Medical Policy

BlueCross BlueShield Kansas
An Independent licensee of the
Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Title: Varicose Veins

Professional / Institutional
Original Effective Date: January 1, 2004 / April 22, 2009
Latest Review Date: July 14, 2026
Current Effective Date: September 13, 2019

State and Federal mandates and health plan member contract language, including specific provisions/exclusions, take precedence over Medical Policy and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage. To verify a member's benefits, contact Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Customer Service.

The BCBSKS Medical Policies contained herein are for informational purposes and apply only to members who have health insurance through BCBSKS or who are covered by a self-insured group plan administered by BCBSKS. Medical Policy for FEP members is subject to FEP medical policy which may differ from BCBSKS Medical Policy.

The medical policies do not constitute medical advice or medical care. Treating health care providers are independent contractors and are neither employees nor agents of Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas and are solely responsible for diagnosis, treatment and medical advice.

If your patient is covered under a different Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan, please refer to the Medical Policies of that plan.

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: • With varicose veins/venous insufficiency and saphenous vein reflux	Interventions of interest are: • Endovenous thermal ablation (radiofrequency or laser)	Comparators of interest are: • Conservative therapy • Ligation and stripping	Relevant outcomes include: • Symptoms • Change in disease status • Morbid events • Quality of life • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With varicose veins/venous insufficiency and saphenous vein reflux	Interventions of interest are: • Microfoam sclerotherapy	Comparators of interest are: • Conservative therapy • Ligation and stripping • Endovenous radiofrequency or laser ablation	Relevant outcomes include: • Symptoms • Change in disease status • Morbid events • Quality of life • Treatment-related morbidity

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: • With varicose veins/venous insufficiency and saphenous vein reflux	Interventions of interest are: • Mechanochemical ablation	Comparators of interest are: • Conservative therapy • Ligation and stripping • Endovenous radiofrequency or laser ablation • Microfoam sclerotherapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Symptoms • Change in disease status • Morbid events • Quality of life • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With varicose veins/venous insufficiency and saphenous vein reflux	Interventions of interest are: • Cyanoacrylate adhesive	Comparators of interest are: • Conservative therapy • Ligation and stripping • Endovenous radiofrequency or laser ablation	Relevant outcomes include: • Symptoms • Change in disease status • Morbid events • Quality of life • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With varicose veins/venous insufficiency and saphenous vein reflux	Interventions of interest are: • Cryoablation	Comparators of interest are: • Conservative therapy • Ligation and stripping • Endovenous radiofrequency or laser ablation	Relevant outcomes include: • Symptoms • Change in disease status • Morbid events • Quality of life • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With varicose tributary veins	Interventions of interest are: • Ablation (stab avulsion, sclerotherapy, or phlebectomy) of tributary veins	Comparators of interest are: • Conservative therapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Symptoms • Change in disease status • Morbid events • Quality of life • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With perforator vein reflux	Interventions of interest are: • Ablation (e.g., subfascial endoscopic perforator surgery) of perforator veins	Comparators of interest are: • Conservative therapy	Relevant outcomes include: • Symptoms • Change in disease status • Morbid events • Quality of life • Treatment-related morbidity

DESCRIPTION

A variety of treatment modalities are available to treat varicose veins/venous insufficiency, including surgery, thermal ablation, sclerotherapy, mechanochemical ablation (MOCA), cyanoacrylate adhesive (CAC), and cryotherapy. The application of each modality is influenced by the severity of the symptoms, type of vein, source of venous reflux, and the use of other (prior or concurrent) treatment.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this evidence review is to evaluate whether the use of ablative, chemical, and adhesive technologies to treat varicose veins/venous insufficiency arising from reflux in the saphenous, tributary, and perforator veins improves net health outcomes.

BACKGROUND

Venous Reflux/Venous Insufficiency

The venous system of the lower extremities consists of the superficial veins (this includes the great and small saphenous and accessory, or duplicate, veins that travel in parallel with the great and small saphenous veins), the deep system (popliteal and femoral veins), and perforator veins that cross through the fascia and connect the deep and superficial systems. One-way valves are present within all veins to direct the return of blood up the lower limb. Because the venous pressure in the deep system is generally greater than that of the superficial system, valve incompetence at any level may lead to backflow (venous reflux) with pooling of blood in superficial veins. Varicose veins with visible varicosities may be the only sign of venous reflux, although itching, heaviness, tension, and pain may also occur. Chronic venous insufficiency secondary to venous reflux can lead to thrombophlebitis, leg ulcerations, and hemorrhage. The CEAP classification of venous disease considers the clinical, etiologic, anatomic, and pathologic characteristics of venous insufficiency, ranging from class 0 (no visible sign of disease) to class 6 (active ulceration).

Treatment of Saphenous Veins and Tributaries

Saphenous veins include the great and small saphenous and accessory saphenous veins that travel in parallel with the great or small saphenous veins. Tributaries are veins that empty into a larger vein. Treatment of venous reflux has traditionally included the following:

- Identification by preoperative Doppler ultrasonography of the valvular incompetence.
- Control of the most proximal point of reflux, traditionally by suture ligation of the incompetent saphenofemoral or saphenopopliteal junction.
- Removal of the superficial vein from circulation, eg, by stripping of the great and/or small saphenous veins.
- Removal of varicose tributaries (at the time of the initial treatment or subsequently) by stab avulsion (phlebectomy) or injection sclerotherapy.

Minimally invasive alternatives to ligation and stripping have been investigated. These include forms of sclerotherapy, cyanocrylate adhesive, and thermal ablation using cryotherapy, high-frequency radio waves (200 to 300 kHz), or laser energy.

Thermal Ablation

Radiofrequency ablation (RFA) is performed using a specially designed catheter inserted through a small incision in the distal medial thigh to within 1 to 2 cm of the saphenofemoral junction. The catheter is slowly withdrawn, closing the vein. Laser ablation is performed similarly. A laser fiber is introduced into the great saphenous vein under ultrasound guidance. The laser is then activated and slowly removed, along the course of the saphenous vein. Cryoablation uses extreme cold. The objective of endovenous techniques is to injure the vessel, causing retraction and subsequent fibrotic occlusion of the vein. Technical developments since thermal ablation

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

procedures were initially introduced include the use of perivenous tumescent anesthesia, which allows successful treatment of veins larger than 12 mm in diameter and helps to protect adjacent tissue from thermal damage during treatment of the small saphenous vein.

Sclerotherapy
The objective of sclerotherapy is to destroy the endothelium of the target vessel by injecting an irritant solution (either a detergent, osmotic solution, or chemical irritant), ultimately occluding the vessel. Treatment success depends on accurate injection of the vessel, an adequate injectate volume and concentration of sclerosant, and compression. Historically, larger veins and very tortuous veins were not considered good candidates for sclerotherapy due to technical limitations. Technical improvements in sclerotherapy have included the routine use of Duplex ultrasound to target refluxing vessels, luminal compression of the vein with anesthetics, and a foam/sclerosant injectate in place of liquid sclerosant. Foam sclerosants are produced by forcibly mixing a gas (eg, air or carbon dioxide) with a liquid sclerosant (eg, polidocanol or sodium tetradecyl sulfate). Physician-compounded foam is produced at the time of treatment. A commercially available microfoam sclerosant with a proprietary gas mix is available and is proposed to provide a smaller and more consistent bubble size than what is produced with physician-compounded sclerosant foam.

Endovenous Mechanochemical Ablation
Endovenous mechanochemical ablation uses both sclerotherapy and mechanical damage to the lumen. Following ultrasound imaging, a disposable catheter with a motor drive is inserted into the distal end of the target vein and advanced to the saphenofemoral junction. As the catheter is pulled back, a wire rotates at 3500 rpm within the lumen of the vein, abrading the lumen. At the same time, a liquid sclerosant (sodium tetradecyl sulfate) is infused near the rotating wire. It is proposed that mechanical ablation allows for better efficacy of the sclerosant, and results in less pain and risk of nerve injury without the need for the tumescent anesthesia used with endovenous thermal ablation techniques (RFA, endovenous laser ablation).

Cyanoacrylate Adhesive
A cyanoacrylate adhesive is a clear, free-flowing liquid that polymerizes in the vessel via an anionic mechanism (ie, polymerizes into a solid material on contact with body fluids or tissue). The adhesive is gradually injected along the length of the vein in conjunction with ultrasound and manual compression. The acute coaptation halts blood flow through the vein until the implanted adhesive becomes fibrotically encapsulated and establishes chronic occlusion of the treated vein. Cyanoacrylate glue has been used as a surgical adhesive and sealant for a variety of indications, including gastrointestinal bleeding, embolization of brain arteriovenous malformations, and surgical incisions or other skin wounds.

Transilluminated Powered Phlebectomy
Transilluminated powered phlebectomy is an alternative to stab avulsion and hook phlebectomy. This procedure uses 2 instruments: an illuminator, which also provides irrigation, and a resector, which has an oscillating tip and suction pump. Following removal of the saphenous vein, the illuminator is introduced via a small incision in the skin and tumescence solution (anesthetic and epinephrine) is infiltrated along the course of varicosity. The resector is then inserted under the skin from the opposite direction, and the oscillating tip is placed directly beneath the illuminated veins to fragment and loosen the veins from the supporting tissue. Irrigation from the illuminator is used to clear the vein fragments and blood through aspiration and additional drainage holes.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

The illuminator and resector tips may then be repositioned, thereby reducing the number of incisions needed when compared with stab avulsion or hook phlebectomy. It has been proposed that transilluminated powered phlebectomy might decrease surgical time, decrease complications such as bruising, and lead to a faster recovery than established procedures.

REGULATORY STATUS

In 2015, the VenaSeal™ Closure System (Medtronic) was approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through the premarket approval (P140018) process for the permanent closure of clinically significant venous reflux through endovascular embolization with coaptation. The VenaSeal Closure System seals the vein using a cyanoacrylate adhesive agent. FDA product code: PJQ.

In 2013, Varithena® (formerly Varisolve), a sclerosant microfoam made with a proprietary gas mix, was approved by the FDA under a new drug application (205-098) for the treatment of incompetent great saphenous veins, accessory saphenous veins, and visible varicosities of the great saphenous vein system above and below the knee.

The following devices were cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process for endovenous treatment of superficial vein reflux:

In 1999, the VNUS Closure® System, a radiofrequency device, was cleared by the FDA through the 510(k) process for "endovascular coagulation of blood vessels in patients with superficial vein reflux." In 2005, the VNUS RFS® and RFS*Flex®* devices were cleared by the FDA for "use in vessel and tissue coagulation including treatment of incompetent (ie, refluxing) perforator and tributary veins." In 2008, the modified VNUS ClosureFast® Intravascular Catheter was cleared by the FDA through the 510(k) process. FDA product code: GEI.

In 2002, the Diomed 810 nm surgical laser and EVLT® (endovenous laser therapy) procedure kit were cleared by the FDA through the 510(k) process ".....for use in the endovascular coagulation of the great saphenous vein of the thigh in patients with superficial vein reflux." FDA product code: GEX.

In 2005, a modified Erbe Erbokryo cryosurgical unit (Erbe USA) was approved by the FDA for marketing through the 510(k) process. A variety of clinical indications are listed, including cryostripping of varicose veins of the lower limbs. FDA product code: GEH.

In 2003, the Trivex system (InaVein), a device for transilluminated powered phlebectomy, was cleared by the FDA through the 510(k) process for "ambulatory phlebectomy procedures for the resection and ablation of varicose veins." FDA product code: DNQ.

In 2008, the ClariVein® Infusion Catheter (Merit Medical) was cleared by the FDA through the 510(k) process (K071468) for mechanochemical ablation. The FDA determined that this device was substantially equivalent to the Trellis Infusion System (K013635) and the Slip-Cath Infusion Catheter (K882796). The system includes an infusion catheter, motor drive, stopcock, and syringe, and is intended for the infusion of physician-specified agents in the peripheral vasculature. FDA product code: KRA

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

POLICY

A. **SAPHENOUS VEINS - Great or Small Saphenous Veins**

1. Treatment of the great or small saphenous veins by surgery (ligation and stripping) endovenous thermal ablation (radiofrequency or laser), or microfoam sclerotherapy may be considered **medically necessary** for symptomatic varicose veins / venous insufficiency when all the following criteria have been met:
   a. There is demonstrated saphenous reflux and CEAP [Clinical, Etiology, Anatomy, Pathophysiology], class C2 or greater
      AND
   b. There is documentation of 1 or more of the following indications:
      I Ulceration secondary to venous stasis
      OR
      II Recurrent superficial thrombophlebitis
      OR
      III Hemorrhage or recurrent bleeding episodes from a ruptured superficial varicosity
      OR
      IV **All** of the following:
         i. Persistent pain, swelling, itching, burning, or other symptoms associated with saphenous reflux
         AND
         ii. The symptoms significantly interfere with activities of daily living
         AND
         iii. Conservative management including compression therapy for at least 3 months has not improved the symptoms

2. Treatment of great or small saphenous veins by surgery, endovenous thermal ablation (radiofrequency or laser), or microfoam sclerotherapy that does not meet the criteria described above is considered **not medically necessary.**

3. Treatment of the great or small saphenous veins by cyanoacrylate adhesive is considered **not medically necessary** for symptomatic varicose veins / venous insufficiency (see Policy Guideline A).

4. Treatment of varicose veins for cosmetic purposes is **not covered**.

B. **ACCESSORY SAPHENOUS VEINS**

1. Treatment of accessory saphenous veins by surgery (ligation and stripping), endovenous thermal ablation (radiofrequency or laser) or microfoam sclerotherapy may be considered **medically necessary** for symptomatic varicose veins / venous insufficiency when all the following criteria have been met:
   a. One of the following:
      I. Incompetence of the accessory saphenous vein, when documentation of the anatomy supports the reflux is isolated
      OR
      II. The great or small saphenous veins had been previously eliminated (at least 3 months)

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

AND

b. There is demonstrated accessory saphenous reflux
AND
c. There is documentation of 1 or more of the following indications:
I. Ulceration secondary to venous stasis
OR
II. Recurrent superficial thrombophlebitis
OR
III. Hemorrhage or recurrent bleeding episodes from a ruptured superficial varicosity
OR
IV. All of the following:
- Persistent pain, swelling, itching, burning, or other symptoms associated with saphenous reflux
AND
- The symptoms significantly interfere with activities of daily living
AND
- Conservative management including compression therapy for at least 3 months has not improved the symptoms

2. Treatment of accessory saphenous veins by surgery, endovenous thermal ablation (radiofrequency or laser), or microfoam sclerotherapy that do not meet the criteria described above is considered **not medically necessary**.

3. Treatment of accessory saphenous veins by cyanoacrylate adhesive is considered **not medically necessary** for symptomatic varicose veins / venous insufficiency (see Policy Guideline A).

4. Treatment of varicose veins for cosmetic purposes is **not covered**.

C. **SYMPTOMATIC VARICOSE TRIBUTARIES**

1. When physical findings support medical necessity; the following treatments are considered **medically necessary** as a component of the treatment of symptomatic varicose tributaries (none of these techniques has been shown to be superior to another):
a. Stab avulsion
b. Hook phlebectomy
c. Sclerotherapy
d. Transilluminated powered phlebectomy

2. The sole treatment of varicose vein tributaries in the presence of saphenofemoral or saphenopopliteal reflux is considered **not medically necessary**.

3. Treatment of tributary veins less than 3 mm is considered **cosmetic and not covered.**

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

D. **PERFORATOR VEINS**

1. Surgical ligation (including subfascial endoscopic perforator surgery) or endovenous thermal ablation (radiofrequency or laser) of incompetent perforator veins may be considered **medically necessary** as a treatment of leg ulcers associated with chronic venous insufficiency when all the following conditions have been met:
   a. There is demonstrated perforator reflux
      AND
   b. The superficial saphenous veins (great, small, or accessory saphenous and symptomatic varicose tributaries) have been previously eliminated
      AND
   c. Ulcers have not resolved following combined superficial vein treatment and compression therapy for at least 3 months
      AND
   d. The venous insufficiency is not secondary to deep venous thromboembolism

2. Treatment of incompetent perforator veins without refractory stasis ulceration is considered **not medically necessary**.

3. Ligation or ablation of incompetent perforator veins performed concurrently with superficial venous surgery is **not medically necessary**.

E. **TELANGIECTASIA**

Treatment of telangiectasia such as spider veins, angiomata, and hemangiomata is considered **cosmetic and not covered**.

F. **OTHER VEINS**

1. Techniques for conditions not specifically listed above are **experimental / investigational** including, but not limited to:
   a. Sclerotherapy techniques, other than microfoam sclerotherapy, of great, small, or accessory saphenous veins
   b. Sclerotherapy of perforator veins
   c. Sclerotherapy of isolated tributary veins without prior or concurrent treatment of saphenous veins
   d. Stab avulsion, hook phlebectomy, or transilluminated powered phlebectomy of perforator, great or small saphenous, or accessory saphenous veins.
   e. Endovenous radiofrequency or laser ablation of tributary veins
   f. Mechanochemical ablation of any vein
   g. Endovenous cryoablation of any vein

POLICY GUIDELINES

A. For a service to be considered medically necessary, it should not be more costly than an alternative service or supply or sequence of services at least as likely to produce equivalent therapeutic or diagnostic results for the illness, injury, or disease.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

B. The standard classification of venous disease is the CEAP (Clinical, Etiologic, Anatomic, Pathophysiologic) classification system. Table PG1 provides is the Clinical portion of the CEAP.

Table PG1. Clinical Portion of the CEAP Classification System

Class	Definition
C_0	No visible or palpable signs of venous disease
C_1	Telangiectasies or reticular veins
C_2	Varicose veins
C_{2r}	Recurrent varicose veins
C_3	Edema
C_4	Changes in skin and subcutaneous tissue secondary to CVD
C_{4a}	Pigmentation and eczema
C_{4b}	Lipodermatosclerosis or atrophie blanche
C_{4C}	Corona phlebectatica
C_5	Healed
C_6	Active venous ulcer
C_{6r}	Recurrent active venous ulcer
S	Symptomatic
A	Asymptomatic

Adapted from: https://www.jvsvenous.org/article/S2213-333X(20)30063-9/pdf
CVD, Chronic venous disease. Each clinical class sub characterized by a subscript indicating the presence (symptomatic, s) or absence (asymptomatic, a) of symptoms attributable to venous disease.
CEAP: Clinical, Etiologic, Anatomic, Pathophysiologic classification system.

C. A clear and complete description of the physical exam of the lower extremities that documents the medical necessity of treatment for venous insufficiency for medical, not cosmetic purposes, is required. Physical findings that support medically significant venous hypertension must be clearly documented. Treatment of varicose veins for cosmetic purposes is **not covered**. Photographs may be requested.

D. Up to 20 injections in each leg may be treated in any one session and up to 3 sclerotherapy sessions for each leg may be considered medically necessary if selection criteria are met.

E. Patients with combined deep and superficial venous insufficiency are often not good candidates for ablation therapy. Varicose vein recurrence and ulcer recurrence rates following intervention are much higher. However, deep vein insufficiency is not a contraindication to superficial vein treatment.

F. It should be noted that the bulk of the literature discussing the role of ultrasound guidance refers to sclerotherapy of the saphenous vein, as opposed to the varicose tributaries. When

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

ultrasound guidance is used to guide sclerotherapy of the varicose tributaries, it would be considered either not medically necessary or incidental to the injection procedure.

Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

RATIONALE

This evidence review was created using searches of the PubMed database. The most recent literature update was performed through March 23, 2026.

Evidence reviews assess the clinical evidence to determine whether the use of technology improves the net health outcome. Broadly defined, health outcomes are the length of life, quality of life, and ability to function including benefits and harms. Every clinical condition has specific outcomes that are important to patients and managing the course of that condition. Validated outcome measures are necessary to ascertain whether a condition improves or worsens; and whether the magnitude of that change is clinically significant. The net health outcome is a balance of benefits and harms.

To assess whether the evidence is sufficient to draw conclusions about the net health outcome of technology, 2 domains are examined: the relevance, and quality and credibility. To be relevant, studies must represent 1 or more intended clinical use of the technology in the intended population and compare an effective and appropriate alternative at a comparable intensity. For some conditions, the alternative will be supportive care or surveillance. The quality and credibility of the evidence depend on study design and conduct, minimizing bias and confounding that can generate incorrect findings. The randomized controlled trial (RCT) is preferred to assess efficacy; however, in some circumstances, nonrandomized studies may be adequate. Randomized controlled trials are rarely large enough or long enough to capture less common adverse events and long-term effects. Other types of studies can be used for these purposes and to assess generalizability to broader clinical populations and settings of clinical practice.

