

# BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email [info.bmjopen@bmj.com](mailto:info.bmjopen@bmj.com)

# BMJ Open

## Endovenous ablation and surgery in great saphenous vein reflux. A systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-024813
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	14-Jun-2018
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Siribumrungwong, Boonying; Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University; Center of Excellence in Applied Epidemiology, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University</p> <p>Srikuea, Kanoklada; Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University</p> <p>Orrapin, Saritphat; Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University</p> <p>Benyakorn, Thoetphum ; Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University</p> <p>Rerkasem, Kittipan ; Division of Vascular and Endovascular Surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University</p> <p>Thakkestian, Ammarin; Faculty of Medicine Ramathibodi Hospital, Mahidol University, Section for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics</p>
Keywords:	endovenous, saphenous vein reflux, stripping, saphenofemoral ligation, sclerotherapy

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 **Endovenous ablation and surgery in great saphenous vein reflux. A systematic review and**  
4 **network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials protocol.**  
5  
6

7  
8  
9  
10 Boonying Siribumrungwong, M.D., PhD

11 Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine,

12  
13 Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand

14  
15 Center of Excellence in Applied Epidemiology, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University

16  
17 Hospital, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 Kanoklada Srikuea, M.D.

25  
26 Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine,

27  
28 Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Saritphat Orrapin, M.D.

35  
36 Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine,

37  
38 Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand  
39  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 Thoetphum Benyakorn, M.D.

45  
46 Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine,

47  
48 Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 Kittipan Rerkasem, M.D., PhD

55  
56 Division of Vascular and Endovascular Surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine,

57  
58 Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, Thailand  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Ammarin Thakkinstian, PhD.

4  
5 Section for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Faculty of Medicine, Ramathibodi

6  
7 Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 **Corresponding author**

13  
14 Ammarin Thakkinstian, PhD.

15  
16 Section for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Faculty of Medicine, Ramathibodi

17  
18 Hospital, Mahidol University, Rama VI road, Rachatevi, Bangkok, 10400, Thailand

19  
20  
21 Phone number: +662-2011762 Fax number: +662-2011284

22  
23 Email: Ammarin.tha@mahidol.ac.th  
24  
25

26  
27  
28 **Word count:** 1714

29  
30 **Funding:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public,  
31  
32 commercial or not-for-profit sectors  
33

34  
35 **Competing interests:** All authors declare of no competing interests  
36

37  
38 **Data Statement:** The data will be provided by corresponding author per requested  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

**Introduction.** Endovenous ablations are the new standard procedures for treatment of great saphenous vein (GSV) reflux. These included endovenous laser ablation (EVLA), radiofrequency ablation (RFA), and ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy (UGFS). EVLA and RFA demonstrated similar anatomical success to surgery for short term outcome but controversial results for longer term ( $\geq 5$  years). Additional evidences from randomized controlled trials (RCT) have been published with varying follow-up times. This study is therefore conducted to directly and indirectly compare outcomes among all procedures stratify by short and long term follow-up.

**Methods and analysis.** Medline and Scopus will be searched from 2000 to May 2018 with predefined search strategy. Interventions of interest are open surgery (i.e., saphenofemoral or high ligation (HL) with stripping) and endovenous ablations (i.e., EVLA, RFA, and UGFS). The primary outcomes are anatomical success. Two independent reviewers will select studies, extract data, assess risk of bias of included studies. Disagreement will be adjudicated by the third party. Outcomes will be directly pooled if there are at least 3 studies in that comparison. A fixed effect model will be used unless heterogeneity is present, a random effect model will be applied. Source of heterogeneity will be explored using meta-regression analysis, sub-group analysis will be done accordingly. Publication bias will be assessed using Egger's test and funnel plot. A network meta-analysis will be applied to indirect compare all interventions including RFA, EVLA, EVLA with HL, UGFS, UGFS with HL, and HL with stripping. Probability being best intervention will be estimated and ranked. Inconsistency assumption be checked using a design-treatment interaction model.

**Ethics and dissemination.** Ethical approval is not required for systematic review and network meta-analysis. The study will be published in a peer-reviewed journal.

