

**Table VI. Open Surgery or EVLA with various phlebectomy procedures
6 articles, 6 RCTs**

Operative procedure	Reference	Summary
Open surgery with various types of tributary phlebectomy	Aremu M, Mahendran B, Butcher W, Khan Z, Colgan MP, Moore J et al. Prospective randomized controlled trial: conventional <i>versus</i> powered phlebectomy. <i>J Vasc Surg.</i> 2004;39:88-94	<p>Monocenter study 141 patients and 188 lower extremities presenting GSV or/and SSV incompetence. No deep vein anomaly. CEAP class 2-3 General anesthesia Group I (n=100): OS with tributary stab avulsion <i>versus</i> Group II (n=88): OS with tributary avulsion using Trivex® Results at 2 to 52 weeks of follow-up: Fewer incisions in group II compared with group I. P<0.0001 No difference between groups in terms of operative time. P =0.16 No difference between groups in terms of patient satisfaction and cosmetic result</p>
	Scavée V, Lesceu O, Theys S et al. Hook phlebectomy <i>versus</i> transilluminated powered phlebectomy for varicose veins surgery. Early	<p>Multi-center study 80 patients presenting VV with GSV reflux. Exclusion criteria; SSV reflux, previous surgery on the same venous territory and</p>

	<p>results. <i>Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.</i> 2003;25: 473-5.</p>	<p>previous DVT CEAP class 2-6 General or spinal anesthesia Group I (n=40): OS with tributary stab avulsion <i>versus</i> Group II (n=40): OS with tributary avulsion using Trivex[®] Results at 6 weeks of follow-up: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Fewer incisions in group II (Trivex[®]) compared with group I. P<0.0001 · More bruising in group II (Trivex[®]) compared with group I. P=0.06 · No difference between groups in terms of postoperative pain, number of complications, residual varices, cosmetic result </p>
	<p>Ray-Chaudury SB, Huq Z, Souter RG, McWhinnie D. A randomized controlled trial comparing transilluminated powered phlebectomy with hook avulsions: an adjunct to day surgery. <i>The Journal of One Day Surgery</i> 2003;13:24-7.</p>	<p>Monocenter study 30 patients (40 LL) presenting VV in GSV or/and SSV territory Exclusion criteria: previous surgery on the same venous territory and deep venous incompetence. CEAP clinical class C 2-C3 Group I (n= 19): OS with tributary stab avulsion <i>versus</i> Group II (n=:21): OS with tributary avulsion using Trivex[®] Post-operative results: No difference in terms of postoperative pain</p>

	<p>Chetter I C, Mylankal K J, Hughes H, Fitridge R. Randomized clinical trial comparing multiple stab incision phlebectomy and transilluminated powered phlebectomy for varicose veins. <i>Br J Surg.</i> 2006;93:169-74.</p>	<p>Multi-center study 62 patients with primary symptomatic VV in GSV territory Exclusion criteria: previous surgery on the same venous territory, SSV incompetence, deep venous anomaly No CEAP class information Group I (n=33): OS with multiple stab incision phlebectomy <i>versus</i> Group II (n=29): OS with transilluminated powered phlebectomy Post-operative results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · No difference in terms of surgery duration · Less incisions in group II compared with group I · More skin bruising and pain in group II compared with group I
	<p>Krasznai AG, Sigterman TA, Willems CE, Dekkers P, Snoeijs MGJ, Wittens CHA et al. Prospective study of a single treatment strategy for local tumescent anesthesia in Muller phlebectomy. <i>Ann Vasc Surg.</i> 2014. DOI10.1016/j.avsg10 .028</p>	<p>Multi-center study 101 patients with GSV or/and SSV incompetence. CEAP classification; C3-4, Ep, As, P r 2-4 All patients scheduled for ambulatory Muller phlebectomy under LA Group I: anesthetic solution Lidocaine 1%+ epinephrine in sodium bicarbonate 1.4% <i>versus</i> Group II: anesthetic solution Lidocaine 1%+ epinephrine in saline 0.9% standard solution. Post-operative results:</p>

		<p>Significantly less pain during injection in group I compared with group II. P <0.01</p> <p>No significant difference between groups in terms of per operative and postoperative pain</p>
<p>Open surgery with different tributary phlebectomy procedures using UGFS Sodium tetra-decyl sulphate Versus Polidocanol</p>	<p>Kushwaha JK, Anand A, Sonkar A A, Gupta R. A study to compare outcomes of Sodium tetra-decyl sulphate and Polidocanol in the treatment of varicosities due to incompetent tributaries of superficial vein of leg: a randomized controlled trial. Int Surgery Journal 2018; 5:3315-19</p>	<p>Monocenter study. 56 symptomatic patients presenting with GSV or/and SSV incompetence were treated by open surgery or EVLA. Incompetent tributaries were treated later by UGFS using STD or POL. CEAP clinical classification C2-C6 Exclusion criteria DVT, congenital or secondary varices Group I: STD (n=26) Group II: POL (n=30) Results Lost to follow-up 6 in each group <u>Post procedure complications.</u> There was no significant difference between the 2 groups in terms of skin necrosis. Conversely Pain and hyperpigmentation were lesser in group II compared to group I. P=0.01 <u>Outcome at 4 weeks</u> Pain was lesser in group II. P=0.01</p>

Abbreviations:

EVLA = endovenous laser ablation; GSV: Great Saphenous Vein; EVLA=endovenous laser ablation LA= local anesthesia; LL=lower limb; OS= Open surgery: High ligation + Saphenous stripping+/- Perforator ligation +/- tributary phlebectomy; ; POL=Polidocanol; STD= sodium tetra-decyl sulphate SSV= small saphenous vein; VV= varicose veins.