TREATMENT OF SAPHENOUS VEINS

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

Treatment of venous reflux/venous insufficiency seeks to reduce abnormal pressure transmission from the deep to the superficial veins. Conservative medical treatment consists of elevation of the extremities, graded compression, and wound care when indicated. Conventional surgical treatment consists of identifying and correcting the site of reflux by ligation of the incompetent junction followed by stripping of the vein to redirect venous flow through veins with intact valves. While most venous reflux is secondary to incompetent valves at the saphenofemoral or saphenopopliteal junctions, reflux may also occur at incompetent valves in the perforator veins or the deep venous system. The competence of any single valve is not static and may be pressure-dependent. For example, accessory saphenous veins may have independent saphenofemoral or saphenopopliteal junctions that become incompetent when the great or small saphenous veins are eliminated, and blood flow is diverted through the accessory veins.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

The following section addresses the efficacy of the conventional treatments, specifically on the appropriate length of a trial of compression therapy and evaluation of recurrence rates for surgical treatment (ie, ligation and stripping) compared with compression therapy.

Compression Therapy

A Cochrane review by O'Meara et al (2009) evaluating compression for venous leg ulcers included 39 RCTs with 47 different comparisons.[1,] This review was updated in 2012 and included 48 RCTs with 59 different comparisons.[2,] Most RCTs were small. Measures of healing were the time to complete healing, the proportion of ulcers healed within the trial period (typically 12 weeks), the change in ulcer size, and the rate of change in ulcer size. Evidence from 8 trials indicated that venous ulcers healed more rapidly with compression than without. Findings suggested that multicomponent systems (bandages or stockings) were more effective than single-component compression. Also, multicomponent systems containing an elastic bandage appeared more effective than those composed mainly of inelastic constituents. Although these meta-analyses did not include time to healing, studies included in the review reported that the mean time to ulcer healing was approximately 2 months, while the median time to healing in other reports was 3 to 5 months.

A Cochrane review by Knight Nee Shingler et al (2021) assessed compression stockings as an initial treatment for varicose veins in patients without venous ulceration.[3,] This is the second update of a review first published in 2011. Thirteen studies involving 1021 participants with varicose veins without healed or active venous ulceration (CEAP [Clinical, Etiology, Anatomy, Pathophysiology] class C2 to C4) were selected. Compression ranged from 10 to 50 mmHg among studies. Studies could not be pooled for analysis due to heterogeneity in outcomes and method of assessment leading to a low or very low certainty of evidence. Using compression stockings compared to no treatment or placebo stockings led to subjective improvement in symptoms but this finding could be biased because the change in symptoms was not compared to the control arm in all studies. Studies that compared different compression stockings also found subjective improvement in symptoms from baseline to the end of the study, but the change in symptoms was not always compared between groups. The authors were unable to make conclusions about the optimal stocking pressure or length of stocking exposure from the included studies. Reviewers concluded that there was insufficient high-quality evidence to determine whether compression stockings were effective as the sole and initial treatment of varicose veins in patients without venous ulceration, or whether any type of stocking was superior to another type.

Ligation and Stripping

Systematic literature reviews have indicated a similar healing rate of venous ulcers with superficial vein surgery and conservative compression treatments but a reduction in ulcer recurrence rate with surgery.[4,5,] In general, recurrence rates after ligation and stripping are estimated at 20% in short-term follow-up. Jones et al (1996) reported on the results of a trial that randomized 100 patients with varicose veins to ligation alone or ligation plus stripping.[6,] At 1 year, reflux was detected in 9% of patients, rising to 26% at 2 years. Rutgers and Kitslaar (1994) reported on the results of a trial that randomized 181 limbs to ligation and stripping or to ligation plus sclerotherapy.[7,] At 2 years, Doppler ultrasound demonstrated reflux in approximately 10% of patients after ligation and stripping, increasing to 15% at 3 years.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Alternatives to Ligation and Stripping
The purpose of endovenous thermal ablation (radiofrequency or laser), microfoam sclerotherapy, mechanochemical ablation (MOCA), cyanoacrylate adhesive (CAC), or cryoablation in individuals who have varicose veins/venous insufficiency and saphenous vein reflux is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing treatments.

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Populations
The relevant populations of interest are those who have varicose veins/venous insufficiency and saphenous vein reflux.

Interventions
The therapies being considered are endovenous thermal ablation (radiofrequency or laser), microfoam sclerotherapy, MOCA, CAC, or cryoablation.

Comparators
Established treatments for varicose veins/venous insufficiency and saphenofemoral junction reflux are conservative therapy with compression bandages and ligation and stripping, with which the endovenous thermal procedures are compared. The less invasive endovenous thermal ablation (radiofrequency or laser) have become the standard treatments by which the newer treatments are compared. Endovenous thermal ablation techniques require tumescent anesthesia, which involves multiple injections along the vein and is associated with moderate pain. Compression stockings and avoidance of strenuous activities are recommended. Procedures that have more recently been developed (MOCA, CAC, and cryotherapy) do not require tumescent anesthesia and are compared with thermal ablation procedures.

Outcomes
Outcomes of interest for venous interventions include healing and recurrence, recanalization of the vein, and neovascularization. Recanalization is the restoration of the lumen of a vein after it has been occluded; this occurs more frequently following treatment with endovenous techniques. Neovascularization is the proliferation of new blood vessels in tissue and occurs more frequently following vein stripping. Direct comparisons of the durability of endovenous and surgical procedures are complicated by these mechanisms of recurrence. Relevant safety outcomes include the incidence of paresthesia, thermal skin injury, thrombus formation, thrombophlebitis, wound infection, and transient neurologic effects.

Specific measures may include the visual analog score (VAS) for pain, the Venous Clinical Severity Score (VCSS), and the Aberdeen Varicose Veins Questionnaire (AVVQ). AVVQ scores range from 0 to 100 (worst possible quality of life). Follow-up at 1 and 2 years from RCTs is of interest to monitor treatment success (vein occlusion and recanalization), with follow-up to 5 years to assess the durability of treatment.

Study Selection Criteria
Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs;

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies;
- To assess long-term outcomes and adverse effects, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow up and/or larger populations were sought;
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

REVIEW OF EVIDENCE

TREATMENT OF SAPHENOUS VEINS: ENDOVENOUS THERMAL ABLATION (LASER OR RADIOFREQUENCY)

Systematic Reviews

Farah et al (2022) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis that informed the 2022 mutiorganization guideline on management of varicose veins.[8,] The review addressed 3 key questions related to treatment: whether there is a benefit of surgical stripping versus endovenous ablation, whether there is a benefit of thermal versus nonthermal ablation techniques, and whether ablation of incompetent perforator veins improves outcomes. Multiple outcomes of interest were assessed at various time points for each question. For the first key question, an analysis of 30 RCTs and 16 observational studies found few studies that reported the outcomes of interest at each time point (between 1 month and 5 years), but anatomic closure was better with surgical stripping compared to endovenous ablation techniques. Analysis for the second question included 16 RCTs and 11 observational studies, few of which included the outcomes of interest at the time points of interest. Overall, endovenous laser ablation resulted in higher rates of anatomical closure at 1 year and 5 years versus nonthermal ablation techniques.

A Cochrane review by Whing et al (2021) compared interventions for great saphenous vein incompetence.[9,] The review included 24 RCTs (N=5135) and the duration of follow-up for included trials ranged from 5 weeks to 8 years. When comparing endovenous laser ablation to ligation and stripping, pooled data from 6 RCTs (n=1051) suggest that technical success may be better with endovenous laser ablation up to 5 years (odds ratio [OR], 2.31; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.27 to 4.23; low-certainty evidence), but not at 5 years and beyond based on data from 5 RCTs (n=874). The risk of recurrence is similar between treatments within 3 years and at 5 years based on data from 7 RCTs each (n=1459 and n=1267, respectively). When comparing radiofrequency ablation (RFA) to ligation and stripping, data from 2 RCTs (n=318) suggest that there is no significant difference in the rate of technical success up to 5 years; data from 1 RCT (n=289) with duration over 5 years also suggest no significant difference between treatments. Based on data from 4 RCTs (n=546), there is no significant difference in the risk of recurrence up to 3 years; but based on 1 trial (n=289), a possible long-term benefit for RFA is observed (OR, 0.41; 95% CI, 0.22 to 0.75; low-certainty evidence). When comparing endovenous laser ablation with RFA, technical success is comparable up to 5 years and over 5 years. Based on data from 1 study (n=291), there is no significant difference in the risk of recurrence between treatments at 3 years, but a benefit for RFA over endovenous laser ablation may be seen at 5 years (OR, 2.77; 95% CI, 1.52 to 5.06).

A Cochrane review by Paravastu et al (2016) compared endovenous laser ablation or RFA with surgical repair for small saphenous veins with reflux at the saphenopopliteal junction.[10,] Three RCTs identified compared endovenous laser ablation with surgery. There was moderate-quality

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

evidence that recanalization or persistence of reflux at 6 weeks occurred less frequently after endovenous laser ablation than after surgery (OR, 0.07; 95% CI, 0.02 to 0.22), and low-quality evidence that recurrence of reflux was lower after endovenous laser ablation at 1 year (OR, 0.24; 95% CI, 0.07 to 0.77).

Randomized Controlled Trials

The largest RCT was reported by Brittenden et al (2014) and compared foam sclerotherapy, endovenous laser ablation, and surgical treatment in 798 patients.[11,] The trial was funded by the U.K.'s National Institute for Health Research. Veins greater than 15 mm in diameter were excluded from the trial. At the 6-week follow-up visit, patients assigned to treatment with foam or laser had the option of treatment with foam for any residual varicosities. This optional treatment was performed in 38% of patients in the foam group and 31% of patients in the endovenous laser ablation group. Disease-specific quality of life was similar for the laser and surgery groups. The frequency of procedural complications was similar for the foam sclerotherapy (6%) and surgery (7%) groups but was lower for the laser group (1%).

The 2012 Randomized Study Comparing Endovenous Laser Ablation with Crossectomy and Stripping of the Great Saphenous Vein (RELACS) study randomized 400 patients to endovenous laser ablation performed by a surgeon at 1 site or to ligation and stripping performed by a different surgeon at a second location.[12,] At 2-year follow-up, there were no significant differences between groups for clinically recurrent varicose veins, medical condition measured on the Homburg Varicose Vein Severity Score, or disease-related quality of life. Saphenofemoral reflux was detected by ultrasonography more frequently after endovenous laser treatment (17.8% vs. 1.3%). The follow-up rate at 5 years was 81%.[13,] Same-site recurrences were more frequent in the endovenous laser ablation group (18% with endovenous laser ablation vs. 5% with surgery ; p=.002), but different-site recurrences were more frequent in the surgically treated group (50% with surgery vs. 31% with endovenous laser ablation; p=.002). Overall, there was no significant difference in recurrence rates between groups. There were also no significant differences between groups in disease severity or quality of life at 5 years.

Christenson et al (2010) compared endovenous laser ablation with ligation and stripping in 200 limbs (100 in each group).[14,] At 1-year follow-up, 98% of the limbs were reported to be free of symptoms. At 2-year follow-up, the endovenous laser ablation group had 2 veins completely reopened and 5 partially reopened, which was significantly greater than in the ligation and stripping group. In the 2013 Comparative Study of the Treatment of Insufficient Greater Saphenous Vein: Surgery vs Ultrasound Guided Sclerotherapy With Foam and Endovenous Laser Therapy (MAGNA) trial, 223 consecutive patients (240 legs) with great saphenous vein reflux were randomized to endovenous laser ablation, ligation and stripping, or foam sclerotherapy.[15,] At 1-year follow-up, the anatomic success rates were similar for endovenous laser ablation (88.5%) and stripping (88.2%), which were both superior to foam sclerotherapy (72.2%). Ten percent of the stripping group showed neovascularization. At 5 years, health-related quality of life and CEAP classification improved in all groups with no significant differences among them.[16,] Grade I neovascularization was higher in the conventional surgery group (27% vs. 3%; p<.001), while grade II neovascularization did not differ significantly between surgical (17%) and endovenous laser ablation (13%) groups.

Wallace et al (2018) published the 5-year outcomes of an RCT consisting of endovenous laser ablation compared with conventional surgery as treatments for symptomatic great saphenous

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

varicose veins.[17,] Data from 218 patients were available at the 5-year follow-up. The clinical recurrence rate was 34.4% for the surgery group and 20.9% for endovenous laser ablation (p=.010). Patients' quality of life, assessed using EuroQol Five Dimensions (EQ-5D) and AVVQ, was significantly improved from baseline for both surgery (EQ-5D: 0.859 to 1.0, p=.002; AVVQ: 13.69 to 4.59, p<.001) and endovenous laser ablation (EQ-5D: 0.808 to 1.0, p=.002; AVVQ: 12.73 to 3.35, p<.001). Technical success assessed by duplex ultrasound examination was 85.4% for surgery and 93.2% for endovenous laser ablation (p=.074).

Tables 1 and 2 provide a summary of key characteristics and results, respectively, of these RCTs. The primary limitation of all studies was a lack of blinding.

Table 1. Summary of Key RCT Characteristics

Study; Trial	Countries	Sites	Dates	Participants	Interventions	
					Active	**Comparator**
Brittenden et al (2014)[11,]	UK	11	2008-2012	Individuals with primary varicose veins	Foam sclero-therapy (n=286) or endovenous laser ablation (n=210)	Surgical treatment (n=289)
Rass et al (2012);[12,] RELACS	US	2	2004-2007	Individuals with great saphenous vein insufficiency	Endovenous laser ablation (n=185)	Surgical treatment (n=161)
Wallace et al (2018)[17,]	UK	1	2004-2009[1]	Individuals with great saphenous vein insufficiency	Endovenous laser ablation (n=108)	Surgical treatment (n=110)

RCT: randomized controlled trial.
[1] Date of original intervention study

Table 2. Summary of Key RCT Results

Study	AVVQ Score at Baseline; 6 Months	Frequency of Procedural Complications	Rate of Same-Site Recurrence	Clinically Recurrent Varicose Veins	AVVQ Score at Baseline; 5 years
Brittenden et al (2014)[11,]					
Foam	17.69.9; 9.17.9	6%			
Laser	17.89.1; 7.98.4	1%			
Surgery	18.29.1; 7.87.5	7%			
p-value		<.001			
Rass et al (2012);[12,] RELACS					

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Study	AVVQ Score at Baseline; 6 Months	Frequency of Procedural Complications	Rate of Same-Site Recurrence	Clinically Recurrent Varicose Veins	AVVQ Score at Baseline; 5 years
Laser			18%	16.2%	
Surgery			5%	23.1%	
p-value			.002	.15	
Wallace et al (2018)[17,]					
Laser				20.9%	13.69; 4.59
Surgery				34.3%	12.73; 3.35
p-value				.010	<.001

AVVQ: Aberdeen Varicose Veins Questionnaire; RELACS: Randomized Study Comparing Endovenous Laser Ablation with Crossectomy and Stripping of the Great Saphenous Vein; RCT: randomized controlled trial.

The literature on the isolated treatment of the anterior accessory saphenous vein is relatively limited. A systematic review by Alozai et al (2021) identified 16 studies that evaluated treatment modalities for anterior accessory saphenous vein incompetence.[18,] All included studies were of moderate to poor quality. The pooled anatomic success rates were 91.8% after endovenous laser ablation and RFA (n=11 studies), 93.6% after CAC (n=3 studies), and 79.8% after sclerotherapy (n=2 studies).

Subsection Summary: Endovenous Thermal Ablation (Laser or Radiofrequency)
There are multiple large RCTs and systematic reviews of RCTs assessing endovenous ablation using radiofrequency or laser energy of the saphenous veins. Comparison with ligation and stripping at 2- to 5-year follow-up has indicated similar recurrence rates for the different treatments. Evidence has suggested that ligation and stripping may lead to neovascularization, while thermal ablation may lead to recanalization, resulting in similar outcomes for endovenous thermal ablation and surgery. Laser ablation and RFA have similar success rates.

TREATMENT OF SAPHENOUS VEINS: SCLEROTHERAPY

Systematic Reviews

A Cochrane review by Whing et al (2021) that compared interventions for great saphenous vein incompetence was introduced above.[9,] Based on pooled data from 4 RCTs (n=954), ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy was inferior to ligation and stripping for technical success up to 5 years (OR, 0.32; 95% CI, 0.11 to 0.94; low-certainty evidence), and beyond 5 years based on 3 RCTs (n=525)(OR, 0.09; 95% CI, 0.03 to 0.30; moderate-certainty evidence). There was no significant difference between treatments for recurrence up to 3 years based on 3 RCTs (n=822) and beyond 5 years based on 3 RCTs (n=639). Similarly, technical success was improved with endovenous laser ablation over ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy up to 5 years based on data from 3 RCTs (n=588) (OR, 6.13; 95% CI, 0.98 to 38.27; low-certainty evidence), and beyond 5 years based on data from 3 RCTs (n=534) (OR, 6.47; 95% CI, 2.60 to 16.10; low-certainty evidence). There was no significant difference between endovenous laser ablation and

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy for recurrence up to 3 years based on data from 2 RCTs (n=443), and at 5 years based on data from 2 RCTs (n=418).

Hamann et al (2017) conducted a meta-analysis of RCTs reporting 5-year follow-up.[19,] The meta-analysis (3 RCTs, 10 follow-up studies) included 611 legs treated with endovenous laser ablation, 549 treated with high ligation and stripping, 121 with sclerotherapy, and 114 with high ligation and endovenous laser ablation. Ultrasound-guided sclerotherapy had significantly worse outcomes than the other 3 treatments, with anatomic success rates of 34% for sclerotherapy compared with 83% to 88% for the other 3 treatments (p<.001).

PHYSICIAN-COMPOUNDED SCLEROTHERAPY

Randomized Controlled Trials

In the 2013 MAGNA trial (previously described), 223 consecutive patients (240 legs) with great saphenous vein reflux were randomized to endovenous laser ablation, ligation and stripping, or physician-compounded foam sclerotherapy (1 mL aethoxysclerol 3%: 3 cc air).[15,] At 1-year follow-up, the anatomic success rate of foam sclerotherapy (72.2%) was inferior to both endovenous laser ablation (88.5%) and stripping (88.2%). Twenty-one patients in the sclerotherapy group had partial occlusion with reflux, though the clinical complaint was completely relieved. At 5-year follow-up, obliteration or absence of the great saphenous vein was observed in only 23% of patients treated with sclerotherapy compared with 85% of patients who underwent conventional surgery and 77% of patients who underwent endovenous laser ablation.[16,] Thirty-two percent of legs treated initially with sclerotherapy required 1 or more reinterventions during follow-up compared with 10% in the conventional surgery and endovenous laser ablation groups. However, clinically relevant grade II neovascularization was higher in the conventional surgery (17%) and endovenous laser ablation (13%) groups than in the sclerotherapy group (4%). EQ-5D scores improved equally in all groups.

Vahaaho et al (2018) published a study looking at the 5-year follow-up of patients with symptomatic great saphenous vein insufficiency.[20,] Between 2008 and 2010, 166 individuals were randomized to receive open surgery, endovenous laser ablation, or ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy. The great saphenous vein occlusion rate was 96% (95% CI, 91% to 100%) for open surgery, 89% (95% CI, 82% to 98%) for endovenous laser ablation, and 51% (95% CI, 38% to 64%) for ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy (p<.001). For patients with no additional treatment during follow-up, occlusion rates for open surgery, endovenous laser ablation, and ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy were 96%, 89%, and 41%, respectively. The study was limited by a lack of blinding and by non-standardized foam application.

Hamel-Desnos et al (2023) conducted a randomized trial of endovenous laser ablation versus physician-compounded foam sclerotherapy (0.5 mL polidocanol at concentrations ranging from 1% to 3% depending on vessel diameter; 2 mL air) in 161 patients with isolated small saphenous vein incompetence.[21,] Tributary vein treatments were not allowed for the first 6 months after the procedure. After the first 6 months, 33% of patients who received sclerotherapy and 19% of patients who received endovenous laser ablation received tributary treatment. The primary endpoint, absence of reflux in the treated segment at 3 years, was achieved in 86% of patients who received endovenous laser ablation versus 56% of patients who received sclerotherapy (risk ratio, 1.59; 95% CI, 1.26 to 2.01). Rates of partial and total failure were higher in the sclerotherapy group than the endovenous laser ablation group. Limitations include the pragmatic

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

design that allowed clinicians to treat patients according to their normal practice except for the study intervention and a lack of blinding.

Non-randomized Comparative Studies

A noninferiority trial by Shadid et al (2012) compared foam sclerotherapy with ligation and stripping in 430 patients.[22,]The analysis was per protocol. Forty (17%) patients had repeat sclerotherapy. At 2 years, the probability of clinical recurrence was similar in both groups (11.3% sclerotherapy vs. 9.0% ligation and stripping), although reflux was significantly more frequent in the sclerotherapy group (35% vs. 21%). Thrombophlebitis occurred in 7.4% of patients after sclerotherapy. Two serious adverse events in the sclerotherapy group (deep venous thrombosis, pulmonary emboli) occurred within 1 week of treatment. Lam et al (2018) reported 8-year follow-up with 53% of the patients in the original trial.[23,] All measures of treatment success (eg, symptomatic great saphenous vein reflux, saphenofemoral junction failure, and recurrent reflux in the great saphenous vein) were lower in the physician-compounded sclerotherapy group compared to the ligation and stripping group.