1  
2  
3 **PROSPERO registration number.** CRD42018096794  
4

5 **Keywords.** Endovenous, stripping, varicose vein, saphenous vein reflux, saphenofemoral  
6  
7 ligation, sclerotherapy  
8  
9

## 10 11 12 **Article summary**

### 13 14 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 15
- 16
- 17 • This review will include all relevant RCTs comparing outcomes between
- 18 endovenous ablation and surgery since 2000 to March 2018.
- 19
- 20
- 21 • Stratify analysis by short and long term follow up will be performed
- 22
- 23
- 24 • Probability of being a best procedure will be estimated and provided
- 25
- 26
- 27

## 28 **INTRODUCTION**

29  
30 Chronic venous disease is common condition affected both men and women with  
31 prevalence rate of 30-50%.<sup>1,2</sup> This has led to significant health spending, about 1%-2% of  
32 health care budgets had been spent for venous disease in European countries.<sup>3</sup> Great  
33 saphenous vein (GSV) reflux is the most common site of reflux accounting for about 80% of  
34 all reflux sites.<sup>4</sup> GSV ablation is recommended to improve symptoms and quality of life of  
35 patients.<sup>5,6</sup>  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 To ablate GSV, endovenous ablations are recommended over surgery as a new  
45 standard treatment.<sup>6</sup> The benefits over open surgery are less postoperative pain, lower rate  
46 of surgical site infection, faster return to normal activities and work.<sup>7</sup> However, it is  
47 accompanied with higher equipment costs.<sup>8</sup> Many techniques of endovenous ablation have  
48 therefore emerged including endovenous laser ablation (EVLA), radiofrequency ablation  
49 (RFA), and ultrasound-guided sclerotherapy (UGFS). Two novel techniques of non-  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 tumescent non-thermal endovenous ablation (NTNT) including mechanico-chemical ablation  
4  
5 (MOCA) and cyanoacrylate injection had been introduced for several years with promising  
6  
7 early results.<sup>9</sup>  
8

9  
10 Directly-related outcome after GSV ablation is anatomical success, which is patency  
11  
12 of the GSV after ablation. It can be classified as technical failure, periprocedural, early,  
13  
14 midterm, and late failure if it is occurred  $\leq 3$  days,  $\leq 1$  month, 1 year, 1-3 years, and  $> 3$   
15  
16 years after operation. Another important outcome is patient's-reported outcome  
17  
18 measurements or PROMs, which measured patients' perspective in both generic and  
19  
20 specific quality of life.<sup>6</sup>  
21  
22

23  
24 Previous evidences about efficacy of these procedures had been pooled considering  
25  
26 short to long term outcomes. The first systematic review in 2012 included 28 RCTs to  
27  
28 compare short-midterm outcomes of endovenous procedures with surgery. It found  
29  
30 benefits of endovenous procedures (i.e. EVLA, RFA, and UGFS) over open surgery in  
31  
32 postoperative pain, morbidity, and faster recovery with similar efficacies for EVLA and RFA  
33  
34 but less efficacy for UGFS.<sup>7</sup> Other two systematic reviews in 2017<sup>10</sup> and 2018<sup>11</sup> considered  
35  
36 only long term outcomes by including 12 and 9 RCTs with  $> 5$  year follow up, respectively.  
37  
38 Although the former meta-analysis<sup>10</sup> considered only RCTs, they pooled outcome data (i.e.,  
39  
40 success/recurrent reflux rates and mean difference before vs after of each intervention  
41  
42 without directly compared these outcomes between groups. As a result, randomization may  
43  
44 be broken and thus bias the results. The latest meta-analysis<sup>11</sup> could not detect whether  
45  
46 recurrence rates between EVLA, RFA, and surgery were different due to small numbers of  
47  
48 included studies and subjects.  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 Some additional RCTs comparing endovenous procedures and open surgery or  
55  
56 comparing among endovenous ablations have been published with varying of follow up time  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and also surgical techniques (with or without high ligation).<sup>11-24</sup> These data have not yet  
4  
5 been updated in the aforementioned meta-analyses with long term outcomes. In addition,  
6  
7 accurate and precise magnitude of benefit of endovenous procedures over surgery along  
8  
9 time horizon of treatment is important for economic analysis.<sup>25</sup> Therefore, this systematic  
10  
11 review and network meta-analysis is conducted which aim to directly and indirectly  
12  
13 compare clinical outcomes between interventions stratifying by time of follow up including  
14  
15 anatomical success, clinical recurrence, and quality of life. Other postoperative outcomes  
16  
17 include postoperative pain, time to return to normal activities and work, and complications  
18  
19 (i.e. wound infection, hematoma, paresthesia, ecchymosis, and deep venous thrombosis)  
20  
21 are pooled using all available data. Probability being best intervention will be estimated and  
22  
23 ranked for each outcome. Risk and benefit will be then compared.  
24  
25  
26

