## **Table III. Classic open surgery versus cryostripping.** 2 articles, 2 RCTs.

Operative	Reference	Summary
procedure		
Classic open surgery versus cryostripping	Menyhei G, Gyevnar Z, Arato E, Kelemen O, Kollar L. Conventional stripping versus cryostripping: a prospective randomised trial to compare improvement in quality of life and complications. <i>Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.</i> 2008;35:218-23	Monocenter study.  165 patients with GSV incompetence less than 12 mm in diameter No SSV reflux. No data on deep vein.  CEAP clinical classification C2-C4S in the lower limb treated.  Spinal or general anesthesia. No complementary VV phlebectomy at thigh in both groups.  Group I (n=86): OS  versus  Group II (n=79): HL+ cryostripping  Post-operative course:  No difference between group I and II in terms of pain  Less bruising in group II compared with group I. P=0.01  Results at 6 months of follow-up:  No difference between group I and II in terms of clinical results.
	Klem TMAL, Schnater JM, Schütte PR, Hop W, van der Ham AC, Wittens CHA. A randomized trial of cryostripping versus conventional stripping of the great saphenous vein. <i>J Vasc Sur</i> g. 2009;49:403-409	Multi-center study.  494 patients with GSV incompetence. No SSV reflux, no deep vein obstruction. CEAP clinical classification C2-C4S in the lower limb treated. Group I (n=245): OS versus Group II (n=249): HL+ cryostripping Post-operative course Median operation time was significantly shorter in group II. Results at 6 months of follow-up: The percentage of patients with residual GSV at 6 months (primary outcome) was better ingroup I. P < .001. The AVVQ showed small but significantly better results in group I

	·

## Abbreviations:

AVVQ Aberdeen varicose vein questionnaire; GSV=Great saphenous vein; HL= High ligation; OS= Open surgery: High ligation + Saphenous stripping+/ - Perforator ligation +/ - Tributary phlebectomy below the knee; SSV =small saphenous vein; VV= varicose veins