MICROFOAM SCLEROTHERAPY

Randomized Controlled Trials

In 2013, polidocanol microfoam (Varithena) was approved under a new drug application for the treatment of varicose veins. Efficacy data were derived from 2 randomized, blinded, multicenter studies.[24,] One compared polidocanol at 0.5%, 1.0%, and 2.0% with endovenous placebo or a subtherapeutic dose of polidocanol foam. The primary endpoint was an improvement in symptoms at week 8, as measured by the Varicose Vein Symptoms Questionnaire. The improvement in symptoms was greater in the pooled polidocanol treatment group ($p<.001$) and in each of the individual dose-concentration groups compared with vehicle alone. Secondary and tertiary endpoints (appearance, duplex ultrasound response, quality of life) were also significantly better for the polidocanol groups compared with controls. The second study, VANISH-2, was published by Todd et al (2014).[25,] At the 8-week assessment, there was elimination of reflux and/or occlusion of the previously incompetent vein in 85.6% of the combined 0.5% and 1.0% groups, 59.6% of patients in the 0.125% group, and 1.8% of the placebo group. Analysis of data from both studies showed a dose-response from 0.5% to 2.0% for improvement in appearance and from 0.5% to 1.0% for Duplex responders. The polidocanol 1.0% dose was selected for the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval. Safety analysis found deep vein thrombosis detected by ultrasound in 2.8% of polidocanol-treated patients, with 1% of patients having proximal symptomatic thrombi; these patients were treated with anticoagulants. There was no sign of an increase in neurologic adverse events, and there were no adverse cardiac or cardiopulmonary effects following treatment with polidocanol injectable foam. Rates of occlusion with Varithena are similar to those reported for endovenous laser ablation or stripping. A randomized trial comparing endovenous laser ablation and stripping with this new preparation of foam sclerotherapy is needed to evaluate its comparative effectiveness. Evaluation out to 5 years is continuing.

Vasquez et al (2017) reported on a double-blind RCT that evaluated the addition of polidocanol microfoam to endovenous thermal ablation.[26,] A total of 117 patients who were candidates for both endovenous thermal ablation and treatment of visible varicosities received endovenous thermal ablation plus placebo (n=38) or polidocanol 0.5% (n=39) or 1% (n=40). At 8-week follow-up, physician-blinded vein appearance was significantly better with the combined

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

polidocanol groups (p=.001), but the improvement in patient ratings was not statistically significant. At 6-month follow-up, the percentages of patients who achieved a clinically meaningful change were significantly higher in both physician (70.9% vs. 42.1% ; p=.001) and patient (67% vs. 50%; p=.034) ratings. The proportion of patients who received additional treatment for residual varicosities between week 8 and month 6 was modestly reduced (13.9% for the polidocanol vs. 23.7% for placebo; p=.037).

Watanabe et al (2024) conducted a double-blinded trial RCT comparing transluminal injection of microfoam sclerosant plus endovenous laser ablation to endovenous laser ablation alone in 142 patients (160 legs) with small saphenous vein reflux.[27,] At one year, the transluminal injection of microfoam sclerosant plus endovenous laser ablation reduced residual or recurrent reflux (4% vs. 16%; p=.027) and secondary interventions (4% vs. 16%; p=.027), without major complications. Improvements in venous clinical severity score were similar with both interventions.

Retrospective Studies

Deak (2018) reported results from a retrospective review of 250 patients with symptomatic chronic venous insufficiency who were treated with polidocanol microfoam in a community practice.[28,] Patients who had tortuous veins that were not accessible with a catheter or who had a history of a previous vein ablation procedure with scarring in the lumen were selected for treatment with the microfoam scleroscant. It was reported that some patients required additional treatments between 5 days and 2 years for the vein to close, but the publication did not report how many additional treatments were given. After all the treatments were completed, 94.4% of patients showed elimination of venous valvular reflux and symptom improvement. In addition to the lack of information on the number of treatments given, the time of patient follow-up was variable (from 1 month to 2 years), precluding any conclusions regarding the durability of the treatment.

Subsection Summary: Sclerotherapy

In a Cochrane review, ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy was inferior to ligation and stripping and endovenous laser ablation for technical success up to 5 years and beyond 5 years, but there was no significant difference between treatments for recurrence up to 3 years and at 5 years. For physician-compounded sclerotherapy, there is high variability in success rates of the procedure and some reports of serious adverse events. Results of a noninferiority trial of physician-compounded sclerotherapy indicated that once occluded, recurrence rates at 2 years are similar to those of ligation and stripping. By comparison, rates of occlusion with the FDA-approved microfoam sclerotherapy (polidocanol 1%) are similar to those reported for endovenous laser ablation or stripping.

TREATMENT OF SAPHENOUS VEINS: MECHANOCHEMICAL ABLATION

Randomized Controlled Trials

Four RCTs with over 100 patients each (range, 132 to 213) have been identified that compared MOCA to thermal ablation. Study characteristics and study results are presented in Tables 3 and 4. Study limitations are described in Tables 5 and 6.

Two publications (Bootun et al [2016], Lane et al [2017]) reported on early results from an RCT of 170 patients that compared ClariVein with RFA.[29,30,] Maximum VAS pain scores (out of 100) during the procedure were significantly lower in the MOCA group (median, 15 mm) than in the

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

RFA group (median, 34 mm; p=.003). Average VAS pain scores during the procedure were also modestly lower in the MOCA group (median, 10 mm) than in the RFA group (median, 19.5 mm; p=.003). Occlusion rates, clinical severity scores, disease-specific quality of life, and generic quality of life scores were similar between the groups at 1 and 6 months. Only 71% of patients were available for follow-up at 6 months, limiting the evaluation of closure rates at this time point.

Vahaaho et al (2019) reported an RCT that compared MOCA with endovenous thermal ablation (endovenous laser ablation or RFA).[20,] Liquid sclerosant at a concentration of 1.5% was used. Out of 132 patients enrolled, 7 patients were later excluded and 117 (88.6%) attended the 1-year follow-up evaluation. Occlusion of the great saphenous vein was observed in 45 of 55 (82%) of the MOCA group compared to 100% of the endovenous laser ablation and RFA groups (p=.002). Another randomized trial (Lam et al [2016]) reported interim results of a dose-finding study, finding greater closure with the use of polidocanol 2% or 3% (liquid) than with polidocanol 1%.[31,] Therefore, it is uncertain whether the concentration of sclerosant in the study by Vahaaho et al (2019) was optimal (Table 5).

Three percent polidocanol was tested in the Mechanochemical endovenous Ablation to RADiOfrequeNcy Ablation (MARADONA) non-inferiority trial reported by Holewijn et al (2019).[32,] Although the study was powered for 400 participants, only 213 patients were randomized before reimbursement for the procedure was suspended. Pain scores in the 14 days after the procedure were slightly lower, but hyperpigmentation was higher. Anatomic failures were significantly greater in the MOCA group at 1 year and approached significance at 2 years; with the note that the study was underpowered for anatomic failures because of the early stoppage of the study. At 1 and 2 years, clinical and quality of life outcomes were similar in the 2 groups.

A fourth RCT reported by Mohamed et al (2020) is the Randomized Clinical Trial Comparing Endovenous Laser Ablation and Mechanochemical Ablation (ClariVein) in the Management of Superficial Venous Insufficiency (LAMA).[33,] Patients (N=150) were randomized to MOCA with 1.5% sodium tetradecyl sulfate or to endovenous laser ablation. Anatomic success (occlusion) rates were lower in the MOCA group (77%) compared to the endovenous laser ablation group (91%) with no significant difference between the 2 treatments in intraprocedural pain scores. In contrast to the difference in anatomical occlusion rates, clinical severity and quality of life scores were not significantly different between the groups at 1 year follow-up. Five-year follow-up results were reported by Lim et al (2025).[34,] A total of 69% of endovenous laser ablation patients followed up compared with 76% of MOCA patients. Anatomic success (occlusion) rates remained lower in the MOCA group (47%) compared to the endovenous laser ablation group (91%). Reintervention rates were significantly higher with MOCA (21% vs 8%; p=.031).

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Table 3. Summary of Key RCT Characteristics

Study; Trial	Countries	Sites	Dates	Participants	Interventions	
					Active	Comparator
Bootun et al (2016);[29,] Lane et al (2017)[30,]				170 patients with varicose veins	MOCA	RFA
Vahaaho et al (2019) [20,]				132 patients with varicose veins	MOCA with 1.5% polidocanol	Thermal ablation (endovenous laser ablation or RFA)
Holewijn et al (2019)[32,] (MARADONA)	EU	4	2012-2015	213 patients with great saphenous vain incompetence and CEAP C2 to C5	MOCA with 2 mL of 3% polidocanol for the first 10 to 15 cm and 1.5% polidocanol for the remainder	RFA
Mohamed et al (2020)[33,](LAMA)	UK	1	2015-2018	150 patients with symptomatic superficial venous incompetence CEAP grades 2 to 6	MOCA (n=75) with 1.5% sodium tetradecyl sulfate	Endovenous laser ablation (n=75)

CEAP: clinical etiologic anatomic pathological; LAMA: A Randomised Clinical Trial Comparing Endovenous Laser Ablation and Mechanochemical Ablation (ClariVein) in the Management of Superficial Venous Insufficiency; MARADONA: Mechanochemical endovenous Ablation to RADiOfrequeNcy Ablation; MOCA: mechanochemical ablation; RCT: randomized controlled trial; RFA: radiofrequency ablation.

Table 4. Summary of Key RCT Results

Study	Pain	Post-procedure Occlusion Rate	Occlusion Rate at Follow-up	Clinical Severity	Clinical Severity at Follow-up		Quality of Life
Bootun et al (2016)[29,]; Lane et al (2017)[30,]	During Procedure - VAS		6 mo occlusion rates				
N			71%		71%		
MOCA	10 mm						
RFA	19.5 mm						
p-value	.003	NS	NS	NS	NS		NS
Vahaaho et al (2019)[20,]			1 yr		1 yr		

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Study	Pain	Post-procedure Occlusion Rate	Occlusion Rate at Follow-up	Clinical Severity	Clinical Severity at Follow-up		Quality of Life
N			117 (88.6%)		117 (88.6%)		
MOCA			45 of 55 (82%)				
Endovascular laser ablation or RFA			100%				
p-value			.002				
Holewijn et al (2019)[32,] (MARADONA)	For 14 days after the procedure median (range)	30 day failure rate	1 yr recanalization rate	2 yr recanalization rate	1 yr VCSS	2 yr VCSS	AVVQ improved
N			153 (72%)	157 (73%)	153 (72%)	157 (73%)	
MOCA	0.2 (0.0 to 0.8)	5 (4.9%)	15 (16.5%)	21 (20%)	1.8	1.0	88%
RFA	0.5 (0.2 to 1.3)	1 (1%)	5 (5.8%)	12 (11.7%)	1.7	1.0	89%
p-value	.01	.10	.025	.066	.695	.882	.90
Mohamed et al (2020)[33,] (LAMA)	Median (IQR)		Occlusion at 1 yr		VCSS		AVVQ Median (IQR)
N			138 (92%)				
MOCA	15 (9 to 29)		53/69 (77%)				2.0 (0.0 to 5.3)
Endovascular laser ablation	22 (9 to 44)		63/69 (91%)				2.0 (0.0 to 4.8)
p- value	.21		.020		NS		NS

AVVQ: Aberdeen varicose vein questionnaire; IQR: intraquartile range; LAMA: A Randomised Clinical Trial Comparing Endovenous Laser Ablation and Mechanochemical Ablation (ClariVein) in the Management of Superficial Venous Insufficiency; MARADONA: Mechanochemical endovenous Ablation to RADiOfrequeNcy Ablation; MOCA: mechanochemical ablation; NS: not significant; RCT: randomized controlled trial; RFA: radiofrequency ablation; VAS: visual analog scale.; VCSS: venous clinical severity score.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Table 5. Study Relevance Limitations

Study	Population[a]	Intervention[b]	Comparator[c]	Outcomes[d]	Follow-Up[e]
Bootun et al (2016);[29] Lane et al (2017)[30]				1. Primary outcome was pain during the procedure	1. Outcomes only out to 6 mo, which is insufficient to assess durability
Vahaaho et al (2019)[20]	4. Strict inclusion criteria that may not be representative of intended use.	3. The concentration of sclerosant (1.5% polidocanol) may not have been optimal.			1. Outcomes only out to 1 yr, which is insufficient to assess durability
Holewijn et al (2019)[32] (MARADONA)	4. Patients with bilateral reflux were excluded due to dosing limits of polidocanol				
Mohamed et al (2020)[33] (LAMA)					1. Outcomes out to 1 yr, follow-up is continuing

LAMA: A Randomised Clinical Trial Comparing Endovenous Laser Ablation and Mechanochemical Ablation (ClariVein) in the Management of Superficial Venous Insufficiency; MARADONA: Mechanochemical endovenous Ablation to RADiOfrequeNcy Ablation.

The study limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.

[a] Population key: 1. Intended use population unclear; 2. Clinical context is unclear; 3. Study population is unclear; 4. Study population not representative of intended use.

[b] Intervention key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Version used unclear; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as comparator; 4.Not the intervention of interest.

[c] Comparator key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Not standard or optimal; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as intervention; 4. Not delivered effectively.

[d] Outcomes key: 1. Key health outcomes not addressed; 2. Physiologic measures, not validated surrogates; 3. No CONSORT reporting of harms; 4. Not establish and validated measurements; 5. Clinical significant difference not prespecified; 6. Clinical significant difference not supported.

[e] Follow-Up key: 1. Not sufficient duration for benefit; 2. Not sufficient duration for harms.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Table 6. Study Design and Conduct Limitations

Study	Allocation[a]	Blinding[b]	Selective Reporting[c]	Data Completeness[d]	Power[e]	Statistical[f]
Bootun et al (2016);[29] Lane et al (2017)[30]		1. Patients not blinded to treatment (assessors of duplex ultrasound were blinded)		1. There was high loss to follow-up (76% follow-up at 1 mo and 71% follow-up at 6 mo)		
Vahaaho et al (2019)[20]		1, 2, 3. Patients, surgeons, and assessors were not blinded to treatment				
Holewijn et al (2019)[32] (MARADONA)		1, 2, 3. Patients, surgeons, and assessors were not blinded to treatment			3. Underpowered for anatomic success due to early termination of recruitment	4. Results of non-inferiority analysis were not reported
Mohamed et al (2020) [33](LAMA)		1, 2, 3. Patients, surgeons, and assessors were not blinded to treatment				2. 14-day pain scores were not analyzed by repeated measures ANOVA

ANOVA: analysis of variance; LAMA: A Randomised Clinical Trial Comparing Endovenous Laser Ablation and Mechanochemical Ablation (ClariVein) in the Management of Superficial Venous Insufficiency; MARADONA: Mechanochemical endovenous Ablation to RADiOfrequeNcy Ablation.
The study limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.
[a] Allocation key: 1. Participants not randomly allocated; 2. Allocation not concealed; 3. Allocation concealment unclear; 4. Inadequate control for selection bias.
[b]Blinding key: 1. Not blinded to treatment assignment; 2. Not blinded outcome assessment; 3. Outcome assessed by treating physician.
[c] Selective Reporting key: 1. Not registered; 2. Evidence of selective reporting; 3. Evidence of selective publication.
[d]Data Completeness key: 1. High loss to follow-up or missing data; 2. Inadequate handling of missing data; 3. High number of crossovers; 4. Inadequate handling of crossovers; 5. Inappropriate exclusions; 6. Not intent to treat analysis (per protocol for noninferiority trials).
[e] Power key: 1. Power calculations not reported; 2. Power not calculated for primary outcome; 3. Power not based on clinically important difference.
[f] Statistical key: 1. Intervention is not appropriate for outcome type: (a) continuous; (b) binary; (c) time to event; 2.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Intervention is not appropriate for multiple observations per patient; 3. s and/or p values not reported; 4.Comparative treatment effects not calculated.

Prospective Cohort Studies

Oud et al (2025) reported on a single-center, prospective cohort study evaluating the long-term effectiveness of MOCA using the ClariVein device for treating great saphenous vein incompetence.[35,] The study had a mean follow-up of 8.4 years and was conducted as a continuation of a previous multicenter RCT, including 109 patients (115 treated limbs) who underwent treatment between 2012 and 2018. The primary outcome was anatomical success, defined as complete closure of the treated vein or a partially reopened segment measuring <10 centimeters. A secondary measure, called reflux-free anatomical success, required that any reopened segment did not show backward blood flow. Results are reported in Table 8. Approximately 7% of patients required repeat interventions due to treatment failure.

A prospective cohort study that had a 5-year follow-up was reported by Thierens et al (2019).[36,] Study inclusion criteria are described in Table 7. Anatomic and clinical follow-ups were performed at 4 weeks, 6 months, and 1, 3, and 5 years after the procedure (Table 8). With slightly less than half of the participants remaining in the study through 5 years, 79% had freedom from anatomic failure and clinical measures had worsened. Nearly 15% of the recanalizations occurred in the first year, which the authors considered to be due to technical issues when the procedure was initially introduced. For example, there had been an increase in the concentration of sclerosant over time. It should be noted, however, that the more recent MARADONA trial from the same group of investigators using 3% polidocanol (described above) also saw a rate of recanalization of 16.5% in the first year and 20% in the second year.[32,] Without a control condition, it cannot be determined whether the loss of clinical improvement in this cohort study is due to recanalization or the usual progression of venous disease over time.

Table 7. Summary of Prospective Cohort Study Characteristics

Study	Country	Participants	Treatment Delivery	Follow-Up
Oud et al (2025)[35,]	Netherlands	Great saphenous vein insufficiency determined by duplex ultrasound examination	MOCA with 2% polidocanol or 3% polidocanol as sclerosant	Mean, 8 yr
Thierens et al (2019)[36,]	Netherlands	C2 to C5 varicose veins, great saphenous vein diameter of 3 to 12 mm and primary great saphenous vein insufficiency determined by duplex ultrasound examination	MOCA with 2% polidocanol as sclerosant	5 yr

MOCA: mechanochemical ablation.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Table 8. Summary of Prospective Cohort Study Results

Outcome Measure	Baseline	<6 months	1 yr	3 yr	5 yr	8 yr
Oud et al (2025)[35],	n=109 patients (115 limbs)					
Anatomical success		88.5% (100/113 limbs)				60.5% (69/114 limbs)
Reflux-free anatomical success		NR				72.8% (83/114 limbs)
VCSS score	5.3					4.1
DVAAQ	13.5					10.5
Thierens et al (2019)[36],	n=94		90	71	58	
Freedom from anatomic failure (SE)			85.6% (0.033)	80.1% (0.039)	78.7% (0.041)	
AVVQ score	8.9		2.3	5.6	6.3	
VCSS score	4.0		1.0	1.0	2.0	
Clinical improvement			80%	74%	65%	

AVVQ: Aberdeen varicose vein questionnaire; DVAAQ: Dutch version of the Aberdeen Varicose Vein Questionnaire;NR: not reported; SE: standard error; VCSS: venous clinical severity score.

Subsection Summary: Mechanochemical Ablation

MOCA is a combination of liquid sclerotherapy and mechanical abrasion of the lumen. The evidence on MOCA includes 4 RCTs that compared MOCA to thermal ablation with 6 month to 2-year results, and 2 prospective cohorts with follow-up out to 8 years. Results to date have been mixed regarding a reduction in intraprocedural pain, which is a proposed benefit of MOCA compared to thermal ablation procedures. Occlusion rates at 6 months to 2 years in the RCTs indicate lower anatomic success rates compared to thermal ablation, but a difference in clinical outcomes at these early time points has not been observed. Experience with other endoluminal ablation procedures suggests that lower anatomic success in the short term is associated with recanalization and clinical recurrence between 2 to 5 years. The possibility of later clinical recurrence is supported by prospective cohort studies with up to 8-year follow-up following treatment with MOCA. However, there have been improvements in technique since the cohort studies began , and clinical progression is frequently observed with venous disease. Because of these limitations, longer follow-up of the more recently conducted RCTs is needed to establish the efficacy and durability of this procedure compared with the criterion standard of thermal ablation.