## 27 28 **METHODS**

29  
30 The protocol was developed according to PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for  
31  
32 Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses) statement for reporting systematic reviews and  
33  
34 meta-analyses<sup>26</sup> and extension statement for systematic reviews incorporating network  
35  
36 meta-analyses of health care interventions.<sup>27</sup>  
37  
38

### 39 40 **Search strategy**

41  
42 Medline and Scopus will be searched from August 2011 to May 2018. Search terms  
43  
44 are constructed according to patients and intervention/comparator as follows: "Varicose  
45  
46 veins"[Mesh] OR "Saphenous vein"[Mesh] OR varicose OR saphenous NOT esophageal;  
47  
48 radiofrequency OR RFA OR VNUS OR endovenous OR EVLT OR EVLA OR laser OR  
49  
50 sclerotherapy[Mesh] OR foam sclerotherapy OR UGFS OR stripping OR sapheno-femoral  
51  
52 ligation OR surgery. These search terms of the two domains will be combined with  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 AND with limited to clinical trial, human, and English articles. Reference lists from previous  
4  
5 meta-analysis and all eligible papers will be reviewed for relevant studies.  
6

### 7 8 **Study selection**

9  
10 After remove duplicated studies, study selection will be done by two independent  
11  
12 authors (BS and TB). Title and abstract will be screened for eligible criteria, full text will then  
13  
14 be reviewed if decision cannot be made. Any disagreement will be adjudicated by a third  
15  
16 party (AT). Data from multiple publication studies will be combined as one publication for  
17  
18 analysis.  
19

20  
21 RCTs studied in patients with GSV reflux will be included if they meet following  
22  
23 criteria: Had any pair of following interventions including endovenous ablation (i.e., EVLA,  
24  
25 RFA, and UGFS) and surgery; had at least one following outcomes including anatomical  
26  
27 success, postoperative pain, wound infection, hematoma, ecchymosis, deep vein  
28  
29 thrombosis, time to return to normal activities and work, clinical recurrence, and quality of  
30  
31 life. Studies will be excluded if they have insufficient data for pooling.  
32  
33

### 34 35 **Interventions**

36  
37 Interventions of interest are open surgery (i.e., saphenofemoral or high ligation (HL)  
38  
39 with stripping of the GSV) and endovenous abrasions (i.e., EVLA, RFA, and UGFS).  
40  
41 EVLA ablates GSV using laser energy with varying wavelength such as 810, 940, 980, 1470,  
42  
43 and 1560 nm.<sup>28</sup> RFA generates heat by radiofrequency energy. Both RFA and EVLA are  
44  
45 usually performed with tumescent anesthesia to prevent thermal injury to adjacent tissue.  
46  
47 UGFS, damages endothelium causing occlusion of vein, is injected to the GSV by either  
48  
49 direct puncture or via catheter.<sup>29</sup> HL might or might not be applied with endovenous  
50  
51 procedures.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Outcomes

The primary outcome of interest is anatomical success, which originally defined according to individual studies as not having patency of GSV, occlusion, or reflux of GSV diagnosed by duplex scan. This outcome will be considered according to time frame of follow up, i.e., periprocedural, early, midterm, and late failure.<sup>6</sup>

Secondary outcomes of interest are clinical recurrence, postoperative pain, time to return to normal activities and work, quality of life, and postoperative complications (i.e. hematoma, ecchymosis, paresthesia, and deep vein thrombosis). Quality of life will be compared according to time frame of follow up. Clinical recurrence will be defined as clinical detected recurrence of varicose vein.

## Data extraction

Two independent authors (BS and KS) will extract data using standardized data extraction forms. General characteristics of studies and interventions including patients' severity, age, detailed of intervention, duration of follow up, type of anesthesia, compression method, tumescent anesthesia, primary outcome definition, concomitant phlebectomy and sclerotherapy will be extracted. These data will be used for exploring source of heterogeneity. Mean (SD) and frequencies of outcomes data by intervention will be extracted for pooling. Mean difference or risk ratio will be used in case of no summary data provided in the study. Inconsistent data will be solved by consensus with third party (AT) and finalize. Author will contact corresponding authors twice for missing data.

