (adjusted hazard ratio-0.69, P=0.41) ; - HRQoL (adjusted hazard ratio-0.79, 95% CI 0.45-1.39 using generic (SF 36) and specific (CXVUQ) tools</p>
	<p>Gohel MS, Barwell JR, Earnshaw JJ, Heather BP, Mitchell DC, Whyman MR, Poskitt KR. Randomized clinical trial of compression plus surgery <i>versus</i> compression alone in chronic venous ulceration (ESCHAR study)- haemodynamic and anatomical changes. <i>Br J Surg</i>. 2005;92:291-297.</p>	<p>214 lower legs with saphenous reflux +/- deep venous reflux Group I (N=112): compression therapy <i>versus</i> Group II (N=102): OS + compression therapy Results at 1 year of follow-up: <i>Haemodynamics</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Venous refill time better improved in Group II compared with Group I; P <0.001 · Deep venous reflux abolition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 10/22 when segmental ○ 3/17 when axial </p>
	<p>van Gent WB, Hop WC, Van Prag MC, Mackaay AJ, de Boer EM, Wittens CH. Conservative <i>versus</i> surgical treatment of venous leg ulcers : A prospective, randomized, multicenter trial. <i>J Vasc Surg</i>. 2006;44:563-71.</p>	<p>70 patients, and 200 venous ulcers (C₆) Group I (N=97 ulcers): open surgery +/- SEPS (50%)+ compression therapy <i>versus</i> Group II (N=103 venous ulcers) : compression therapy Results at 29 months (mean 27) of follow-up: <i>Venous ulcer healing</i> Group I, 72% <i>versus</i> group II, 53%; P=0.11 <i>Venous ulcer recurrences or medial ulcers:</i> better results in group I compared with group II; P=0.02</p>

	<p>Gohel MS, Barwell JR, Taylor M, Chant T, Foy C, Earnshaw JJ, Heather BP, Mitchell DC, Whyman MR, Poskitt KR. Long term results of compression therapy <i>versus</i> compression plus surgery in chronic venous ulceration (ESCHAR). Randomized controlled trial. <i>Br J Surg.</i> 2007;335(7610):83-89.</p>	<p>500 lower legs classified C₅,C₆ Group I: OS+ compression therapy <i>versus</i> Group II: compression therapy. Results at 3 years of follow-up: <i>Venous ulcer healing</i> in C₆ patients Non-significant difference between the 2 groups (P=0,73) Results at 4 years of follow-up: <i>Venous ulcer healing and recurrence in patients with isolated superficial reflux:</i> Ulcer free time longer in group I vs group II; P=0,007 Recurrence rates lower in group I vs group II; P<0,01 <i>Venous ulcer recurrence in patients with combined deep segmental reflux:</i> Recurrence rates lower in group I vs group II; P=0,04 <i>Venous ulcer recurrence in patients with combined deep axial reflux</i> No significant difference between groups in terms of recurrent rates ; P=0.33</p>
<p>CHIVA + compression therapy <i>versus</i> compression therapy in C₆ patients</p>	<p>Zamboni P, Cisno C, Marchetti F, Mazza L, Fogato L, Carandina S, De Palma M, Liboni A. Minimally invasive surgical management of primary venous ulcers vs. compression treatment: a randomized clinical trial. <i>Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.</i> 2003;25:313-318.</p>	<p>45 patients C₆, and 47 venous ulcers Group I (N patients=21 ; N ulcers=23) : CHIVA + compression therapy <i>versus</i> Group II (N patients=24 ; N ulcers=24) :compression therapy Results at 3 years of follow-up: <i>Venous ulcer healing:</i> Group I, 100% at 31 days (mean) <i>versus</i> Group II 96% at 63 days (mean); P<0.02 <i>Venous ulcer recurrences:</i> Group I, 9% <i>versus</i> Group II 36% ; P<0.05 <i>HRQoL(SF 36):</i> Group I with better HRQoL > Group II (P<0.05)</p>
	<p>Zamboni P, Cisno C, Marchetti P, Fogato L, Carandina S, De Palma M et Liboni A. Hemodynamic CHIVA correction <i>versus</i> compression for primary venous ulcers: first year results. <i>Phlebology.</i> 2004;19:28.</p>	<p>45 patients and 47 lower limbs with primary VV (C₆) Group I (N=23): CHIVA + compression therapy <i>versus</i> Group II (N=24): compression therapy) Results at 1 year of follow-up: <i>Venous ulcer healing:</i> Group I, 100% at 29 days (mean) <i>versus</i> Group II 96% at 61 days (mean); P<0.02 <i>HRQoL(SF 36):</i> Group I with better QoL > Group II (P<0.05)</p>
<p>EVLA+ Compression therapy <i>versus</i> Compression therapy in C₆ patients</p>	<p>Viarengo ML, Potério-Filho J, Potério M Menezes FH, Meirelles GV. Endovenous laser treatment for varicose veins in patients with active ulcers: measurement of intravenous and perivenous temperatures during the procedure. <i>Dermatol Surg.</i> 2007;33:551-8.</p>	<p>52 patients classified C₆, with active ulcer for more than 1 year Group I (N= 25): compression therapy Group II (N= 27): EVLA (Diode 980-nm) under local anesthesia + compression therapy Results at 1 year of follow-up: <i>Venous ulcer healing:</i> Group I, 24% <i>versus</i> Group II 81.5% ; P=0.0001 <i>Venous ulcer recurrences:</i> Group I, 44.4% <i>versus</i> Group II 0%; P<0.05</p>

<p>Ulcer healing and recurrence according to presence or absence of incompetent perforator after SEPS procedure</p>	<p>van Gent WB, Wittens CHA. Influence of perforating vein surgery in patients with venous ulceration. <i>Phlebology</i> 2015. 30 ;127-132. PMID: 24357450</p>	<p>94 lower limbs with venous ulcer (C6) treated by open surgery for GSV or /and SSV incompetence (54%)+SEPS (100%) + medical compression</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · DS performed at 1 year to assess the presence or the absence of incompetent Pe (missed Pe at SEPS or new incompetent Pe): Group I:= presence of incompetent Pe; and group II= absence of incompetent Pe <p>Follow-up at 1 year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Ulcer healing: 70% in group I vs 70% in group II (P=NS). · Recurrence rate: 30% in group I vs 8% in group II <p>Follow-up at 27 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Recurrence rate: 50% in group I vs 16% in group II (P = 0.007) <p>Conclusion: Ulcer healing was not significantly influenced by the number of remaining incompetent perforators, but ulcer recurrence rate was higher in the failure group (I).</p>
---	--	---

Abbreviations:

CHIVA= Ambulatory Conservative Haemodynamic Management of Varicose Vein; CXVUQ= Charing Cross Venous Ulcer Questionnaire; DS= duplex scanning ; EVLA=endovenous laser ablation; GSV = great saphenous vein ; HRQoL= Health related quality of life; OS= Open surgery: High ligation + Saphenous stripping+/- Perforator ligation +/- tributary phlebectomy; Pe= perforator; SEPS= subfascial endoscopic perforating vein surgery; SF-36= Short form 36 items; SSV= small saphenous veins.