TREATMENT OF SAPHENOUS VEINS: CYANOACRYLATE ADHESIVE

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Randomized Controlled Trials

The VenaSeal pivotal study (VeClose), a multicenter noninferiority trial with 222 patients, compared VenaSeal with RFA for the treatment of venous reflux.[37,38,] The pivotal registration study for the VeClose study and follow-up through 36 months have been published. These reports are summarized in Tables 9 and 10. The primary endpoint (the proportion of patients with complete closure of the target great saphenous vein at 3 months measured by ultrasound) was noninferior to RFA, with a 99% closure rate for VenaSeal compared with 96% for RFA. The secondary endpoint (intraoperative pain) was similar for both groups (2.2 on a 10-point scale for VenaSeal vs. 2.4 for RFA ; p=.11). Ecchymosis at day 3 was significantly lower in the cyanoacrylate group; 67.6% of patients treated with cyanoacrylate had no ecchymosis compared with 48.2% of patients following RFA (p<.01). Scores on the AVVQ and Venous Clinical Severity Score improved to a similar extent in both groups. The mean time to return to work in a prospective cohort of 50 patients reported by Gibson and Ferris (2017) was 0.2 days.[39,]

For the CAC and RFA groups, the complete occlusion rates were 97.2% and 97.0%. Freedom from recanalization was also similar between the 2 groups (p=.08).[40,] Twenty-four month results were reported by Gibson et al (2018), which included 171 patients (87 from CAC and 84 from RFA).[41,] Thirty-six month results were reported by Morrison et al (2019), with follow-up on 146 (66%) patients (72 from CAC and 74 from RFA).[42,] Loss to follow-up was similar in the 2 groups. The complete closure rates for CAC and RFA were 94.4% and 91.9% (p=.005 for non-inferiority), respectively. Recanalization-free survival through 36 months was not statistically different for the 2 groups. No significant device- or procedure-related adverse events were reported for either group.

VariClose CAC was compared with RFA and endovenous laser ablation by Eroglu and Yasim (2018) in an RCT with 525 patients (Table 9).[43,] Periprocedural outcomes showed a shorter intervention time, less pain, and shorter return to work with CAC compared to endovenous thermal ablation (Table 10). There was no significant difference in occlusion rates between the 3 treatments at 6, 12, and 24-month follow-up.

Alhewy et al (2024) conducted an RCT at 2 centers in Egypt comparing VenaSeal CAC with RFA in 248 patients with venous reflux, with follow-up extending to 2 years postprocedure.[44,] The primary outcome was complete closure of the target great saphenous vein at the 3-month visit, although results for this outcome were not reported by the authors. Authors reported that at the 1-month follow-up, all veins treated with CAC remained occluded, while 154 out of 158 (97%) veins treated with RFA remained occluded. At 24 months, 122 out of 128 (95%) veins treated with CAC and 146 out of 158 (93%) veins treated with RFA remained occluded. At month 24, there were 6 recanalizations in the CAC group and 12 in the RFA group, with recanalization-free survival in the CAC group found to be non-inferior to that of the RFA group (95.3% vs. 92.4%, respectively; p<.0001 for 10% noninferiority). The CAC group experienced fewer complications, with only 2 cases of paresthesia and 18 cases of bruises reported, whereas the RFA group encountered 18 cases of bruises, 2 cases of skin burns, and 2 cases of access site hematoma. Periprocedural outcomes showed a potentially shorter intervention time with CAC versus RFA.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Table 9. Summary of Key RCT Characteristics

Study; Trial	Countries	Sites	Dates	Participants	Interventions[2]	
					Active	Comparator
FDA SSED (2015);[37,] Morrison et al (2015, 2017, 2019);[38,45,42,] Gibson et al (2018);[39,][VeClose trial]	US	10	2013-2014	Age ≥21 and ≤70 years with symptomatic[1] great saphenous vein reflux and CEAP C2-C4b great saphenous vein diameter while standing of 3 to 12 mm	108 VenaSeal CAC	114 RFA
Eroglu and Yasim (2018)[43,]	Asia	1	NR	525 patients ≥18 years with incompetence of the great saphenous vein (>5.5 mm in diameter) or small saphenous vein (>4 mm in diameter) and reflux >0.5 sec	175 VariClose CAC	125 RFA and 125 endovenous laser ablation
Alhewy et al (2024)[44,]	Egypt and Saudi Arabia	*2*	August 1, 2018 to May 1, 2022	248 patients ≥18 years (286 limbs) with symptomatic moderate to severe varicosities, CEAP classifications of C2-C5, and great saphenous vein incompetence with a reflux time of 0.5 sec	128 VenaSeal CAC	120 RFA

CAC: cyanoacrylate; CEAP: Clinical Etiology Anatomy Pathophysiology; FDA: Food and Drug Administration; NR: not reported; RCT: randomized controlled trial; RFA: radiofrequency ablation; SSED; Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data;

[1] One or more of the following symptoms related to the target vein: aching, throbbing, heaviness, fatigue, pruritus, night cramps, restlessness, generalized pain or discomfort, swelling.

[2] Protocol mandated use of compression stockings for 7 days post-procedure

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Table 10. Periprocedural Outcomes

Eroglu and Yasim (2018)[43,]	**Duration of Procedure min (SD)**	**Average Periprocedural Pain[1]**	**2 or More Analgesics Used Daily n (%)**	**1 Day to Return to Work n (%)**	**2 Days to Return to Work n (%)**	**3 or More Days to Return to Work n (%)**
N	503	503	456	456	456	456
VariClose	15.3 (2.6)	1 (mild)	105 (62.5)	161 (95.8)	7 (4.2)	0 (0)
RFA	27.3 (7.7)	2 (moderate)	98 (65.8)	75 (50.3)	53 (35.6)	21 (14.1)
Endovenous laser ablation	35.0 (5.2)	2 (moderate)	105 (75.5)	105 (75.5)	24 (17.3)	10 (7.2)
p- value	<.001		.1472	<.0012		
Alhewy et al (2024)[44,]						
N	248					
VenaSeal	range, 25 to 54					
RFA	range, 40 to 70					
p-value	NR					

[1]Scale of 1 to 4; [2]overall p-Value
NR: not reported; RFA: radiofrequency ablation; SD: standard deviation.

Table 11. Summary of Key RCT Results

Study	**Vein Closure[1] n (%)**	**Vein Closure 12 months n (%)**	**Vein Closure 24 months n (%)**	**Vein Closure 36 months n (%) or VCSS**	**Device Related Event n (%)**
FDA SSED (2015);[37,] Morrison et al (2015, 2017, 2019);[38,45,42,] Gibson et al (2018);[39,][VeClose trial]	**3 months**				
N	222	189	171	146	222
VenaSeal	107 (99.1%)[2]	92 (96.7%)	82/86 (95.3%)	68/72 (94.4%)	31 (27%)
RFA	109 (95.6%)[2]	91 (96.8%)	79/84 (94.0%)	68/74 (91.9%)	7 (6%)
Eroglu and Yasim (2018)[43,]	**6 months**			**VCSS at 24 months**	
N		503	456	456	
VariClose	98.1%	94.1%	95.1%	2.7	

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Study	Vein Closure[1] n (%)	Vein Closure 12 months n (%)	Vein Closure 24 months n (%)	Vein Closure 36 months n (%) or VCSS	Device Related Event n (%)
RFA	94.7%	92.5%	94.2%	3.7	
Endovenous laser ablation	92.6%	90.9%	91.5%	3.5	
p-value	NS	NS	NS	<.001	
Alhewy et al (2024)[44,]	Vein Closure at 1 month				
N	248				
VenaSeal	128/128 (100%)	122/128 (95%)			
RFA	154/158 (97%)	146/158 (93%)			
p-value	NR	NR			

FDA: Food and Drug Administration; NR: not reported; NS: not significant; RCT: randomized controlled trial; RFA: radiofrequency ablation; SSED: Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data; VCSS: venous clinical severity score.
[1]Complete closure defined as Doppler ultrasound showing vein closure along entire treated vein segment with no discrete segments of patency exceeding 5 cm. Central laboratory confirmation.
[2] Used prespecified data imputation method (Last Observation Carried Forward).

Notable limitations of the studies are shown in Tables 12 and 13. The primary limitation of the pivotal study of VenaSeal is the loss to follow-up at 2 and 3 years, although loss to follow-up was similar in the 2 groups. The study by Eroglu and Yasim (2018) had an unequal loss to follow-up after patients were informed of the treatment allocation. Different expectations in the CAC group compared to the control groups may have influenced subjective outcomes. In addition, VariClose is not currently approved for marketing in the U.S.; both CAC products use N-butyl cyanoacrylate. The study conducted by Alhewy et al (2024) presented descriptive results for vein closure outcomes without inclusion of p-values or other statistical outputs. Additionally, the study did not report the results of the prespecified primary outcome.

Table 12. Study Relevance Limitations

Study	Population[a]	Intervention[b]	Comparator[c]	Outcomes[d]	Follow-Up[e]
Morrison et al (2015),[38,] Morrison et al (2017),[45,] Gibson et al (2018),[41,] Morrison et al (2019)[42,] [VeClose trial]					1. Follow-up scheduled to continue to 60 months
Eroglu and Yasim (2018)[43,]		2. This specific cyanoacrylate product is not currently available in the US			
Alhewy et al (2024)[44,]					

The evidence gaps stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.
[a] Population key: 1. Intended use population unclear; 2. Clinical context is unclear; 3. Study population is unclear; 4. Study population not representative of intended use.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

[b] Intervention key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Version used unclear; 3. Delivery not similar intensity as comparator; 4.Not the intervention of interest.
[c] Comparator key: 1. Not clearly defined; 2. Not standard or optimal; 3.Delivery not similar intensity as intervention; 4. Not delivered effectively.
[d] Outcomes key: 1. Key health outcomes not addressed; 2. Physiologic measures, not validated surrogates; 3. No CONSORT reporting of harms; 4. Not establish and validated measurements; 5. Clinical significant difference not prespecified; 6. Clinical significant difference not supported.
[e] Follow-Up key: 1. Not sufficient duration for benefit; 2. Not sufficient duration for harms.

Table 13. Study Design and Conduct Limitations

Study	Allocation[a]	Blinding[b]	Selective Reporting[c]	Data Completeness[d]	Power[e]	Statistical[f]
Morrison et al (2015),[38] Morrison et al (2017),[45] Gibson et al (2018)[41] Morrison et al (2019),[42] [VeClose trial]		1, 2, 3. The outcome was assessed by the treating physician and patients were not blinded		1. >20% loss to follow-up		3. Variable reporting of CI and p values
Eroglu and Yasim (2018)[43]		1, 2, 3. Patients were notified of the group assignment a day before the procedure		6, 7. Not intent-to-treat analysis and unequal loss to follow-up. 21 patients did not receive the allocated intervention, 19 of whom were in the control groups.		
Alhewy et al (2024)[44]		4. Blinding not reported			1. Power calculations not reported	3. CI and p values mostly not reported

CI: confidence interval.
The study limitations stated in this table are those notable in the current review; this is not a comprehensive gaps assessment.
[a] Allocation key: 1. Participants not randomly allocated; 2. Allocation not concealed; 3. Allocation concealment unclear; 4. Inadequate control for selection bias; 5. Other.
[b] Blinding key: 1. Participants or study staff not blinded; 2. Outcome assessors not blinded; 3. Outcome assessed by treating physician; 4. Other.
[c] Selective Reporting key: 1. Not registered; 2. Evidence of selective reporting; 3. Evidence of selective publication; 4. Other.
[d] Data Completeness key: 1. High loss to follow-up or missing data; 2. Inadequate handling of missing data; 3. High number of crossovers; 4. Inadequate handling of crossovers; 5. Inappropriate exclusions; 6. Not intent to treat analysis (per protocol for noninferiority trials); 7. Other.
[e] Power key: 1. Power calculations not reported; 2. Power not calculated for primary outcome; 3. Power not based on clinically important difference; 4. Other.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

[f] Statistical key: 1. Analysis is not appropriate for outcome type: (a) continuous; (b) binary; (c) time to event; 2. Analysis is not appropriate for multiple observations per patient; 3. Confidence intervals and/or p values not reported; 4. Comparative treatment effects not calculated; 5. Other.

Prospective Cohort Studies

Eroglu et al (2017) reported closure rates of 94.1% at 30 months in a prospective cohort of 159 patients.[46,] Thirty-three-month follow-up was reported by Zierau (2015) for 467 (58.7%) of 795 veins treated at 1 institution in Germany.[47,] An inflammatory reddening of the skin was observed at 1 week posttreatment in 11.7% of cases. No permanent skin responses were observed. Of the 467 veins reexamined, the sealing rate was 97.7%. This series had a high loss to follow-up.

Imai et al (2025) conducted a multicenter, prospective registry study in Japan to evaluate the efficacy and safety of VenaSeal CAC for treating incompetent great and small saphenous veins.[48,] The study included 125 patients, and results showed a 92.6% overall vein closure rate at 1 year, with significant improvement in venous clinical severity scores and quality-of-life measures, though no significant change in EuroQol scores. Postoperative complications were observed in 20 patients, including hypersensitivity-type phlebitis in 7 patients and superficial venous thrombosis in 5 patients.

Section Summary: Cyanoacrylate Adhesive

Evidence assessing CAC for the treatment of varicose veins and venous insufficiency includes a multicenter noninferiority trial with follow-up through 36 months, 2 RCTs with follow-up through 24 months, and prospective cohorts with up to 30 months of follow-up. The short-term efficacy of VenaSeal CAC has been shown to be noninferior to RFA at up to 36 months of follow-up. At 24 and 36 months, the study had greater than 20% loss to follow-up, but loss to follow-up was similar in the 2 groups at the long-term follow-up and is not expected to influence comparative results. Another RCT (N=248) comparing VenaSeal CAC with RFA found similar proportions of vein closures at 24 months with both treatments (100% and 95%, respectively; p-value not reported), with potentially shorter procedure duration with CAC versus RFA (25 to 54 minutes and 40 to 70 minutes, respectively; p-value not reported). An RCT (N=525) with an active CAC ingredient (N-butyl cyanoacrylate) that is currently available outside of the U.S. found no significant differences in vein closure between CAC and thermal ablation controls at 24 months of follow-up. The CAC procedure and return to work were shorter and pain scores were lower compared to thermal ablation; the subjective pain scores may have been influenced by differing expectations in this study. Prospective cohort studies report high closure rates at follow up to 30 months. Overall, results indicate that outcomes from CAC are at least as good as thermal ablation techniques, the current standard of care.

TREATMENT OF SAPHENOUS VEINS: CRYOABLATION

Randomized Controlled Trials

Klem et al (2009) reported on a randomized trial that found endovenous cryoablation (n=249) to be inferior to conventional stripping (n=245) for treating patients with symptomatic varicose veins.[40,] Forty-four percent of patients had residual great saphenous vein remaining with cryoablation while 15% had residual vein remaining with conventional stripping. AVVQ scores also showed better results for conventional stripping (score, 11.7) than cryoablation (score, 8.0). There were no differences between groups in 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey summary scores or neural damage (12% in both groups).

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Disselhoff et al (2008, 2011) reported on 2- and 5-year outcomes from a randomized trial that compared cryoablation with endovenous laser ablation.[49,50,] Included were 120 patients with symptomatic uncomplicated varicose veins (CEAP class C2) with saphenofemoral incompetence and great saphenous vein reflux. At 10 days after treatment, endovenous laser ablation provided better results than cryoablation with respect to pain scores over the first 10 days (2.9 vs. 4.4), resumption of normal activity (75% vs. 45%), and induration (15% vs. 52%), all respectively. At a 2-year follow-up, freedom from recurrent incompetence was observed in 77% of patients after endovenous laser ablation and in 66% of patients after cryoablation (p=not significant). At 5 years, 36.7% of patients were lost to follow-up; freedom from incompetence and neovascularization were found in 62% of patients treated with endovenous laser ablation and in 51% of patients treated with cryoablation (p=not significant). Neovascularization was more common after cryoablation, but incompetent tributaries were more common after endovenous laser ablation. There were no significant differences between groups in the Venous Clinical Severity Score or AVVQ scores at either the 2 or 5-month follow-up for endovenous laser ablation.

Subsection Summary: Cryoablation
Two RCTs have suggested that cryotherapy is ineffective for treating varicose veins compared with available alternatives.

TRIBUTARY VARICOSITIES

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose
The purpose of ablation (stab avulsion, sclerotherapy, or phlebectomy) of tributary veins in patients who have varicose tributary veins is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Populations
The relevant population of interest is individuals who have varicose tributary veins.

Interventions
The therapy being considered is ablation (stab avulsion, sclerotherapy, or phlebectomy) of tributary veins.

Transilluminated powered phlebectomy (TIPP) is an alternative to stab avulsion and hook phlebectomy. This procedure uses 2 instruments: an illuminator, which also provides irrigation, and a resector, which has an oscillating tip and suction pump. Following removal of the saphenous vein, the illuminator is introduced via a small incision in the skin, and tumescence solution (anesthetic and epinephrine) is infiltrated along the course of varicosity. The resector is then inserted under the skin from the opposite direction, and the oscillating tip is placed directly beneath the illuminated veins to fragment and loosen the veins from the supporting tissue. Irrigation from the illuminator is used to clear the vein fragments and blood through aspiration and additional drainage holes. The illuminator and resector tips may then be repositioned, thereby reducing the number of incisions needed when compared with stab avulsion or hook

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

phlebectomy. It has been proposed that TIPP might decrease surgical time, decrease complications such as bruising, and lead to a faster recovery than established procedures.

Comparators
The following therapy is currently being used to treat varicose tributary veins: conservative therapy.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are reductions in symptoms and morbid events, change in disease status, and improvements in quality of life. Follow-up at 6- and 12-months is of interest for ablation (stab avulsion, sclerotherapy, or phlebectomy) of tributary veins to monitor relevant outcomes.

Study Selection Criteria
Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs;
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies;
- To assess long-term outcomes and adverse effects, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow up and/or larger populations were sought;
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

REVIEW OF EVIDENCE

SCLEROTHERAPY AND PHLEBECTOMY

Systematic Reviews
Early studies established ligation and stripping as the criterion standard for treating saphenofemoral incompetence based on improved long-term recurrence rates, with sclerotherapy used primarily as an adjunct to treat varicose tributaries. A Cochrane review of 28 studies by de Avlia Oliveira et al (2021) concluded that there is low certainty evidence that sclerotherapy is effective and safe compared to placebo for treating cosmetic appearance, persistent symptoms, and quality of life concerns related to varicose veins.[51,] Evidence was limited or lacking for comparisons of foam with liquid sclerotherapy or other substances, and between concentrations of foam. Sclerotherapy and phlebectomy are considered appropriate in the absence of reflux of the saphenous system (eg, post- or adjunctive treatment to other procedures such as surgery).[52,]

Randomized Controlled Trials
El-Sheikha et al (2014) reported on a small randomized trial of concomitant or sequential (if needed) phlebectomy following endovenous laser ablation for varicose veins.[53,]Quality of life and clinical severity scores were similar between the groups by 1 year, with 16 (67%) of 24 patients in the sequential phlebectomy group receiving a secondary intervention.

The bulk of the literature discussing the role of ultrasound guidance refers to sclerotherapy of the saphenous vein, as opposed to the varicose tributaries. For example, Yamaki et al (2012) reported on a prospective RCT that compared visual foam sclerotherapy plus ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy of the great saphenous vein with visual foam sclerotherapy for varicose

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

tributary veins.[54,] Fifty-one limbs in 48 patients were treated with ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy plus visual foam sclerotherapy of the varicose tributaries, and 52 limbs in 49 patients were treated with foam sclerotherapy alone. At 6-month follow-up, complete occlusion was found in 23 (45.1%) limbs treated with ultrasound plus visually guided foam sclerotherapy and in 22 (42.3%) limbs treated with visual sclerotherapy alone. Reflux was absent in 30 (58.8%) limbs treated with ultrasound plus visual guidance and in 37 (71.2%) treated with visual guidance alone (p=not significant). The authors noted that, for the treatment of tributary veins in clinical practice, most patients receive a direct injection of foam without ultrasound guidance.

A small proportion of patients may present with tributary varicosities in the absence of saphenous reflux. For example, as reported by Michaels et al (2006), of 1009 patients recruited for an RCT, 64 patients had minor varicose veins without reflux, 34 of whom agreed to be randomized to sclerotherapy or conservative treatment.[55,] At baseline, 92% had symptoms of heaviness, 69% had cosmetic concerns, 53% reported itching, and 30% reported relief of symptoms using compression hosiery. At 1-year follow-up, there was an improvement in clinician-assessment of the anatomic extent of varicose veins, with 85% of patients in the sclerotherapy group showing improvement compared with 29% of patients in the conservative therapy group. Symptoms of aching were milder or eliminated in 69% of the sclerotherapy group and 28% of the group treated with conservative therapy.