## Risk of bias assessment

Studies will be assessed for risk of bias using Cochrane Collaboration's tool<sup>30</sup> by two independent researchers (BS and SO). This tool consists of 7 domains: random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of

1  
2  
3 outcome assessors, incomplete outcome reports, selective outcome reports, and other  
4  
5 source of bias. Disagreement will be resolved by third party (AT).  
6

### 7 **Grading evidence**

8  
9 Quality of evidence will be graded separately for each outcome using a tool  
10  
11 suggested by the GRADE Working Group.<sup>31</sup> Five domains will be assessed including study  
12  
13 limitations, consistency, indirectness, imprecision, and publication bias. The evidence will be  
14  
15 downgraded one and two levels for serious and very serious concerns, respectively.  
16  
17

### 18 **Statistical analysis**

#### 19 *Direct meta-analysis*

20  
21 Data will be directly pooled if there are at least 3 studies for each comparison. Risk  
22  
23 ratios (RR) with 95% confidence interval (CI) will be estimated for dichotomous outcome. A  
24  
25 continuity correction will be used if there is a zero cell. The RRs will be pooled using inverse  
26  
27 variance, and Dersimonian and Laird for data without and with heterogeneity, respectively.  
28  
29 For continuous outcome, unstandardized or standardised mean difference (MD) with 95%CI  
30  
31 will be estimated and pooled across studies if outcome measures are the same and different  
32  
33 scales, respectively. Mean and standard deviation (SD) will be estimated from median and  
34  
35 range/interquartile If study did not report mean and SD.<sup>32</sup>  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Heterogeneity will be assessed using degree of heterogeneity ( $I^2$ ) and  $Q$  test. If either  
42  
43  $I^2 \geq 25\%$  or  $Q$  test is significant with  $p < 0.10$ , the results will be considered as  
44  
45 heterogeneous and random effect model will be applied. Possible source of heterogeneity  
46  
47 will be explored by fitting studies' characteristics (i.e., outcome definition, concomitant  
48  
49 phlebectomy, type of anesthesia, and compression method), interventional techniques (i.e.,  
50  
51 laser wavelength, catheter use in UGFS), and patient's characteristics (i.e., age, severity) in a  
52  
53 meta-regression model if data are sufficient for doing. Subgroup or sensitivity analysis will  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 be performed accordingly to factors that can reduce a degree of heterogeneity. Publication  
4  
5 bias will be assessed by funnel plot and Egger test. If there is evidence of asymmetry of the  
6  
7 funnel by either two, a contour-enhanced plot will be constructed to distinguish whether a  
8  
9 source of asymmetry due to heterogeneity or missing studies.  
10

### 11 *Network meta-analysis*

12  
13  
14 A network meta-analysis<sup>33</sup> will be performed to indirectly compare among  
15  
16 interventions including RFA, EVLA, EVLA with HL, UGFS, UGFS with HL, and HL with stripping.  
17  
18 HL with stripping will be used as a common comparator. Analysis will be performed as  
19  
20 following steps: First, relative intervention effect, i.e., risk ratio (RR) along with its variance-  
21  
22 covariance will be estimated by binary regression analysis. A multivariate random-effect  
23  
24 meta-analysis with consistency mode will be then used to pool RRs across studies. Mixed  
25  
26 intervention comparisons will be next estimated. Probability being best intervention will be  
27  
28 estimated and ranked using surface under cumulative ranking (SUCRA) method, rankogram  
29  
30 will be plotted accordingly. Cluster rank plot will be constructed by comparing probability  
31  
32 being risk and benefit.  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 The inconsistency assumption (i.e., whether direct effects agree with the indirect  
38  
39 effects) will be checked using a design-treatment interaction model. If this assumption does  
40  
41 not meet, an inconsistency factor (IF, i.e.,  $\ln(\text{RR}_{\text{direct}}) - \ln(\text{RR}_{\text{indirect}})$ ) will be estimated and  
42  
43 tested. In addition, a comparison-adjusted funnel plot taking into account different  
44  
45 comparisons will be plotted to explore whether there is evidence of small study effect for  
46  
47 the whole network.<sup>33 34</sup>  
48  
49  
50

51 Analyses will be performed using STATA version 15.0. A *p* value of less than 0.05 will  
52  
53 be considered as statistically significant, except heterogeneity test where *p* value <0.10 will  
54  
55 be used.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ETHIC and DISSEMINATION

Ethical consideration and ethic committee approval are not required from the nature of systematic review and network meta-analysis. Results of the study will be presented in international meeting. The manuscript will be submitted to peer-reviewed journal.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

BS generated research question, writing part of the protocol, KS wrote and register protocol, SO wrote and register protocol, TB wrote and comment on protocol, KR wrote and comment on protocol, and AT wrote and comment on protocol.

## REFERENCE

1. Carpentier PH, Maricq HR, Biro C, et al. Prevalence, risk factors, and clinical patterns of chronic venous disorders of lower limbs: a population-based study in France. *Journal of vascular surgery* 2004;40(4):650-9. doi: 10.1016/j.jvs.2004.07.025 [published Online First: 2004/10/09]
2. Beebe-Dimmer JL, Pfeifer JR, Engle JS, et al. The epidemiology of chronic venous insufficiency and varicose veins. *Annals of epidemiology* 2005;15(3):175-84. doi: 10.1016/j.annepidem.2004.05.015 [published Online First: 2005/02/23]
3. Ruckley CV. Socioeconomic impact of chronic venous insufficiency and leg ulcers. *Angiology* 1997;48(1):67-9. doi: 10.1177/000331979704800111 [published Online First: 1997/01/01]
4. Kanchanabat B, Stapanavatr W. Venous ultrasonography findings and clinical correlations in 104 Thai patients with chronic venous insufficiency of the legs. *Singapore medical journal* 2018;59(3):155-58. doi: 10.11622/smedj.2017043 [published Online First: 2017/05/16]

- 1  
2  
3 5. Siribumrungwong B, Noorit P, Wilasrusmee C, et al. Quality of life after great saphenous  
4  
5 vein ablation in Thai patients with great saphenous vein reflux. *Asian J Surg*  
6  
7 2017;40(4):295-300. doi: 10.1016/j.asjsur.2015.10.004 [published Online First:  
8  
9 2015/12/03]  
10  
11  
12 6. Gloviczki P, Comerota AJ, Dalsing MC, et al. The care of patients with varicose veins and  
13  
14 associated chronic venous diseases: clinical practice guidelines of the Society for  
15  
16 Vascular Surgery and the American Venous Forum. *Journal of vascular surgery*  
17  
18 2011;53(5 Suppl):2s-48s. doi: 10.1016/j.jvs.2011.01.079 [published Online First:  
19  
20 2011/05/06]  
21  
22  
23 7. Siribumrungwong B, Noorit P, Wilasrusmee C, et al. A systematic review and meta-  
24  
25 analysis of randomised controlled trials comparing endovenous ablation and surgical  
26  
27 intervention in patients with varicose vein. *European journal of vascular and*  
28  
29 *endovascular surgery : the official journal of the European Society for Vascular*  
30  
31 *Surgery* 2012;44(2):214-23. doi: 10.1016/j.ejvs.2012.05.017 [published Online First:  
32  
33 2012/06/19]  
34  
35  
36  
37 8. Siribumrungwong B, Noorit P, Wilasrusmee C, et al. Cost-utility analysis of great  
38  
39 saphenous vein ablation with radiofrequency, foam and surgery in the emerging  
40  
41 health-care setting of Thailand. *Phlebology* 2016;31(8):573-81. doi:  
42  
43 10.1177/0268355515604258 [published Online First: 2015/09/06]  
44  
45  
46  
47 9. Vos CG, Unlu C, Bosma J, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of two novel  
48  
49 techniques of nonthermal endovenous ablation of the great saphenous vein. *Journal*  
50  
51 *of vascular surgery Venous and lymphatic disorders* 2017;5(6):880-96. doi:  
52  
53 10.1016/j.jvsv.2017.05.022 [published Online First: 2017/10/19]  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 10. Kheirelseid EAH, Crowe G, Sehgal R, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of  
4  
5 randomized controlled trials evaluating long-term outcomes of endovenous  
6  
7 management of lower extremity varicose veins. *Journal of vascular surgery Venous*  
8  
9 *and lymphatic disorders* 2018;6(2):256-70. doi: 10.1016/j.jvsv.2017.10.012  
10  
11 [published Online First: 2018/01/03]  
12  
13  
14 11. Rass K, Frings N, Glowacki P, et al. Comparable effectiveness of endovenous laser  
15  
16 ablation and high ligation with stripping of the great saphenous vein: Two-year  
17  
18 results of a randomized clinical trial (RELACS study). *Archives of dermatology*  
19  
20 2012;148(1):49-58. doi: 10.1001/archdermatol.2011.272  