TRANSILLUMINATED POWERED PHLEBECTOMY

Systematic Reviews

A meta-analysis by Luebke and Brunkwall (2008) included 5 studies that compared TIPP with conventional surgery.[56,] Results showed a significant advantage of TIPP over the conventional treatment for the number of incisions, mean cosmetic score, and duration of the procedure. However, TIPP also increased the incidence of hematoma and resulted in worse mean pain scores.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Included in the meta-analysis by Luebke and Brunkwall (2008) was an RCT by Chetter et al (2006) that compared TIPP (n=29) with a multiple stab incision procedure (n=33).[57,] A single surgeon performed all but 2 of the procedures, and there was no difference in operating time. Patients treated with TIPP had an average of 5 incisions, compared with 20 for the multiple stab procedure. However, the blinded evaluation revealed that bruising or discoloration was higher for the TIPP group at 1 and 6 weeks post surgery. At 6 weeks after surgery, patients in the TIPP group showed no reductions in pain (-2 points on the Burford Pain Scale), while patients in the multiple stab incision group had a significant reduction in pain scores compared with presurgical baseline (-20 points). Six weeks post-surgery, quality of life measures had improved in the multiple stab incision group but not in the TIPP group. Thus, although TIPP required fewer surgical incisions, in this single-center study, it was associated with longer recovery due to more extensive bruising, prolonged pain, and reduced early postoperative quality of life.

Section Summary: Tributary Varicosities

The evidence on the use of stab avulsion, sclerotherapy, and phlebectomy includes RCTs and systematic reviews of RCTs. The literature has indicated that sclerotherapy is effective for the treatment of tributary veins following occlusion of the saphenofemoral or saphenopopliteal

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

junction and saphenous veins. No studies have been identified comparing RFA or laser ablation of tributary veins with standard procedures (microphlebectomy and/or sclerotherapy). TIPP is effective at removing varicosities; outcomes are comparable with available alternatives such as stab avulsion and hook phlebectomy. However, there is limited evidence that TIPP is associated with more pain, bruising, discoloration, and a longer recovery, and the current literature does not show an advantage of TIPP over conventional treatment.

PERFORATOR REFLUX

Clinical Context and Therapy Purpose

Perforator veins cross through the fascia and connect the deep and superficial venous systems. Incompetent perforating veins were originally treated with an open surgical procedure, called the Linton procedure, which involved a long medial calf incision to expose all posterior, medial, and paramedial perforators. While this procedure was associated with healing of ulcers, it was largely abandoned due to a high incidence of wound complications. The Linton procedure was subsequently modified by using a series of perpendicular skin flaps instead of a longitudinal skin flap to provide access to incompetent perforator veins in the lower part of the leg. The modified Linton procedure may occasionally be used to close incompetent perforator veins that cannot be reached by less invasive procedures.

The following PICO was used to select literature to inform this review.

Populations

The relevant population of interest is individuals who have perforator vein reflux.

Interventions

The therapy being considered is ablation with subfascial endoscopic perforator surgery (SEPS) of perforator veins. SEPS is a less invasive surgical procedure for the treatment of incompetent perforators and has been reported since the mid-1980s. Guided by Duplex ultrasound scanning, small incisions are made in the skin, and the perforating veins are clipped or divided by endoscopic scissors. Endovenous ablation of incompetent perforator veins with sclerotherapy, radiofrequency, and laser ablation has also been reported.

Comparators

The following is currently being used to treat perforator vein reflux: conservative therapy or treatment of saphenous veins alone.

Outcomes

The general outcomes of interest are reductions in symptoms and morbid events, change in disease status, and improvements in quality of life. These may be assessed by VAS, AVVQ, and VCSS, along with ulcer healing and recurrence.

Follow-up at 2 years is of interest for ablation (eg, SEPS) of perforator veins to monitor relevant outcomes.

Study Selection Criteria

Methodologically credible studies were selected using the following principles:

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

- To assess efficacy outcomes, comparative controlled prospective trials were sought, with a preference for RCTs;
- In the absence of such trials, comparative observational studies were sought, with a preference for prospective studies;
- To assess long-term outcomes and adverse effects, single-arm studies that capture longer periods of follow up and/or larger populations were sought;
- Studies with duplicative or overlapping populations were excluded.

REVIEW OF EVIDENCE

Systematic Reviews

Giannopoulos et al (2022) performed a systematic review of percutaneous treatments for pathologic perforating veins.[58,] Thirty-five studies met the inclusion criteria (5 double-arm studies and 28 single-arm studies). Endovenous laser ablation (with or without microphlebectomy and/or sclerotherapy) was successful within the first 2 weeks after the procedure in 95% of patients. Success rates for RFA (with or without microphlebectomy) were 91% (95% CI, 75% to 99%). Ultrasound-guided sclerotherapy had a success rate of 70% after multiple sessions (95% CI, 53% to 84%). After 12 months of follow-up, occlusion rates were 89%, 77%, and 83% in the 3 groups, respectively. Limitations of the review include heterogeneity of the interventions in the included studies, including adjuvant therapy that could be provided at the investigator's discretion.

Ho et al (2022) published a systematic review to compare interventions for incompetent perforator veins, including open ligation, SEPS, endovascular laser ablation, ultrasound-guided sclerotherapy, and RFA.[59,] A total of 81 studies (N=7010) were identified, and the overall quality of evidence was low to intermediate. Results demonstrated that in the short term (≤ 1 year), efficacy rates for wound healing were 99.9% for ultrasound-guided sclerotherapy, 72.2% for open ligation, and 96.0% for SEPS. For short-term freedom from wound recurrence, the pooled estimate for SEPS was 91.0%; wound recurrence rates were not reported for other interventions.

A systematic literature review by O'Donnell (2008) indicated there was a lack of evidence on the role of incompetent perforator vein surgery performed in conjunction with superficial saphenous vein surgery.[5,] These conclusions were based on 4 RCTs published since 2000 that compared superficial vein surgery with conservative therapy for advanced chronic venous insufficiency (CEAP classes C5 to C6). The 4 trials included 2 level I (large subject population) and 2 level II (small subject population) studies. Two trials combined surgical treatment of the incompetent perforator veins with concurrent or prior treatment of the superficial saphenous veins; the other 2 treated the great saphenous vein alone. The 2 randomized studies (2004, 2007) in which the great saphenous vein alone was treated (including the ESCHAR trial) showed a significant reduction in ulcer recurrence compared with conservative therapy.[60,61,]

Treatment of the great saphenous vein alone has been reported to improve perforator function. For example, Blomgren et al (2005) showed that reversal of perforator vein incompetence (28 [41%] of 68 previously incompetent perforators) was more common than new perforator vein incompetence (41 [22%] of 183 previously competent perforators) following superficial vein surgery.[62,]O'Donnell (2008) discussed additional (lower quality) evidence to suggest deep venous valvular involvement rather than incompetent perforators in venous insufficiency.[5,] Thus, although incompetence of perforator veins is frequently cited as an important etiologic factor in

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

the pathogenesis of venous ulcer, current evidence does not support the routine ligation or ablation of perforator veins.

Subfascial Endoscopic Perforator Surgery

A Cochrane review by Lin et al (2019) evaluated the efficacy of SEPS for the treatment of venous ulcers.[63,] The authors identified 4 RCTs, 2 compared SEPS plus compression with compression alone (n=208), 1 compared SEPS with the Linton procedure (n=39), and 1 compared SEPS plus saphenous vein surgery with saphenous vein surgery alone (n=75). Results are shown in Table 14. The authors concluded that:

- Compared with compression alone, there was low certainty evidence that SEPS may increase the rate of ulcer healing compared to compression alone, but it was uncertain whether SEPS reduced the rate of ulcer recurrence.
- Compared with the Linton procedure, it was uncertain whether there was a difference in ulcer healing, and very uncertain whether there was a difference in ulcer recurrence. Based on very low certainty evidence, the Linton procedure was possibly associated with more adverse events.
- Compared to saphenous vein surgery alone, it was uncertain whether there was a difference in ulcer healing or the risk of ulcer recurrence. It was uncertain whether SEPS led to an increase in adverse events (very low certainty due to imprecision and risk of reporting bias).

Table 14. Meta-analysis Results

Comparator	Ulcer Healing	Ulcer Recurrence	Adverse Events
Compression alone, N	196	208	
Risk ratio (95% CI)	1.17 (1.03 to 1.33)	0.85 (0.26 to 2.76)	
Linton procedure, N	39	39	39
Risk ratio (95% CI)	0.95 (0.83 to 1.09)	0.47 (0.10 to 2.30)	0.04 (0.00 to 0.60)
Saphenous vein surgery, N	22	75	75
Risk ratio (95% CI)	0.96 (0.64 to 1.43)	1.03 (0.15 to 6.91)	2.05 (0.86 to 4.90)

CI:confidence interval.

In a meta-analysis of SEPS for chronic venous insufficiency, Luebke and Brunkwall (2009) concluded that "its use should not be employed routinely and could only be justified in patients with persistent ulceration thought to be of venous origin, and in whom any superficial reflux has already been ablated and postthrombotic changes excluded."[64,] Reviewers also stated that the "introduction of less invasive techniques for perforator vein ablation, such as ultrasound-guided sclerotherapy or radiofrequency ablation, may diminish the role of subfascial endoscopic perforator surgery in the future."

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Retrospective Studies
Lawrence et al (2020) reported a multicenter retrospective review of 832 consecutive patients who met criteria and were treated for venous leg ulcers in the U.S.[65,] Of the 832 patients, 187 were managed with compression alone (75% ulcer healing) and 528 received superficial vein treatment after failure of a mean of 23 months of compression. Of the 528, 344 also underwent ablation of an average of 1.8 perforator veins. Techniques included radiofrequency, laser, and sclerotherapy. The ulcer healing rate was 17% higher in patients treated for perforator reflux (68%) in comparison with superficial vein treatment alone (51%; hazard ratio, 1.619; 95% CI, 1.271 to 2.063), even though the ulcers were larger at baseline. Perforator vein treatment did not affect recurrence rates in ulcers that had healed. Larger ulcers were associated with reflux in more than 1 level, and deep vein stenting was performed in 95 patients, some in combination with superficial vein treatment and some in combination with both superficial and perforator vein treatment. The ulcer healing rate in patients who underwent all 3 procedures was 87% at 36 months with an ulcer recurrence of 26% at 24 months.

Section Summary: Perforator Reflux
The literature has shown that the routine ligation and ablation of incompetent perforator veins is not necessary for treating varicose veins and venous insufficiency concurrent with superficial vein procedures. However, when combined superficial vein procedures and compression therapy have failed to improve symptoms (ie, ulcers), treatment of perforator vein reflux may be as beneficial as any alternative (eg, deep vein valve replacement). Comparative studies are needed to determine the most effective method of ligating and ablating incompetent perforator veins. There is some low quality evidence that SEPS is as effective as the Linton procedure with a reduction in adverse events. Endovenous ablation with specialized laser or RFA probes has been shown to effectively ablate incompetent perforator veins with a potential decrease in morbidity compared with surgical interventions.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
The purpose of the following information is to provide reference material. Inclusion does not imply endorsement or alignment with the evidence review conclusions.

Clinical Input From Physician Specialty Societies and Academic Medical Centers
While the various physician specialty societies and academic medical centers may collaborate with and make recommendations during this process, through the provision of appropriate reviewers, input received does not represent an endorsement or position statement by the physician specialty societies or academic medical centers, unless otherwise noted.

In response to requests, input was received from 4 physician specialty societies while this policy was under review in 2015. There was no agreement on the need to treat varicose tributaries to improve functional outcomes in the absence of saphenous vein disease. Input was also mixed on the use of mechanochemical ablation and cyanoacrylate adhesive.

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements
Guidelines or position statements will be considered for inclusion in 'Supplemental Information' if they were issued by, or jointly by, a US professional society, an international society with US representation, or National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Priority will be given

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

to guidelines that are informed by a systematic review, include strength of evidence ratings, and include a description of management of conflict of interest.

American Venous Forum et al
In 2020, in response to published reports of potentially inappropriate application of venous procedures, the American Venous Forum, Society for Vascular Surgery, American Vein and Lymphatic Society, and the Society of Interventional Radiology published appropriate use criteria for the treatment of chronic lower extremity venous disease.[66,] Appropriate use criteria were developed using the RAND/UCLA method incorporating best available evidence and expert opinion.

Appropriate use criteria were determined for various scenarios (eg, symptomatic, asymptomatic, CEAP [Clinical, Etiology, Anatomy and Pathophysiology] class, axial reflux, saphenofemoral junction reflux) for the following:

- Saphenous vein ablation:
  - Great saphenous vein;
  - Small saphenous vein;
  - Accessory great saphenous vein.
- Nontruncal varicose veins;
- Diseased tributaries associated with saphenous ablation;
- Perforator veins;
- Iliac vein or inferior vena cava stenting as a first line treatment;
- Duplex ultrasound;
- Timing and reimbursement.

Treatment of saphenous veins for asymptomatic CEAP class 1 and 2, or symptomatic class 1, was considered to be rarely appropriate or never appropriate, and treatment of symptomatic CEAP class 2, 3, and 4 to 6 without reflux was rated as never appropriate. Based on the 2011 Guidelines from the Society for Vascular Surgery and American Venous Forum (see below), treatment of perforator veins for asymptomatic or symptomatic CEAP class 1 and 2 was considered to be rarely appropriate or never appropriate. Perforator vein treatment was rated as appropriate for CEAP classes 4 to 6, and may be appropriate for CEAP class 3. Except for a recommendation to use endovenous procedures for perforator vein ablation, techniques used to treat veins in these scenarios were not evaluated.

Society for Vascular Surgery, American Vein and Lymphatic Society, and American Venous Forum
The Society for Vascular Surgery and the American Venous Forum (2011) published joint clinical practice guidelines.[67,] Table 15 provides the recommendations.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Table 15. Guidelines on Management of Varicose Veins and Associated Chronic Venous Diseases

Recommendation	Grade[a]	SOR	QOE
Compression therapy for venous ulcerations and varicose veins			
Compression therapy is recommended as the primary treatment to aid healing of venous ulceration	1B	Strong	Moderate
To decrease the recurrence of venous ulcers, ablation of the incompetent superficial veins in addition to compression therapy is recommended	1A	Strong	High
Use of compression therapy for patients with symptomatic varicose veins is recommended	2C	Weak	Low
Compression therapy as the primary treatment if the patient is a candidate for saphenous vein ablation is not recommended	1B	Strong	Moderate
Treatment of the incompetent great saphenous vein			
Endovenous thermal ablation (radiofrequency or laser) is recommended over chemical ablation with foam or high ligation and stripping due to reduced convalescence and less pain and morbidity. Cryostripping is a technique that is new in the United States, and it has not been fully evaluated.	1B	Strong	Moderate
Varicose tributaries			
Phlebectomy or sclerotherapy are recommended to treat varicose tributaries	1B	Strong	Moderate
Transilluminated powered phlebectomy using lower oscillation speeds and extended tumescence is an alternative to traditional phlebectomy	2C	Weak	Low
Perforating vein incompetence			
Selective treatment of perforating vein incompetence in patients with simple varicose veins is not recommended	1B	Strong	Moderate
Treatment of pathologic perforating veins (outward flow of ≥500 ms duration, with a diameter of ≥3.5 mm) located underneath healed or active ulcers (CEAP class C5-C6) is recommended	2B	Weak	Moderate

CEAP: Clinical Etiology Anatomy Pathophysiology; QOE: quality of evidence; SOR: strength of recommendation.
[a] Grading: strong=1 or weak=2, based on a level of evidence that is either high quality=A, moderate quality=B, or low quality=C.

The Society for Vascular Surgery, the American Vein and Lymphatic Society (AVLS), and the American Venous Forum published a joint clinical practice guideline in 2022 on management of lower extremity varicose veins.[68,] The guideline was published in sections; the first part (published in 2022) focuses on duplex scanning and treatment of superficial truncal reflex. Superficial truncal veins are defined as the great saphenous vein, small saphenous vein, anterior accessory great saphenous vein, and posterior accessory great saphenous vein. A summary of the 2022 guideline recommendations is provided in Table 16. The second part of the guideline was published in 2023 and focuses on the management of varicose vein patients with compression, treatment with drugs and nutritional supplements, evaluation and treatment of varicose tributaries, superficial venous aneurysms, and management of complications of varicose

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

veins and their treatment.[69,] Relevant guideline recommendations regarding the management of varicose veins and varicose tributaries are summarized in Table 17.

Table 16. Summary of Recommended Treatment of Superficial Truncal Reflex

Recommendation	Grade[a]	SOR	QOE
Symptomatic varicose veins and axial reflux			
Reflux in the great or small saphenous vein - superficial venous intervention preferred over long-term compression stockings	1B	Strong	Moderate
Reflux in the anterior accessory or posterior accessory great saphenous vein - superficial venous intervention preferred over long-term compression stockings	2C	Weak	Low
Reflux in the superficial truncal vein - compression therapy suggested for primary treatment	2C	Weak	Low
Reflux in the great saphenous vein - endovenous ablation preferred over high ligation and stripping[b]	1B	Strong	Moderate
Reflux in the small saphenous vein - endovenous ablation preferred over high ligation and stripping[b]	1C	Strong	Low
Reflux in the anterior accessory or posterior accessory great saphenous vein - endovenous ablation (with phlebectomy if needed) over ligation and stripping[b]	2C	Weak	Low
Patients who place a high priority on long-term outcomes (quality of life and recurrence) - laser ablation, radiofrequency ablation, or ligation and stripping over ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy	2C or 2B	Weak	Moderate or Low
Symptomatic axial reflux			
Reflux in the great saphenous vein - thermal and nonthermal ablation recommended	1B	Strong	Moderate
Reflux in the small saphenous vein - thermal and nonthermal ablation recommended	1C	Strong	Low
Reflux in the anterior accessory or posterior accessory great saphenous vein - either thermal or nonthermal ablation suggested	2C	Weak	Low
Varicose veins (CEAP class C2)			
Reflux in the great or small saphenous vein - recommend against concomitant initial ablation and treatment of incompetent perforating veins	1C	Strong	Low
Reflux in the anterior accessory or posterior accessory great saphenous vein - recommend against concomitant initial ablation and treatment of incompetent perforating veins	2C	Weak	Low
Persistent or recurrent symptoms after previous complete ablation - treatment of perforating vein incompetence suggested	2C	Weak	Low
Symptomatic reflux and associated varicosities			
Reflux in the great or small saphenous vein - ablation and concomitant phlebectomy or ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy recommended	1C	Strong	Low

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

Recommendation	Grade[a]	SOR	QOE
Reflux in the anterior accessory or posterior accessory great saphenous vein - ablation and concomitant phlebectomy or ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy suggested	2C	Weak	Low

CEAP: Clinical Etiology Anatomy Pathophysiology; QOE: quality of evidence; SOR: strength of recommendation.
[a] Grading: strong=1 or weak=2, based on a level of evidence that is either high quality=A, moderate quality=B, or low quality=C.
[b] Ligation and stripping can be performed if endovenous ablation is not feasible.