21  
22  
23 12. Basela H, Aydina C, Aya Y, et al. Endovenous laser ablation (EVLA) versus high ligation  
24  
25 and stripping (HL/S): Two-years follow up. *Eastern Journal of Medicine* 2012;17(2):83-  
26  
27 87.  
28  
29  
30 13. Flessenkämper I, Hartmann M, Stenger D, et al. Endovenous laser ablation with and  
31  
32 without high ligation compared with high ligation and stripping in the treatment of  
33  
34 great saphenous varicose veins: Initial results of a multicentre randomized controlled  
35  
36 trial. *Phlebology* 2013;28(1):16-23. doi: 10.1258/phleb.2011.011147  
37  
38  
39 14. Mozafar M, Atqiaee K, Haghghatkah H, et al. Endovenous laser ablation of the great  
40  
41 saphenous vein versus high ligation: long-term results. *Lasers in medical science*  
42  
43 2014;29(2):765-71. doi: 10.1007/s10103-013-1389-z [published Online First:  
44  
45 2013/08/15]  
46  
47  
48 15. Shadid N, Ceulen R, Nelemans P, et al. Randomized clinical trial of ultrasound-guided  
49  
50 foam sclerotherapy versus surgery for the incompetent great saphenous vein. *The*  
51  
52 *British journal of surgery* 2012;99(8):1062-70. doi: 10.1002/bjs.8781 [published  
53  
54 Online First: 2012/05/26]  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 16. Yin H, He H, Wang M, et al. Prospective Randomized Study of Ultrasound-Guided Foam  
4  
5 Sclerotherapy Combined with Great Saphenous Vein High Ligation in the Treatment  
6  
7 of Severe Lower Extremity Varicosis. *Annals of vascular surgery* 2017;39:256-63. doi:  
8  
9 10.1016/j.avsg.2016.06.027 [published Online First: 2016/10/26]  
10  
11  
12 17. Venermo M, Saarinen J, Eskelinen E, et al. Randomized clinical trial comparing surgery,  
13  
14 endovenous laser ablation and ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy for the  
15  
16 treatment of great saphenous varicose veins. *The British journal of surgery*  
17  
18 2016;103(11):1438-44. doi: 10.1002/bjs.10260 [published Online First: 2016/08/27]  
19  
20  
21 18. Brittenden J, Cotton SC, Elders A, et al. A randomized trial comparing treatments for  
22  
23 varicose veins. *The New England journal of medicine* 2014;371(13):1218-27. doi:  
24  
25 10.1056/NEJMoa1400781 [published Online First: 2014/09/25]  
26  
27  
28 19. Biemans AAM, Kockaert M, Akkersdijk GP, et al. Comparing endovenous laser ablation,  
29  
30 foam sclerotherapy, and conventional surgery for great saphenous varicose veins.  
31  
32 *Journal of vascular surgery* 2013;58(3):727-34. doi: 10.1016/j.jvs.2012.12.074  
33  
34  
35 20. Mendes CA, Martins AA, Fukuda JM, et al. Randomized trial of radiofrequency ablation  
36  
37 versus conventional surgery for superficial venous insufficiency: If you don't tell,  
38  
39 they won't know. *Clinics* 2016;71(11):650-56. doi: 10.6061/clinics/2016(11)06  
40  
41  
42 21. Sydnor M, Mavropoulos J, Slobodnik N, et al. A randomized prospective long-term (>1  
43  
44 year) clinical trial comparing the efficacy and safety of radiofrequency ablation to  
45  
46 980 nm laser ablation of the great saphenous vein. *Phlebology* 2017;32(6):415-24.  
47  
48 doi: 10.1177/0268355516658592  
49  
50  
51 22. Bozoglan O, Mese B, Eroglu E, et al. Comparison of Endovenous Laser and  
52  
53 Radiofrequency Ablation in Treating Varicose Veins in the Same Patient. *Vascular*  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 *and endovascular surgery* 2016;50(1):47-51. doi: 10.1177/1538574415625813  
4  
5 [published Online First: 2016/01/16]  
6  
7  
8 23. Mese B, Bozoglan O, Eroglu E, et al. A Comparison of 1,470-nm Endovenous Laser  
9  
10 Ablation and Radiofrequency Ablation in the Treatment of Great Saphenous Veins 10  