Table 17. Summary of Recommendations for Varicose Veins and Varicose Tributaries

	Grade[a]	SOR	QOE
Endovenous Ablation vs High Ligation and Stripping			
For patients with symptomatic varicose veins and axial reflux in the GSV, who are candidates for intervention, we recommend treatment with endovenous ablation over HL&S of the GSV.	1	Strong	Moderate
For patients with symptomatic varicose veins and axial reflux in the SSV, who are candidates for intervention, we recommend treatment with endovenous ablation over ligation and stripping of the SSV.	1	Strong	Low to very low
For patients with symptomatic varicose veins and axial reflux in the AAGSV or PAGSV, who are candidates for intervention, we suggest treatment with endovenous ablation, with additional phlebectomy, if needed, over ligation and stripping of the accessory vein.	2	Weak	Low to very low
For patients with symptomatic varicose veins and axial reflux in the GSV or SSV, we recommend treatment with HL&S of the saphenous vein if technology or expertise in endovenous ablation is not available or if the venous anatomy precludes endovenous treatment.	1	Strong	Moderate
For patients with symptomatic varicose veins and axial reflux in the AAGSV or PAGSV, we suggest 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.	2	Weak	Low to very low
For patients with symptomatic varicose veins and axial reflux in the GSV who place a high priority on the long-term outcomes of treatment (QOL and recurrence), we suggest treatment with EVLA, RFA, or HL&S over physician-compounded UGFS, because of long-term improvement of QOL and reduced recurrence.	2	Weak	Moderate
For patients with symptomatic varicose veins and axial reflux in the SSV, we suggest treatment with EVLA, RFA, or ligation and stripping from the knee to the upper or midcalf over physician-compounded UGFS because of long-term improvement of QOL and reduced recurrence.	2	Weak	Low to very low
For patients with symptomatic varicose veins and axial reflux in the AAGSV or PAGSV who place a high priority on the long-term outcomes of treatment (QOL and recurrence), we suggest treatment of the refluxing superficial trunk with endovenous laser ablation, RFA, or HL&S, with additional phlebectomy if needed, over physician-compounded UGFS because of long-term improvement of QOL and reduced recurrence.	2	Weak	Low to very low
Thermal vs. nonthermal ablation of superficial truncal veins			
For patients with symptomatic axial reflux of the GSV, we recommend either thermal or nonthermal ablation from the groin to below the knee, depending on the available expertise of the treating physician and the preference of the patient.	1	Strong	Moderate

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

	Grade[a]	SOR	QOE
For patients with symptomatic axial reflux of the SSV, we recommend either thermal or nonthermal ablation from the knee to the upper or midcalf, depending on the available expertise of the treating physician and the preference of the patient.	1	Strong	Low to very low
For patients with symptomatic axial reflux of the AAGSV or PAGSV, we suggest either thermal or nonthermal ablation, with additional phlebectomy if needed, depending on the available expertise of the treating physician and the preference of the patient.	2	Weak	Low to very low
Telangiectasias and reticular veins			
For patients with symptomatic telangiectasias and reticular veins, we recommend sclerotherapy with liquid or foam.	1	Strong	Moderate
For patients with symptomatic telangiectasias or reticular veins, we suggest transcutaneous laser treatment if the patient has sclerosant allergy, needle phobia, sclerotherapy failure, or small veins (<1 mm) with telangiectatic matting.	2	Weak	Moderate
Varicose tributaries			
For treatment of symptomatic varicose tributaries, we recommend miniphlebectomy or ultrasound-guided sclerotherapy using PCF or PEM.	1	Strong	Moderate
For treatment of symptomatic varicose tributaries, we suggest transilluminated powered phlebectomy as an alternative treatment for patients with clusters of varicosities by a physician who is trained in the procedure.	2	Weak	Low to very low
Treatment of varicose tributaries concomitant or staged with superficial truncal ablation			
For patients with symptomatic reflux in the GSV or SSV and associated varicosities, we recommend ablation of the refluxing venous trunk and concomitant phlebectomy or ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy of the varicosities with PCF or PEM.	1	Strong	Low to very low
For patients with symptomatic reflux in the AAGSV or PAGSV, we suggest simultaneous ablation of the refluxing venous trunk and phlebectomy or UGFS of the varicosities with PCF or PEM.	2	Weak	Low to very low
For patients with symptomatic reflux in the GSV or SSV, we suggest ablation of the refluxing venous trunk and staged phlebectomy or UGFS of the varicosities only if anatomical or medical reasons are present. We suggest shared decision-making with the patient regarding the timing of the procedure.	2	Weak	Low to very low
For patients with symptomatic reflux in the AAGSV or PAGSV, we suggest ablation of the refluxing venous trunk and staged phlebectomy or UGFS of the varicosities only if anatomical or medical reasons are present. We suggest shared decision-making with the patient regarding the timing of the procedure.	2	Weak	Low to very low
Ablation of incompetent perforating veins			
For patients with varicose veins (CEAP class C2) who have significant, symptomatic axial reflux of the GSV or SSV, we recommend against treatment of incompetent perforating veins concomitant with initial ablation of the saphenous veins.	1	Strong	Low to very low
For patients with varicose veins (CEAP class C2) who have significant, symptomatic axial reflux of the AAGSV or PAGSV, we suggest against treatment of incompetent perforating veins concomitant with initial ablation of the superficial truncal veins.	2	Weak	Low to very low

AAGSV: anterior accessory great saphenous vein; CEAP: Clinical, Etiologic, Anatomic, Pathophysiologic classification system; EVLA: endovenous laser ablation; GSV: great sapherous vein; HL&S: high ligation and stripping; PCF: physician-compounded foam; PEM: polidocanol endovenous microfoam; PAGSV: posterior accessory great saphenous vein; QOE: quality of evidence; QOL: quality of life; RFA: radiofrequency ablation; SOR: strength of recommendation; SSV: small saphenous vein; UGFS: ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy.

[a] Grading: strong=1 or weak=2, based on a level of evidence that is either high quality=A, moderate quality=B, or low quality=C.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

American Vein and Lymphatic Society
In 2015, the AVLS (previously named the American College of Phlebology) published guidelines on the treatment of superficial vein disease.[70,]

AVLS gave a Grade 1 recommendation based on high quality evidence that compression is an effective method for the management of symptoms, but when patients have a correctable source of reflux, definitive treatment should be offered unless contraindicated. AVLS recommends against a requirement for compression therapy when a definitive treatment is available. AVLS gave a strong recommendation based on moderate quality evidence that endovenous thermal ablation is the preferred treatment for saphenous and accessory saphenous vein incompetence, and gave a weak recommendation based on moderate quality evidence that mechanochemical ablation may also be used to treat venous reflux.

In 2017, AVLS published guidelines on the treatment of refluxing accessory saphenous veins.[41,] The College gave a Grade 1 recommendation based on level C evidence that patients with symptomatic incompetence of the accessory saphenous veins be treated with endovenous thermal ablation or sclerotherapy to reduce symptomatology. The guidelines noted that although accessory saphenous veins may drain into the great saphenous vein before it drains into the common femoral vein, they can also empty directly into the common femoral vein.

In 2024, AVLS published a position statement on cyanoacrylate endovenous ablation.[71,] They state that cyanoacrylate closure has been proven to be an effective and safe treatment option for incompetent saphenous veins. It offers the advantage of lower patient discomfort and reduced hematoma risk.

In 2025, AVLS published a position statement on mechanochemical chemically assisted ablation of varicose veins for venous insufficiency.[72,] The following conclusion and recommendations were made: "Mechanical occlusion chemically assisted venous ablation is effective in alleviating symptoms and a safe treatment option for venous insufficiency. As a non-thermal ablation method, MOCA [mechanical occlusion chemically assisted ablation] obviates the need for tumescent anesthesia and thus results in less procedural discomfort and risk of thermal nerve or skin injury. It may be used in both the below knee distal GSV [great saphenous veins] as well as the SSV [small saphenous veins] with no risk of thermal injury to the adjacent nerves. However, it is associated with significantly lower rates of vessel closure and higher recanalization rates when followed for more than 1 year compared to both radiofrequency ablation and endovenous laser ablation." "It is an available option for those in whom thermal ablation is not suitable."

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
In 2013, the NICE updated its guidance on ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy for varicose veins.[73,]NICE stated that:

"1.1 Current evidence on the efficacy of ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy for varicose veins is adequate. The evidence on safety is adequate, and provided that patients are warned of the small but significant risks of foam embolization (see section 1.2), this procedure may be used with normal arrangements for clinical governance, consent and audit.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

1.2 During the consent process, clinicians should inform patients that there are reports of temporary chest tightness, dry cough, headaches and visual disturbance, and rare but significant complications including myocardial infarction, seizures, transient ischaemic attacks and stroke."

In 2015, NICE published a technology assessment on the clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of foam sclerotherapy, endovenous laser ablation, and surgery for varicose veins.[74,]

In 2016, NICE revised its guidance on endovenous mechanochemical ablation, concluding that "Current evidence on the safety and efficacy of endovenous mechanochemical ablation for varicose veins appears adequate to support the use of this procedure...."[75,] Similar recommendations were made for cyanoacrylate in 2020.[76,]

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations
Not applicable.

Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials
Some currently unpublished trials that might influence this review are listed in Table 18.

Table 18. Summary of Key Trials

NCT No.	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
NCT04737941	Finnish Venous Ulcer Study	248	Mar 2026
Unpublished			
NTR4613[a]	Mechanochemical endovenous ablation versus radiofrequency ablation in the treatment of primary small saphenous vein insufficiency (MESSI trial)	160	Apr 2020
NCT03820947[a]	Global, Post-Market, Prospective, Multi-Center, Randomized Controlled Trial of the VenaSeal™ Closure System vs. Surgical Stripping or Endothermal Ablation (ETA) for the Treatment of Early & Advanced Stage Superficial Venous Disease	506 (actual)	Nov 2025 (actual)

NCT: national clinical trial. NTR: Netherlands Trial Registry.
[a] Denotes industry-sponsored or cosponsored trial.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

CODING

The following codes for treatment and procedures applicable to this policy are included below for informational purposes. This may not be a comprehensive list of procedure codes applicable to this policy.

Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

The code(s) listed below are medically necessary ONLY if the procedure is performed according to the "Policy" section of this document.

CPT/HCPCS	
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	Single or multiple injections of sclerosing solutions, spider veins (telangiectasia); limb or trunk
36470	Injection of sclerosing solution: single vein
36471	Injection of sclerosing solution; multiple veins, 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; second and subsequent veins 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; second and subsequent veins treated in a single extremity, each through separate access sites (list separately in addition to code for primary procedure)

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

CPT/HCPCS	
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)
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
37760	Ligation of perforator veins, subfascial, radical (Linton type), including skin graft, when performed, open, 1 leg
37761	Ligation of perforator vein(s), subfascial, open, including ultrasound guidance, when performed, 1 leg
37765	Stab phlebectomy of varicose veins, 1 extremity; 10-20 stab incisions
37766	Stab phlebectomy of varicose veins, 1 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), 1 leg
37799	Unlisted procedure, vascular surgery
76937	Ultrasound guidance for vascular access requiring ultrasound evaluation of potential access sites, documentation of selected vessel patency, concurrent real time ultrasound visualization of vascular needle entry, with permanent recording and reporting (List separately in addition to code for primary procedure)
76942	Ultrasonic guidance for needle placement (e.g., biopsy, aspiration, injection, localization device), imaging supervision and interpretation
76998	Ultrasonic guidance, intraoperative
76999	Unlisted ultrasound procedure (e.g. diagnostic, interventional)
93970	Duplex scan of extremity veins including responses to compression and other maneuvers; complete bilateral study
93971	Duplex scan of extremity veins including responses to compression and other maneuvers; unilateral or limited study
0524T	Endovenous catheter directed chemical ablation with balloon isolation of incompetent extremity vein, open or percutaneous, including all vascular access, catheter manipulation, diagnostic imaging, imaging guidance and monitoring
S2202	Echosclerotherapy

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

REVISIONS	
8-17-2004	Removed "-6" from Policy, Covered Services, 1, section.
	Changed "Pain in the affected extremities ~~or~~ with impairment of mobility ~~or~~ and activities of daily living ~~and~~ in the Policy, Covered Services, 2, a, section.
	Changed "Presuming the foregoing criteria are satisfied, treatment for symptomatic varicose veins will be covered for the following clinical indications when ~~any~~ one of the following conditions can be attributed to the varicosities:" in the Policy, Covered Services, 2, section.
	Changed Policy, Covered Services, 2, g, to the Policy, Covered Services, 3, section.
	Added "Documentation of" to Policy, Covered Services, 3.
	Added "Documentation by photograph(s)" to the Policy, Covered Services, 5, section.
	Changed/added "The following codes for the treatment of varicose veins ~~for~~ are cosmetic ~~purposes is~~ and not covered:" to Not Medically Necessary/Experimental/Excluded Services section.
	Removed "The following code represents procedures that are either considered cosmetic, content of service, or investigational for varicose vein treatment and are therefore not covered services." from Not Medically Necessary/Experimental/Excluded Services section.
	Added "The following codes for the treatment of varicose veins are considered experimental/investigational:" to Not Medically Necessary/Experimental/Excluded Services section.
	Changed "~~Repeat~~ Sclerotherapy for varicose veins greater than 7 mm, ~~without evidence of previous sclerotherapy effectiveness,~~ is considered ineffective and denied not medically necessary." in Not Medically Necessary/Experimental/Excluded Services section.
	Removed "The patient's medical record must document the following and be on file for audit purposes: 1. A history and physical findings supporting a diagnosis of symptomatic varicose veins to include: edema, skin changes, ulceration, pain in the limbs, impaired mobility and activities of daily living. 2. Failure of an adequate trial of conservative treatments 3. Drawing with size and dimension of vein 4. Documentation of location of vein" from the Documentation section.
	Changed "Documentation" to Miscellaneous" in the Documentation section.
	Moved "Billing Instructions" from the Coding section to Policy, Covered Services section.
8-24-2004	Removed "BCBSKS staff may see this procedure billed as 37799." and added " For less than 10 stab phlebectomies, use CPT code 37799." to Descriptions, page 3, Multiple Stab Phlebectomy/Micro-Incisional Phlebectomy billed as CPT 37785 section.
5-19-2005	Removed the following CPT codes from the document: 36011, 36012, 37204, 75894, and S2130.
	In "Description" section, Ultrasound-Guided Sclerotherapy and Echosclerotherapy added the phrase, "If guides are met, allow only 36470 or 36471".
	In "Description" section, Multiple Stab Phlebectomy/Micro-Incisional Phlebectomy removed "with other techniques when" and added "when performed as the primary procedure and".
	In "Policy" section under Covered Services added "may be requested" to #5.
	In "Policy" section, Not Medically Necessary/Experimental/Excluded Services, changed "If varicose vein surgery is billed with multiple codes BCBSKS will deny the 7000's code(s) and allow code(s) representing treatment of the varicose veins. " to "If

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

REVISIONS	
	varicose vein surgery is billed with codes considered inclusive of imaging, guidance and monitoring, BCBSKS will deny the 7000's codes content of service".
	In "Policy" section, Not Medically Necessary/Experimental/Excluded Services, changed "Selective catheter placement (36011 and 36012) will be allowed when it is performed with a covered procedure" to "Selective catheter placement is content of service of a covered procedure".
	In "Policy" section, Not Medically Necessary/Experimental/Excluded Services, CPT codes 93965, 93970 or 93971 should not be billed for intraoperative procedures. If these codes are billed separately as the initial diagnostic tool for mapping, the claim will be allowed if medically necessary. Added, "Any additional scans over the initial mapping will be reviewed for medical necessity".
	In "Policy" section, Not Medically Necessary/Experimental/Excluded Services, removed "The multiple stab phlebectomy/micro-incisional phlebectomy (37765, 37766, 37785 and 37799) is considered content of service to CPT 37720 and 37730 if done on the same leg on the same day. BCBSKS will allow 37765, 37766, and 37785 with other techniques when the vessel meets varicose vein guidelines" and added "The multiple stab phlebectomy/micro-incisional phlebectomy is considered content of service to any varicose vein treatment on the same leg on the same day. CPT codes 37765, 37766, and 37785 will be allowed when performed as the primary procedure and when the vessel meets varicose vein guidelines".
	In "Policy" section, Not Medically Necessary/Experimental/Excluded Services, added "Procedures (stab phlebectomy, micro-incisional phlebectomy, sclerotherapy, ligation and stripping, etc.) to treat residual or tributary veins are considered content when performed in conjunction with a primary varicose vein ablative procedure".
	In "Policy" section under Not Medically Necessary/Experimental/Excluded Services, The ligation of perforator veins, subfascial, radical (Linton type), with or without skin graft, open (37760) is considered content of service to CPT 37700, 37720, 37730, 37735, 37780, and 37785 if done on the same leg on the same day. Added "CPT code 37700, 37720, 37730, and 37735 will be allowed when performed as the primary procedure and the vessel meets varicose vein guidelines."
	In "Policy" section, Not Medically Necessary/Experimental/Excluded Services, added "Transilluminated powered phlebectomy is content of service to the primary procedure".
12-15-2005	In "Not Medically Necessary/Experimental/Excluded Services" section replaced 37720 with 37718 and replaced 37730 with 37722.
	In "CPT/HCPCS" section deleted CPT codes 37720 and 37730 and added CPT codes 37718 and 37722.
2-17-2006	In "Coding" title, added "NOTE: Use of any diagnosis code does not guarantee reimbursement. Medical necessity will be based on documentation in the clinical record."
	In "Policy" section, Covered Services, 4, added, "Patients with prior greater and/or lesser saphenous vein ablation procedures for varicose veins will have had the respective valves ablated. Therefore, our requirement for incompetence of valves at the major vein junctions would not apply for requests for additional ablation procedures of the tributaries of the previous ablated major vein. In such cases only the other requirements for medical necessity of varicose vein ablation should be applied."
October 10, 2006 with effective date	In "Policy" section, Covered Services, added "ligation and stripping, endovenous laser, radiofrequency ablation, stab phlebectomy, or sclerotherapy," to the initial sentence at Medical Director's request.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

REVISIONS	
of October 10, 2006	In "Policy" section, Covered Services, #4, deleted "Patients with prior greater and/or lesser saphenous vein ablation procedures for varicose veins will have had the respective valves ablated. Therefore, our requirement for incompetence of valves at the major vein junctions would not apply for requests for additional ablation procedures of the tributaries of the previous ablated major vein. In such cases only the other requirements for medical necessity of varicose vein ablation should be applied." and added "is required for endoluminal radiofrequency or laser ablation." At Medical Director's request.
	In "Policy" section, Covered Services, Billing Instructions, added "for sclerotherapy" following Billing Instruction at Medical Director's request.
	In "Not Medically Necessary/Experimental/Excluded Services", experimental/investigational section added "the greater saphenous vein or" to the third statement beginning with 'Sclerotherapy for…' at Medical Director's request.
October 31, 2006 with effective date of January 1, 2007	In "Coding" CPT/HCPCS section, deleted CPT code 76986 and added CPT code 76998 due to the 2007 CPT changes.
09-07-2007	Re-written for clarification. In Descriptions section: ▪ In Reticular Veins paragraph, removed "(>2mm)". ▪ In Sclerotherapy paragraph, removed "This causes veins to gently dry up and become absorbed by the body's natural healing response." and "…because blood flow is shifted to healthy veins." ▪ In Ultrasound-Guided Sclerotherapy title added "or Echosclerotherapy" ▪ In Ultrasound-Guided Sclerotherapy paragraph removed "This is an in office treatment alternative to surgical stripping. With needle or catheter technique, sclerotherapy is done while the doctor visually monitors the vein on an ultrasound screen." ▪ Removed paragraph entitled Echosclerotherapy billed as CPT S2202 which stated, "This procedure is used for the destruction of a vessel using the injection of an irritant solution under the guidance of a duplex ultrasound machine. This procedure is the same as Ultrasound-Guided Sclerotherapy. The procedure remains experimental/investigational. If guides are met, allow only 36470 or 36471." ▪ In Endoluminal Radiofrequency Ablation paragraph removed, "The scanner allows pinpoint accuracy and also means that the veins can be seen so that none are missed." and "as no strip is required." In Multiple Stab Phlebectomy title removed, "Multiple" and added "and 37766".
	In Policy Covered Services section: ▪ In #1 removed the following stricken through words, "~~Prior to treating varicose veins, and where clinically appropriate~~, the patient must ~~have been offered and~~ undergone a 3 month trial of conservative medical therapy ~~including~~ such ~~measures~~ as leg elevation, compressive elastic stockings (support hose) and weight loss(when appropriate). This must be documented in the medical record." ▪ In #1 added, "at least a" 3 month trail of conservative medical therapy… ▪ In #2 removed the following stricken through words, "~~Presuming the foregoing criteria are satisfied, treatment for symptomatic varicose veins will be covered for the following clinical indications when~~, one of the following conditions can be attributed to the varicosities:" ▪ In #4 removed, "the saphenofemoral and/or saphenopopliteal junctions or in" and "is required for endoluminal radiofrequency or laser ablation."

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

REVISIONS	
	▪ In #4 added, "when these specific veins are being treated." In #5 added, "A clear description of the varicose vein related physical exam findings."
	In Policy Not Medically Necessary/Experimental/Excluded Services section: Added, "Endovenous ablation (36475, 36476, 36478 and 36479) other than the greater, accessory or small saphenous vein will be reimbursed at 25% of full."
10-16-2007	In Descriptions section: ▪ In Ultrasound-Guided Sclerotherapy paragraph removed, "There is little evidence in the form of randomized prospective clinical trials to support that ultrasound makes a significant difference in optimizing outcome or decreasing complications. This procedure is the same as Eschotherapy. This procedure remains experimental /investigational." ▪ In Ultrasound-Guided Sclerotherapy paragraph added "Ultrasound guidance is content of service. For S2202, allow only 36470 or 36471 (the ultrasound component is content of service.)" ▪ In Ultrasound-Guided Laser title removed "with 76998". ▪ In Ultrasound-Guided Laser paragraph removed "The laser is then fired to cause injury to the vein wall, which causes it to collapse. There are some significant potential complications including burning of the skin. The procedure remains experimental/ investigational." In Endoluminal Radiofrequency Ablation title added "or 37204".
	In Policy Not Medically Necessary/Experimental/Excluded Services section: ▪ Replaced "The following codes for the treatment of varicose veins are considered experimental/investigational: 76937, 76998, S2202" with "The use of the following ultrasound guidance procedures (7000 codes, 93965, 93970, 93971, S2202) during varicose vein surgery is considered content of service." ▪ To code S2202 section added, "(pay only as 36470 or 36471)". ▪ Removed, "The use of ultrasound guidance during varicose vein surgery is considered experimental/investigational. If varicose vein surgery is billed with a global code the total service will be denied experimental/investigational." And "If varicose vein surgery is billed with codes considered inclusive of imaging guidance and monitoring, BCBSKS will deny 7000's codes content of service." ▪ Added the phrase "ligation and division procedures" as a descriptor to CPT codes within a paragraph. Added the phrase "(ordinary diagnostic)" behind CPT codes 37250 and 37251 within a paragraph.
01-04-2008	In Descriptions section: ▪ Removed Ultrasound-Guided Laser billed as CPT 37204 paragraph stating, "The treatment for varicose veins involves the use of a cut down on the saphenous vein and introduction of a catheter with laser fiber within. The procedure is otherwise identical to radiofrequency ablation." *In Endoluminal Radiofrequency Ablation (VNUS Closure Technique) billed as CPT 36475 and 36476 or 37204 title, removed "or 37204".*
	In Policy Not Medically Necessary/Experimental/Excluded section: ▪ Removed the following paragraphs: "The multiple stab phlebectomy/micro-incisional phlebectomy (37765, 37766, 37785 and 37799) is considered content of service to any varicose vein treatment on the same leg on the same day. CPT codes 37765, 37766, and 37785 will be allowed when performed as the primary procedure and when the vessel meets varicose vein guidelines."

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

REVISIONS	
	"Procedures (stab phlebectomy, micro-incisional phlebectomy, sclerotherapy, ligation and stripping, etc.) to treat residual or tributary veins are considered content when performed in conjunction with a primary varicose vein ablative procedure." "The ligation of perforator veins, subfascial, radical (Linton type), with or without skin graft, open (37760) is considered content of service to ligation and division procedures, CPT 37700, 37718, 37722, 37735, 37780, and 37785 if done on the same leg on the same day. CPT code 37700, 37718, 37722, and 37735 will be allowed when performed as the primary procedure and the vessel meets varicose vein guidelines." "Intravascular ultrasound, codes 37250 and 37251 (ordinarily diagnostic) are considered content of service to any vascular procedure." "Transilluminated powered phlebectomy (TIPP) is content of service to the primary procedure."
07-18-2008	In Policy Covered Services section: ▪ In #3 added the underlined words, "Document <u>that tributary</u> veins <u>treated are</u> 3 mm in diameter or larger." ▪ In #4 added the underlined words, "Documentation of valvular incompetence of the greater, lesser <u>assessory</u>, saphenous, or <u>penetrator</u> veins…" In Policy Not Medically Necessary/Experimental/Excluded Services section: ▪ In first paragraph, replaced "varicose" with "tributary". *In #3, replace "7000 codes" with "76937, 76942, 76998, 76999"*
04-22-2009	In Policy Covered Services section: ▪ In #4 added, "(Note: There is no medical indication to treat incompetent perforators in patients not suffering from stasis ulcers per consultant.)" In Policy Billing Instructions for Sclerotherapy section: *Added #4, "CPT code 3779, when used for stab phlebectomy less than 10 with a diagnosis code of 454.0, 454.1, 454.2, or 454.8, modifier 22 should be added and box 19 of the claim form populated with 'stab phlebectomy less than 10'."*
11-18-2009	In Policy Covered Services section: Modified wording of 4. From "Documentation of valvular incompetence of the greater, lesser assessory, or saphenous or perforator veins by Doppler or duplex ultrasound scanning when these specific veins are being treated. (Note: There is no medical indication to treat incompetent perforators in patients not suffering from stasis ulcers per consultant.)" To "Documentation of valvular incompetence of the greater, lesser assessory, or saphenous veins by Doppler or duplex ultrasound scanning when these specific veins are being treated."
	In Not Medically Necessary / Experimental / Excluded Services / Content of Service section: ▪ Added the indication: 7. Treatment of incompetent perforator veins is considered not medically necessary as demonstrated in references 20 and 21: ▪ "Patients with isolated reflux in perforator veins…are generally asymptomatic; reflux at multiple valve sites is required for symptom expression." ▪ "Reflux in perforator veins that are smaller than 4mm in diameter is not considered to be clinically significant. ▪ "In complex venous disease, comprehensive correction is neither feasible nor necessary; partial correction of multifocal disease often relieves symptoms."

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

REVISIONS	
	▪ "The role of interruption of the perforator vein is controversial because of doubts about the pathologic significance of reflux involving this vein and because its specific efficacy is uncertain." *"The role of perforator vein ablation awaits result, of properly conducted randomized controlled trials."*
	Updated Reference section.
01-01-2010	In Coding Section: Added CPT Code: 37761
10-11-2010	Description section updated
	In Policy section: ▪ Revised policy language to current policy from the following: "BCBSKS will cover the treatment of varicose veins by ligation and stripping, endovenous laser or radiofrequency ablation, stab phlebectomy, or sclerotherapy, according to the following guidelines (must meet all five conditions listed below): 1. The patient must have undergone at least a 3 month trial of conservative medical therapy such as leg elevation, compressive elastic stockings (support hose) and weight loss (when appropriate). This must be documented in the medical record. 2. One of the following conditions can be attributed to the varicosities: a. Pain in the affected extremities with impairment of mobility and activities of daily living, b. Significant recurrent superficial phlebitis, c. Skin ulcerations, d. Bleeding, e. Refractory dependent edema not attributed to other causes, f. Other complications from venous stasis such as dermatitis, 3. Documentation that tributary veins treated are 3 mm in diameter or larger. 4. Documentation of valvular incompetence of the greater, lesser accessory, or saphenous veins by Doppler or duplex ultrasound scanning when these specific veins are being treated. A clear description of the varicose vein related physical exam findings. Documentation by photograph(s) may be requested. <u>Not Medically Necessary / Experimental / Excluded Services / Content of Service</u> 1. Sclerotherapy and /or surgical interventions, for the treatment of telangiectasia veins, reticular veins, or other tributary veins less than 3 mm in diameter are considered cosmetic. 2. The following codes for the treatment of varicose veins are cosmetic and not covered: ▪ 36468 - Single or multiple injections of sclerosing solutions, spider veins (telangiectasia); limb or trunk ▪ 36469 - Single or multiple injections of sclerosing solutions, spider veins (telangiectasia); face 3. The use of the following ultrasound guidance procedures (76937, 76942, 76998, 76999, 93965, 93970, 93971, S2202) during varicose vein surgery is considered content of service. 4. Sclerotherapy for the greater saphenous vein or varicose veins greater than 7 mm is considered ineffective and denied not medically necessary. 5. Selective catheter placement is content of service of a covered procedure. 6. CPT codes 93965, 93970 or 93971 should not be billed for intraoperative procedures. If these codes are billed separately as the initial diagnostic tool for mapping, the claim will be allowed if medically necessary. Any additional scans over the initial mapping will be reviewed for medical necessity.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

REVISIONS	
	7. Treatment of incompetent perforator veins is considered not medically necessary as demonstrated in references 20 and 21: ▪ "Patients with isolated reflux in perforator veins…are generally asymptomatic; reflux at multiple valve sites is required for symptom expression." ▪ "Reflux in perforator veins that are smaller than 4mm in diameter is not considered to be clinically significant. ▪ "In complex venous disease, comprehensive correction is neither feasible nor necessary; partial correction of multifocal disease often relieves symptoms." ▪ "The role of interruption of the perforator vein is controversial because of doubts about the pathologic significance of reflux involving this vein and because its specific efficacy is uncertain." ▪ "The role of perforator vein ablation awaits result, of properly conducted randomized controlled trials." <u>Billing Instructions for Sclerotherapy</u> 1. CPT code 36470 should be used when only one vein is injected on a given date of service. 2. CPT code 36471 should be used when more than one vein in the same leg is injected on a given date of service. 3. If both legs are injected, right and left modifier should be used on claims with the codes to indicate which leg is being treated. The following coding conventions should be used: ▪ One vein on the left; two veins on the right: 36470 LT and 36471 RT. Injections for each leg should be reported on a separate line. ▪ One vein on each leg: Use 36470 RT and 36470 LT. ▪ Two veins on the right; three on the left: 36471 RT and 36471 LT. ▪ In each case, the correct quantity to bill is <u>one</u> unit per code. 4. CPT code 37799, when used for stab phlebectomy less than 10 with a diagnosis code of 454.0, 454.1, 454.2, or 454.8, modifier 22 should be added and box 19 of the claim form populated with "stab phlebectomy less than 10". Endovenous ablation (36475, 36476, 36478 and 36479) other than the greater, accessory or small saphenous vein will be reimbursed at 25% of full. Refunds will be sought on all claims not meeting policy and documentation requirements or inappropriately billed." ▪ Removed the following language: "Miscellaneous C.E.A.P. Classifications of Venous Disorders a. Classification "C" Class 0 – No visible venous disease Class 1 – Telangiectasia or Reticular veins Class 2 – Varicose Veins Class 3 – Varicose Veins with edema Class 4 – Varicose veins with skin changes without ulceration Class 5 – Varicose veins with a healed ulcer Class 6 – Varicose veins skin changes with an active ulcer After this number: ▪ the letter "a" is assigned if the patient is asymptomatic, or ▪ the letter "s" is assigned if the patient experiences symptoms b. Etiology "E" Indicate if the vein is "c" congenital disease, "p" primary disease (not due to another cause) or "s" secondary venous disease, usually due to prior deep venous thrombosis. c. Anatomic Findings "As" or "Ad"

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

REVISIONS	
	Is usually based on Duplex ultrasound examination. The options are as follows: Superficial Veins (As) 1. Telangiectasias or reticular veins 2. Greater saphenous vein - above the knee 3. Greater saphenous vein - below the knee 4. Lesser (short) saphenous vein 5. Nonsaphenous Deep veins (Ad) 1. Inferior vena cava 2. Common iliac 3. Internal iliac 4. External iliac 5. Pelvic: gonadal, broad ligament, etc. 6. Common femoral 7. Deep femoral 8. Superficial femoral 9. Popliteal 10. Crural: anterior tibial, posterial tibial, peroneal 11. Muscular: gastrocnemius, soleus, etc. Perforating Veins • Thigh • Calf d. Pathophysiologic Component "P" "r" for reflux, "o" for obstruction, or "r, o" for both reflux and obstruction may be used In addition, a disability score for chronic venous insufficiency may be used, with: ▪ "0" denoting a patient who is asymptomatic, and thus has no disability ▪ "1" denoting a patient who is symptomatic but can function without a support device ▪ "2" denoting a patient who can work an 8 hour day *only* with a support device ▪ "3" denoting a patient who is unable to work even with a support device Example of the C.E.A.P. documentation: Rt leg: C1a,2a,3s-Ep-As1,2,3-Pr-1 Lt leg: C1a,2a-Ep-As1-P-0
	Policy Guidelines section added
	Rationale section added
	In Coding section: Updated wording, no codes removed or added.
	Rationale section updated
05-04-2011	Description section updated
	In Policy section: ▪ Clarified policy by including within the Greater or Lesser Saphenous Veins, Accessory Saphenous Veins, and Symptomatic Varicose Tributaries sections of the policy the following: "B. Physical findings that support medically significant venous hypertension must be clearly documented." and "D. Treatment of varicose veins for cosmetic purposes is not covered." ▪ Clarified Policy Guidelines by: ▪ Adding to #1: "Physical findings that support medically significant venous hypertension must be clearly documented. Treatment of varicose veins for

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

REVISIONS	
	cosmetic purposes is not covered." to read "1. A clear and complete description of the physical exam of the lower extremities that documents the medical necessity of treatment for venous insufficiency for medical, not cosmetic purposes, is required. Physical findings that support medically significant venous hypertension must be clearly documented. Treatment of varicose veins for cosmetic purposes is not covered. Photographs may be requested." ▪ Revising #2: From "…up to 3 sclerotherapy sessions for both legs…" to "…up to 3 sclerotherapy sessions for each leg…" to read "Up to 20 injections in each leg may be treated in any one session and up to 3 sclerotherapy sessions for each leg may be considered medically necessary if selection criteria are met." ▪ Added to Policy Guidelines: "5. Patients with combined deep and superficial venous insufficiency are often not good candidates for ablation therapy. Varicose vein recurrence and ulcer recurrence rates following intervention are much higher." ▪ Removed from Policy Guidelines: "The severity of signs and symptoms of venous disease tends to correlate with the degree of reflux identified by duplex ultrasound." ▪ The intent of the policy language was not changed.
	Rationale section update
	Revision section: ▪ Removed revision details for 01-04-2008 and 07-18-2008
	References updated
09-06-2011	Description section updated.
	In Policy section: ▪ Within the subsection of Greater or Lesser Saphenous Veins moved the following wording as a stand alone Item B. to be included with the medically necessary criteria as item A. 3. to read, "Physical findings that support medically significant venous hypertension are clearly documented." This change was made to be clearer that in addition to meeting the medical necessity criteria, physical findings that support medically significant venous hypertension must be clearly documented. ▪ Within the subsection of Accessory Saphenous Veins moved the following wording as a stand alone Item B. to be included with the medically necessary criteria as item A. 4. to read, "Physical findings that support medically significant venous hypertension are clearly documented." This change was made to be clearer that in addition to meeting the medical necessity criteria, physical findings that support medically significant venous hypertension must be clearly documented. ▪ Within the subsection of Symptomatic Varicose Tributaries, Item A. was liberalized from, "The following treatments are considered medically necessary as a component of the treatment of symptomatic varicose tributaries when performed either at the same time or following prior treatment (surgical, radiofrequency or laser) of the saphenous veins…" to "The following treatments are considered medically necessary as a component of the treatment of symptomatic varicose tributaries.." ▪ Within the subsection of Symptomatic Varicose Tributaries, Item B. was revised from "Physical findings that support medically significant venous hypertension must be clearly documented." to "Physical findings must support medical necessity."
	Rationale section updated
	References updated
09-11-2012	Description section updated
	In Policy section:

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

REVISIONS	
	a. In I A 2 c and II A 3 c revised wording from "Recurrent hemorrhage or bleeding episodes…" to "Hemorrhage or recurrent bleeding episodes…" No policy intent change was made. b. In I A 3 and II A 4 clarified the wording from "Physical findings…" to "Physical / visible findings…" c. Added to IV Perforator Veins "A. Surgical ligation (including subfascial endoscopic perforator surgery) or endovenous radiofrequency or laser ablation of incompetent perforator veins may be considered medically necessary as a treatment of leg ulcers associated with chronic venous insufficiency when the following conditions have been met: 1. There is demonstrated perforator reflux; AND 2. The superficial saphenous veins (greater, lesser, or accessory saphenous and symptomatic varicose tributaries) have been previously eliminated; AND 3. Ulcers have not resolved following combined superficial vein treatment and compression therapy for at least 3 months; AND 4. The venous insufficiency is not secondary to deep venous thromboembolism." ▪ Moved from Policy Guidelines to IV B the not medically necessary indication of: "6. Perforator reflux often resolves following saphenous ablation." ▪ Added the not medically necessary indication of IV C: " C. Ligation or ablation of incompetent perforator veins performed concurrently with superficial venous surgery is not medically necessary." ▪ In Policy Guidelines #4 added, "However, deep vein insufficiency is not a contraindication to superficial vein treatment." ▪ In Policy Guidelines Reimbursement sub-section item 1 revised, "…reimbursed at 25% of full." to read, "1. Endovenous ablation (36475, 36476, 36478 and 36479) other than the greater saphenous vein will be reimbursed at 50% of full."
	Rationale section updated
	In Revision section: ▪ Removed revision details for dates: 04-22-2009, 11-18-2009, 01-01-2010
	References updated
03-08-2013	In the Reimbursement section: ▪ Removed the reimbursement limitation stating, "Endovenous ablation (36475, 36476, 36478 and 36479) other than the greater saphenous vein will be reimbursed at 50% of full."
12-24-2014	Description section updated
	In Policy section: ▪ In Item I A and II A removed "Physical / visible findings that support medically significant venous hypertension are clearly documented." And added "…or microfoam sclerotherapy…" to read "…by surgery (ligation and stripping), endovenous radiofrequency or laser ablation, or microfoam sclerotherapy may be considered medically necessary for…" ▪ In Item I B added "…or microfoam sclerotherapy…" to read "…by surgery, endovenous radiofrequency or laser ablation, or microfoam sclerotherapy that do not meet the criteria described above is considered not medically necessary." ▪ In Item II A added "1. Incompetence of the accessory saphenous vein is isolated, OR" to read "Incompetence of the accessory saphenous vein is isolated, OR The greater or lesser saphenous veins had been previously eliminated (at least 3 months);" ▪ In Item III A added "When physical findings support medical necessity," (formerly standalone Item III B) to read, "When physical findings support medical necessity, the following treatments are considered medically necessary as a component of the

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

REVISIONS	
	treatment of symptomatic varicose tributaries (none of these techniques has been shown to be superior to another):" ▪ In new Item III B removed "Sclerotherapy as" to read, "The sole treatment of varicose vein tributaries…" ▪ In Policy Guidelines added "5. It should be noted that the bulk of the literature discussing the role of ultrasound guidance refers to sclerotherapy of the saphenous vein, as opposed to the varicose tributaries." ▪ In Policy Guidelines removed "There is little evidence to support that ultrasound guidance makes a significant difference in outcomes from sclerotherapy when compared to non-ultrasound guided techniques."
	Rationale section updated
	In Coding section: ▪ Removed CPT Code: 36469 (Effective January 1, 2015) ▪ Coding comments updated ▪ ICD-10 Codes added
	In Revision section ▪ Removed Revision details for 10-11-2010.
	References updated
01-01-2016	In Coding section: ▪ Removed CPT codes: 37250, 37251
02-01-2019	Policy published 01-01-2019. Policy effective 02-01-2019.
	Description section updated
	In Policy section: • Throughout the policy removed "lesser" and added "small" to read "great or small saphenous veins" • In Item I revised to read "SAPHENOUS VEINS – Great or Small Saphenous Veins" • In Item I A 1 added "and CEAP [Clinical, Etiology, Anatomy, Pathophysiology], class C2 or greater" to read "There is demonstrated saphenous reflux and CEAP [Clinical, Etiology, Anatomy, Pathophysiology], class C2 or greater" • In Item I A 2a and II A 3a removed "that fails to respond to compressive therapy" to read "Ulceration secondary to venous stasis" • In Item I A 2b and II A 3b removed "that fails to respond to compressive therapy" to read "Recurrent superficial thrombophlebitis" • In Item I A 2d1) removed "or significant refractory edema or refractory stasis dermatitis when" to read "Persistent pain, swelling, itching, burning, or other symptoms associated with saphenous reflux" • In Item II A 3d1) removed "or significant refractory edema or refractory stasis dermatitis when" and "accessory vein" to read "Persistent pain, swelling, itching, burning, or other symptoms associated with saphenous reflux" • In Item II B added "veins by surgery, endovenous radiofrequency or laser ablation, or microfoam sclerotherapy" to read "Treatment of accessory saphenous veins by surgery, endovenous radiofrequency or laser ablation, or microfoam sclerotherapy, that do not meet the criteria described above is considered not medically necessary." • In Item III A removed "When physical findings support medical necessity" and added "when performed either at the same time or following prior treatment (surgical, radiofrequency or laser) of the saphenous veins" to read "The following treatments are considered medically necessary as a component of the treatment of symptomatic varicose tributaries when performed either at the same time or following prior treatment (surgical, radiofrequency or laser) of the saphenous veins (none of these techniques has been shown to be superior to another):"

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

REVISIONS	
	• In Item III B removed "The sole", "in the presence of saphenofemoral or saphenopopliteal reflux" and not medically necessary" and added "symptomatic", "when performed either at the same time or following prior treatment of saphenous veins using any other techniques than noted above" and "experimental / investigational" to read "Treatment of symptomatic varicose tributaries when performed either at the same time or following prior treatment of saphenous veins using any other techniques than noted above reflux is considered experimental / investigational" • In Item VI added "Veins" to read "Other Veins" • In Item VI A revised "not medically necessary" to "experimental / investigational" to read "Techniques for conditions not specifically listed above are experimental / investigational, including, but not limited to:" • In Item VI A added "techniques, other than microfoam sclerotherapy, of great, small, or accessory saphenous veins", "Sclerotherapy of perforator veins", "Mechanochemical ablation of any vein", "Cyanoacrylate adhesive of any vein" to read " 1. Sclerotherapy techniques, other than microfoam sclerotherapy, of great, small, or accessory saphenous veins 2. Sclerotherapy of perforator veins 3. Sclerotherapy of isolated tributary veins without prior or concurrent treatment of saphenous veins 4. Stab avulsion, hook phlebectomy, or transilluminated powered phlebectomy of perforator, great or small saphenous, or accessory saphenous veins. 5. Endovenous radiofrequency or laser ablation of tributary veins 6. Mechanochemical ablation of any vein 7. Cyanoacrylate adhesive of any vein 8. Endovenous cryoablation of any vein" • Policy Guidelines updated
	Rationale section updated
	In Coding section: ▪ Added CPT Codes: 36465, 36466, 36473, 36474, 36482, 36483, 0524T ▪ Removed CPT Code: 93965
	References updated
09-13-2019	Policy published 08-14-2019. Policy effective 09-13-2019.
	Description section updated
	In Policy section: ▪ In Items I A, I B, II A, II B, IV A revised the phrase "endovenous radiofrequency or laser ablation" to read "endovenous thermal ablation (radiofrequency or laser)" Added Item I C "Treatment of the great or small saphenous veins by cyanoacrylate adhesive is considered not medically necessary for symptomatic varicose veins / venous insufficiency (see Policy Guideline 1)." ▪ In Item II A 1 a added "when documentation of the anatomy supports the reflux" to read "Incompetence of the accessory saphenous vein, when documentation of the anatomy supports the reflux is isolated" ▪ Added Item C "Treatment of accessory saphenous veins by cyanoacrylate adhesive is considered not medically necessary for symptomatic varicose veins / venous insufficiency (see Policy Guideline 1)." ▪ In Item VI A removed from the E/I statement "cyanoacrylate adhesive of any vein" ▪ In Policy Guidelines added: "1. For a service to be considered medically necessary, it should not be more costly than an alternative service or supply or sequence of services at least as likely to produce equivalent therapeutic or diagnostic results for the illness, injury, or disease."