11  
12 mm or More in Size. *Annals of vascular surgery* 2015;29(7):1368-72. doi:  
13  
14 10.1016/j.avsg.2015.03.063 [published Online First: 2015/07/01]  
15  
16  
17 24. Nordon IM, Hinchliffe RJ, Brar R, et al. A prospective double-blind randomized controlled  
18  
19 trial of radiofrequency versus laser treatment of the great saphenous vein in patients  
20  
21 with varicose veins. *Annals of surgery* 2011;254(6):876-81. doi:  
22  
23 10.1097/SLA.0b013e318230af5a [published Online First: 2011/09/22]  
24  
25  
26 25. Permsuwan U, Guntawongwan K, Buddhawongsa P. Handling time in economic  
27  
28 evaluation studies. *Journal of the Medical Association of Thailand = Chotmaihet*  
29  
30 *thangphaet* 2014;97 Suppl 5:S50-8. [published Online First: 2014/06/27]  
31  
32  
33 26. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic  
34  
35 reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions:  
36  
37 explanation and elaboration. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2009;339:b2700. doi:  
38  
39 10.1136/bmj.b2700 [published Online First: 2009/07/23]  
40  
41  
42 27. Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, et al. The PRISMA extension statement for reporting  
43  
44 of systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses of health care  
45  
46 interventions: checklist and explanations. *Annals of internal medicine*  
47  
48 2015;162(11):777-84. doi: 10.7326/m14-2385 [published Online First: 2015/06/02]  
49  
50  
51 28. Cavallini A. Endovenous laser treatment of saphenous veins: is there clinical difference  
52  
53 using different endovenous laser wavelengths? *International angiology : a journal of*  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3           *the International Union of Angiology* 2015;34(1):1-8. [published Online First:  
4  
5           2014/06/14]
- 6  
7           29. van Eekeren RR, Boersma D, de Vries JP, et al. Update of endovenous treatment  
8  
9           modalities for insufficient saphenous veins--a review of literature. *Seminars in*  
10  
11           *vascular surgery* 2014;27(2):118-36. doi: 10.1053/j.semvascsurg.2015.02.002  
12  
13           [published Online First: 2015/04/15]
- 14  
15  
16           30. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for  
17  
18           assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2011;343:d5928.  
19  
20           doi: 10.1136/bmj.d5928 [published Online First: 2011/10/20]
- 21  
22  
23           31. Puhan MA, Schunemann HJ, Murad MH, et al. A GRADE Working Group approach for  
24  
25           rating the quality of treatment effect estimates from network meta-analysis. *BMJ*  
26  
27           *(Clinical research ed)* 2014;349:g5630. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g5630 [published Online  
28  
29           First: 2014/09/26]
- 30  
31  
32           32. Hozo SP, Djulbegovic B, Hozo I. Estimating the mean and variance from the median,  
33  
34           range, and the size of a sample. *BMC medical research methodology* 2005;5:13. doi:  
35  
36           10.1186/1471-2288-5-13 [published Online First: 2005/04/21]
- 37  
38  
39           33. White IR. Network meta-analysis. *Stata Journal* 2015;15(4):951-85.
- 40  
41  
42           34. Chaimani A, Salanti G. Using network meta-analysis to evaluate the existence of small-  
43  
44           study effects in a network of interventions. *Research synthesis methods*  
45  
46           2012;3(2):161-76. doi: 10.1002/jrsm.57 [published Online First: 2012/06/01]
- 47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Reporting checklist for protocol of a systematic review.