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

REVISIONS	
	Rationale section updated
	In Coding section: ▪ Updated coding notations.
	References updated
04-19-2021	Updated Description section
	In policy guideline 2 ▪ Replaced the Table 1 Clinical Portion of the CEAP Classification System from 2004 with the current Clinical Portion of the CEAP Classification System Table
	Updated Rationale section
	Updated Reference section
07-02-2021	Updated Description section
	Updated Rationale section
	Updated Reference section
07-26-2022	Updated Description Section
	Updated Policy Section ▪ Changed policy format numbering to A.1.a.I.i ▪ Under Reimbursement A and B removed 93965
	Updated Rationale Section
	Updated Coding Section V. Removed Coding Bullet a. Note: The bulk of the literature discussing the role of ultrasound guidance refers to sclerotherapy of the saphenous vein, as opposed to the varicose tributaries. If ultrasound guidance (CPT code 76942) is used to guide sclerotherapy of the varicose tributaries, it would be considered content of service to the injection procedure. VI. Converted ICD-10 Codes to ranges
	Updated References Section
06-27-2023	Updated Description Section
	Updated Rationale Section
	Updated Coding Section ▪ Removed ICD-10 Codes
	Updated Reference Section
06-27-2024	Updated Description Section
	Updated Rationale Section
	Updated Reference Section
06-24-2025	Updated Description Section
	Updated Policy Section ▪ Section D.2. Removed: "as discussed in reference 5"
	Updated Policy Guidelines Section ▪ Removed Guideline E: "Following successful ablation of the greater saphenous vein, tributary veins can become more prominent, but usually improve over time; therefore, delaying treatment of these smaller veins will minimize the number of veins that need treatment."
	Updated Rationale Section
	Updated Reference Section
12-09-2025	Updated Policy Section ▪ Removed a-f under Policy D.2.:

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

REVISIONS	
	a. "Patients with isolated reflux in perforator veins…are generally asymptomatic; reflux at multiple valve sites is required for symptom expression." b. "Reflux in perforator veins that are smaller than 4mm in diameter is not considered to be clinically significant. c. "In complex venous disease, comprehensive correction is neither feasible nor necessary; partial correction of multifocal disease often relieves symptoms." d. "The role of interruption of the perforator vein is controversial because of doubts about the pathologic significance of reflux involving this vein and because its specific efficacy is uncertain." e. "The role of perforator vein ablation awaits results, of properly conducted randomized controlled trials." f. "Perforator reflux often resolves following saphenous ablation."
	Updated Coding Section ▪ Removed Deleted Code 37500 (eff. 01-01-2026)
07-14-2026	Updated Description Section
	Updated Policy Guidelines Section ▪ <u>Removed:</u> <u>Claims Submission Instructions</u> A. CPT code 36470 should be used when only one vein is injected on a given date of service. B. CPT code 36471 should be used when more than one vein in the same leg is injected on a given date of service. C. If both legs are injected, right and left modifier should be used on claims with the codes to indicate which leg is being treated. The following coding conventions should be used: a. One vein on the left; two veins on the right: 36470 LT and 36471 RT. Injections for each leg should be reported on a separate line. b. One vein on each leg: Use 36470 RT and 36470 LT. c. Two veins on the right; three on the left: 36471 d. RT and 36471 LT. e. In each case, the correct quantity to bill is one unit per code. D. For less than 10 phlebectomies, CPT code 37799 should be used, modifier 22 added and box 19 of the claim form populated with "phlebectomies less than 10". <u>Reimbursement</u> A. The use of the following ultrasound guidance procedures (76937, 76942, 76998, 76999, 93970, 93971, S2202) during varicose vein surgery is considered content of service. B. CPT codes 93970 or 93971 Doppler ultrasound should not be billed for intraoperative procedures. If these codes are billed separately as the initial diagnostic tool for mapping, the claim will be allowed if medically necessary. Any additional scans over the initial mapping may be reviewed for medical necessity. C. Selective catheter placement is content of service of a covered procedure. D. Reimbursement for sclerotherapy will be limited to 3 sessions.
	Updated Rationale Section
	Updated Reference Section

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

REFERENCES

1. O'Meara S, Cullum NA, Nelson EA. Compression for venous leg ulcers. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Jan 21 2009; (1): CD000265. PMID 19160178
2. O'Meara S, Cullum N, Nelson EA, et al. Compression for venous leg ulcers. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Nov 14 2012; 11(11): CD000265. PMID 23152202
3. Knight Nee Shingler SL, Robertson L, Stewart M. Graduated compression stockings for the initial treatment of varicose veins in people without venous ulceration. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Jul 16 2021; 7(7): CD008819. PMID 34271595
4. Howard DP, Howard A, Kothari A, et al. The role of superficial venous surgery in the management of venous ulcers: a systematic review. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg. Oct 2008; 36(4): 458-65. PMID 18675558
5. O'Donnell TF. The present status of surgery of the superficial venous system in the management of venous ulcer and the evidence for the role of perforator interruption. J Vasc Surg. Oct 2008; 48(4): 1044-52. PMID 18992425
6. Jones L, Braithwaite BD, Selwyn D, et al. Neovascularisation is the principal cause of varicose vein recurrence: results of a randomised trial of stripping the long saphenous vein. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg. Nov 1996; 12(4): 442-5. PMID 8980434
7. Rutgers PH, Kitslaar PJ. Randomized trial of stripping versus high ligation combined with sclerotherapy in the treatment of the incompetent greater saphenous vein. Am J Surg. Oct 1994; 168(4): 311-5. PMID 7943585
8. Farah MH, Nayfeh T, Urtecho M, et al. A systematic review supporting the Society for Vascular Surgery, the American Venous Forum, and the American Vein and Lymphatic Society guidelines on the management of varicose veins. J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord. Sep 2022; 10(5): 1155-1171. PMID 34450355
9. Whing J, Nandhra S, Nesbitt C, et al. Interventions for great saphenous vein incompetence. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Aug 11 2021; 8(8): CD005624. PMID 34378180
10. Paravastu SC, Horne M, Dodd PD. Endovenous ablation therapy (laser or radiofrequency) or foam sclerotherapy versus conventional surgical repair for short saphenous varicose veins. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Nov 29 2016; 11(11): CD010878. PMID 27898181
11. Brittenden J, Cotton SC, Elders A, et al. A randomized trial comparing treatments for varicose veins. N Engl J Med. Sep 25 2014; 371(13): 1218-27. PMID 25251616
12. Rass K, Frings N, Glowacki P, et al. Comparable effectiveness of endovenous laser ablation and high ligation with stripping of the great saphenous vein: two-year results of a randomized clinical trial (RELACS study). Arch Dermatol. Jan 2012; 148(1): 49-58. PMID 21931012
13. 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. Nov 2015; 50(5): 648-56. PMID 26319476
14. Christenson JT, Gueddi S, Gemayel G, et al. Prospective randomized trial comparing endovenous laser ablation and surgery for treatment of primary great saphenous varicose veins with a 2-year follow-up. J Vasc Surg. Nov 2010; 52(5): 1234-41. PMID 20801608
15. Biemans AA, Kockaert M, Akkersdijk GP, et al. Comparing endovenous laser ablation, foam sclerotherapy, and conventional surgery for great saphenous varicose veins. J Vasc Surg. Sep 2013; 58(3): 727-34.e1. PMID 23769603
16. van der Velden SK, Biemans AA, De Maeseneer MG, et al. Five-year results of a randomized clinical trial of conventional surgery, endovenous laser ablation and

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy in patients with great saphenous varicose veins. Br J Surg. Sep 2015; 102(10): 1184-94. PMID 26132315
17. Wallace T, El-Sheikha J, Nandhra S, et al. Long-term outcomes of endovenous laser ablation and conventional surgery for great saphenous varicose veins. Br J Surg. Dec 2018; 105(13): 1759-1767. PMID 30132797
18. Alozai T, Huizing E, Schreve MA, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of treatment modalities for anterior accessory saphenous vein insufficiency. Phlebology. Apr 2022; 37(3): 165-179. PMID 34965757
19. Hamann SAS, Giang J, De Maeseneer MGR, et al. Editor's Choice - Five Year Results of Great Saphenous Vein Treatment: A Meta-analysis. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg. Dec 2017; 54(6): 760-770. PMID 29033337
20. 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. Apr 2019; 106(5): 548-554. PMID 30908611
21. 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. Mar 2023; 65(3): 415-423. PMID 36470312
22. Shadid N, Ceulen R, Nelemans P, et al. Randomized clinical trial of ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy versus surgery for the incompetent great saphenous vein. Br J Surg. Aug 2012; 99(8): 1062-70. PMID 22627969
23. Lam YL, Lawson JA, Toonder IM, et al. Eight-year follow-up of a randomized clinical trial comparing ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy with surgical stripping of the great saphenous vein. Br J Surg. May 2018; 105(6): 692-698. PMID 29652081
24. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research. Summary Review: 205098 Varithena. 2013; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/nda/2013/205098Orig1s000SumR.pdf. Accessed March 23, 2026.
25. Todd KL, Wright DI, Gibson K, et al. 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. Oct 2014; 29(9): 608-18. PMID 23864535
26. Vasquez M, Gasparis AP. 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. May 2017; 32(4): 272-281. PMID 26957489
27. Watanabe S, Okamura A, Iwamoto M, et al. A randomized controlled study to evaluate the safety and feasibility of concomitant transluminal injection of foam sclerosant combined with endovenous laser ablation in patients with incompetent small saphenous veins. Phlebology. Mar 2025; 40(2): 116-125. PMID 39209827
28. Deak ST. Retrograde administration of ultrasound-guided endovenous microfoam chemical ablation for the treatment of superficial venous insufficiency. J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord. Jul 2018; 6(4): 477-484. PMID 29909854
29. Bootun R, Lane TR, Dharmarajah B, et al. Intra-procedural pain score in a randomised controlled trial comparing mechanochemical ablation to radiofrequency ablation: The Multicentre Venefit™ versus ClariVein® for varicose veins trial. Phlebology. Feb 2016; 31(1): 61-5. PMID 25193822
30. Lane T, Bootun R, Dharmarajah B, et al. A multi-centre randomised controlled trial comparing radiofrequency and mechanical occlusion chemically assisted ablation of

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

varicose veins - Final results of the Venefit versus Clarivein for varicose veins trial. Phlebology. Mar 2017; 32(2): 89-98. PMID 27221810
31. Lam YL, Toonder IM, Wittens CH. Clarivein® mechano-chemical ablation an interim analysis of a randomized controlled trial dose-finding study. Phlebology. Apr 2016; 31(3): 170-6. PMID 26249150
32. 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. May 2019; 7(3): 364-374. PMID 31000063
33. 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. Jun 01 2021; 273(6): e188-e195. PMID 31977509
34. Lim AJM, Mohamed A, Leung C, et al. Editor's Choice - Five Year Follow Up of a Randomised Clinical Trial of Endovenous Laser Ablation versus Mechanochemical Ablation for Superficial Venous Incompetence (LAMA trial). Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg. Sep 2025; 70(3): 367-374. PMID 40288564
35. Oud S, Alozai T, Lam YL, et al. Long-term outcomes of mechanochemical ablation using the Clarivein device for the treatment of great saphenous vein incompetence. J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord. Jan 2025; 13(1): 101967. PMID 39270843
36. Thierens N, Holewijn S, Vissers WH, et al. Five-year outcomes of mechano-chemical ablation of primary great saphenous vein incompetence. Phlebology. May 2020; 35(4): 255-261. PMID 31291849
37. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. VenaSeal Closure System. PMA P140018. 2015; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpma/pma.cfm?id=P140018. Accessed March 25, 2026.
38. 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. Apr 2015; 61(4): 985-94. PMID 25650040
39. 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. Apr 2017; 25(2): 149-156. PMID 27206470
40. Klem TM, Schnater JM, Schütte PR, et al. A randomized trial of cryo stripping versus conventional stripping of the great saphenous vein. J Vasc Surg. Feb 2009; 49(2): 403-9. PMID 19028042
41. Gibson K, Khilnani N, Schul M, et al. American College of Phlebology Guidelines - Treatment of refluxing accessory saphenous veins. Phlebology. Aug 2017; 32(7): 448-452. PMID 27738242
42. 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. Jul 2019; 34(6): 380-390. PMID 30403154
43. Eroglu E, Yasim A. A Randomised 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. Oct 2018; 56(4): 553-560. PMID 30042039

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

44. Alhewy MA, Abdo EM, Ghazala EAE, et al. Outcomes of Cyanoacrylate Closure Versus Radiofrequency Ablation for the Treatment of Incompetent Great Saphenous Veins. Ann Vasc Surg. Jan 2024; 98: 309-316. PMID 37802141
45. 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. May 2017; 5(3): 321-330. PMID 28411697
46. Eroglu E, Yasim A, Ari M, et al. Mid-term results in the treatment of varicose veins with N-butyl cyanoacrylate. Phlebology. Dec 2017; 32(10): 665-669. PMID 28669248
47. Zierau U. Sealing Veins with the VenaSeal Sapheon Closure System: Results for 795 Treated Truncal Veins after 1000 Days. Vasomed. 2015;27:124-127.
48. Imai T, Mo M, Hirokawa M, et al. Mid-term results of cyanoacrylate closure for the treatment of incompetent great and small saphenous veins: Findings from a Japanese prospective consecutive multi-center registry: Mid-term results of cyanoacrylate closure. Phlebology. Feb 2025; 40(1): 21-28. PMID 39116289
49. Disselhoff BC, der Kinderen DJ, Kelder JC, et al. Randomized clinical trial comparing endovenous laser with cryostripping for great saphenous varicose veins. Br J Surg. Oct 2008; 95(10): 1232-8. PMID 18763255
50. Disselhoff BC, der Kinderen DJ, Kelder JC, et al. Five-year results of a randomized clinical trial comparing endovenous laser ablation with cryostripping for great saphenous varicose veins. Br J Surg. Aug 2011; 98(8): 1107-11. PMID 21633948
51. de Ávila Oliveira R, Riera R, Vasconcelos V, et al. Injection sclerotherapy for varicose veins. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Dec 10 2021; 12(12): CD001732. PMID 34883526
52. Leopardi D, Hoggan BL, Fitridge RA, et al. Systematic review of treatments for varicose veins. Ann Vasc Surg. Mar 2009; 23(2): 264-76. PMID 19059756
53. El-Sheikha J, Nandhra S, Carradice D, et al. Clinical outcomes and quality of life 5 years after a randomized trial of concomitant or sequential phlebectomy following endovenous laser ablation for varicose veins. Br J Surg. Aug 2014; 101(9): 1093-7. PMID 24916467
54. Yamaki T, Hamahata A, Soejima K, et al. Prospective randomised comparative study of visual foam sclerotherapy alone or in combination with ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy for treatment of superficial venous insufficiency: preliminary report. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg. Mar 2012; 43(3): 343-7. PMID 22230599
55. Michaels JA, Campbell WB, Brazier JE, et al. Randomised clinical trial, observational study and assessment of cost-effectiveness of the treatment of varicose veins (REACTIV trial). Health Technol Assess. Apr 2006; 10(13): 1-196, iii-iv. PMID 16707070
56. Luebke T, Brunkwall J. Meta-analysis of transilluminated powered phlebectomy for superficial varicosities. J Cardiovasc Surg (Torino). Dec 2008; 49(6): 757-64. PMID 19043390
57. Chetter IC, Mylankal KJ, Hughes H, et al. Randomized clinical trial comparing multiple stab incision phlebectomy and transilluminated powered phlebectomy for varicose veins. Br J Surg. Feb 2006; 93(2): 169-74. PMID 16432820
58. Giannopoulos S, Rodriguez L, Chau M, et al. A systematic review of the outcomes of percutaneous treatment modalities for pathologic saphenous and perforating veins. J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord. Sep 2022; 10(5): 1172-1183.e5. PMID 35364302
59. Ho VT, Adkar SS, Harris EJ. Systematic review and meta-analysis of management of incompetent perforators in patients with chronic venous insufficiency. J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord. Jul 2022; 10(4): 955-964.e5. PMID 35217217

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

60. Tenbrook JA, Iafrati MD, O'donnell TF, et al. Systematic review of outcomes after surgical management of venous disease incorporating subfascial endoscopic perforator surgery. J Vasc Surg. Mar 2004; 39(3): 583-9. PMID 14981453
61. van Gent WB, Catarinella FS, Lam YL, et al. Conservative versus surgical treatment of venous leg ulcers: 10-year follow up of a randomized, multicenter trial. Phlebology. Mar 2015; 30(1 Suppl): 35-41. PMID 25729066
62. Blomgren L, Johansson G, Dahlberg-Akerman A, et al. Changes in superficial and perforating vein reflux after varicose vein surgery. J Vasc Surg. Aug 2005; 42(2): 315-20. PMID 16102633
63. Lin ZC, Loveland PM, Johnston RV, et al. Subfascial endoscopic perforator surgery (SEPS) for treating venous leg ulcers. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Mar 03 2019; 3(3): CD012164. PMID 30827037
64. Luebke T, Brunkwall J. Meta-analysis of subfascial endoscopic perforator vein surgery (SEPS) for chronic venous insufficiency. Phlebology. Feb 2009; 24(1): 8-16. PMID 19155335
65. Lawrence PF, Hager ES, Harlander-Locke MP, et al. Treatment of superficial and perforator reflux and deep venous stenosis improves healing of chronic venous leg ulcers. J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord. Jul 2020; 8(4): 601-609. PMID 32089497
66. 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. Jul 2020; 8(4): 505-525.e4. PMID 32139328
67. Gloviczki P, Comerota AJ, Dalsing MC, et al. 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. May 2011; 53(5 Suppl): 2S-48S. PMID 21536172
68. 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. Mar 2023; 11(2): 231-261.e6. PMID 36326210
69. 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. Jan 2024; 12(1): 101670. PMID 37652254
70. American College of Phlebology. Superficial venous disease. 2015; https://www.myavls.org/assets/pdf/SuperficialVenousDiseaseGuidelinesPMS313-02.03.16.pdf. Accessed March 23, 2026.
71. Vasquez MA, Di Iorio M, Worthington-Kirsch RL, et al. Current practice of cyanoacrylate endovenous ablation: American vein and lymphatic society position statement. Phlebology. May 2024; 39(4): 245-250. PMID 38082236
72. Blebea J, Fukaya E, Moore KS, et al. Mechanochemical chemically assisted ablation of varicose veins for venous insufficiency: American vein and lymphatic society position statement. Phlebology. Mar 2025; 40(2): 104-109. PMID 39167828

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information

73. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy for varicose veins. HTG201. Published February 23, 2013. Accessed March 23, 2026. https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/htg301
74. Brittenden J, Cotton SC, Elders A, et al. Clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of foam sclerotherapy, endovenous laser ablation and surgery for varicose veins: results from the Comparison of LAser, Surgery and foam Sclerotherapy (CLASS) randomised controlled trial. Health Technol Assess. Apr 2015; 19(27): 1-342. PMID 25858333
75. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Endovenous mechanochemical ablation for varicose veins. HTG414. Published May 25, 2016. Accessed March 22, 2026. https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/htg414
76. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Cyanoacrylate glue occlusion for varicose veins. HTG540. Published March 4, 2020. Accessed March 21, 2026. https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/htg540/chapter/1-Recommendations

OTHER REFERENCES

1. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas National Medical Consultant (ID 1073-3390), February 5, 2007.
2. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas board certified vascular surgeon medical consultant (481), January 2009.
3. AMR consultant board certified in general surgery, vascular surgery, and critical care surgery (#48325), September 4, 2012.

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Kansas is an independent licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Contains Public Information