Based on the PRISMA-P guidelines.

## Instructions to authors

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the PRISMA-P reporting guidelines, and cite them as:

Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev.* 2015;4(1):1.

		Reporting Item	Page Number
Identification	<a href="#">#1a</a>	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	<a href="#">#1b</a>	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	1
	<a href="#">#2</a>	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	4
Contact	<a href="#">#3a</a>	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	1-2
Contribution	<a href="#">#3b</a>	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	11
	<a href="#">#4</a>	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important	-

		protocol amendments	
1			
2	Sources	<a href="#">#5a</a> Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	2
3			
4	Sponsor	<a href="#">#5b</a> Provide name for the review funder and / or sponsor	2
5			
6	Role of sponsor or	<a href="#">#5c</a> Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and / or institution(s),	-
7	funder	if any, in developing the protocol	
8			
9			
10	Rationale	<a href="#">#6</a> Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is	4-6
11		already known	
12			
13			
14	Objectives	<a href="#">#7</a> Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will	6
15		address with reference to participants, interventions,	
16		comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	
17			
18			
19	Eligibility criteria	<a href="#">#8</a> Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study	7
20		design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such	
21		as years considered, language, publication status) to be used	
22		as criteria for eligibility for the review	
23			
24			
25			
26	Information	<a href="#">#9</a> Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic	6
27	sources	databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other	
28		grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	
29			
30			
31	Search strategy	<a href="#">#10</a> Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one	6-7
32		electronic database, including planned limits, such that it	
33		could be repeated	
34			
35			
36	Study records -	<a href="#">#11a</a> Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage	7-8
37	data management	records and data throughout the review	
38			
39	Study records -	<a href="#">#11b</a> State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such	7
40	selection process	as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the	
41		review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-	
42		analysis)	
43			
44			
45	Study records -	<a href="#">#11c</a> Describe planned method of extracting data from reports	8
46	data collection	(such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate),	
47	process	any processes for obtaining and confirming data from	
48		investigators	
49			
50			
51	Data items	<a href="#">#12</a> List and define all variables for which data will be sought	8
52		(such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data	
53		assumptions and simplifications	
54			
55			
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			

1	Outcomes and	<a href="#">#13</a>	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought,	8
2	prioritization		including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with	
3			rationale	
4				
5				
6	Risk of bias in	<a href="#">#14</a>	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of	8-9
7	individual studies		individual studies, including whether this will be done at the	
8			outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will	
9			be used in data synthesis	
10				
11				
12				
13	Data synthesis	<a href="#">#15a</a>	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively	9
14			synthesised	
15				
16				
17		<a href="#">#15b</a>	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe	9-10
18			planned summary measures, methods of handling data and	
19			methods of combining data from studies, including any	
20			planned exploration of consistency (such as I <sup>2</sup> , Kendall's $\tau$ )	
21				
22				
23				
24		<a href="#">#15c</a>	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as	9-10
25			sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	
26				
27				
28		<a href="#">#15d</a>	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type	9-10
29			of summary planned	
30				
31	Meta-bias(es)	<a href="#">#16</a>	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as	9-10
32			publication bias across studies, selective reporting within	
33			studies)	
34				
35				
36				
37	Confidence in	<a href="#">#17</a>	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be	9
38	cumulative		assessed (such as GRADE)	
39	evidence			
40				
41				

42 The PRISMA-P checklist is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License  
 43 CC-BY 4.0. This checklist can be completed online using <https://www.goodreports.org/>, a tool made  
 44 by the [EQUATOR Network](#) in collaboration with [Penelope.ai](#)  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60

# BMJ Open

## Endovenous ablation and surgery in great saphenous vein reflux. A systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-024813.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	13-Sep-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Siribumrungwong, Boonying; Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University; Center of Excellence in Applied Epidemiology, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University Srikuea, Kanoklada; Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University Orrapin, Saritphat; Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University Benyakorn, Thoetphum ; Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University Rerkasem, Kittipan ; Division of Vascular and Endovascular Surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University Thakkestian, Ammarin; Faculty of Medicine Ramathibodi Hospital, Mahidol University, Section for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Surgery
Secondary Subject Heading:	Surgery
Keywords:	endovenous, saphenous vein reflux, stripping, saphenofemoral ligation, sclerotherapy

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 **Endovenous ablation and surgery in great saphenous vein reflux. A systematic review and**  
4  
5 **network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials protocol.**  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 Boonying Siribumrungwong, M.D., PhD

11 Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine,

12  
13 Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand

14  
15 Center of Excellence in Applied Epidemiology, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University

16  
17 Hospital, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 Kanoklada Srikuea, M.D.

25  
26 Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine,

27  
28 Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Saritphat Orrapin, M.D.

35  
36 Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine,

37  
38 Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand  
39  
40  
41

42  
43 Thoetphum Benyakorn, M.D.

44  
45 Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine,

46  
47 Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 Kittipan Rerkasem, M.D., PhD

53  
54 Division of Vascular and Endovascular Surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine,

55  
56 Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, Thailand  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Ammarin Thakkinstian, PhD.

4  
5 Section for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Faculty of Medicine, Ramathibodi

6  
7 Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 **Corresponding author**

13  
14 Ammarin Thakkinstian, PhD.

15  
16 Section for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Faculty of Medicine, Ramathibodi

17  
18 Hospital, Mahidol University, Rama VI road, Rachatevi, Bangkok, 10400, Thailand

19  
20  
21 Phone number: +662-2011762 Fax number: +662-2011284

22  
23  
24 Email: Ammarin.tha@mahidol.ac.th  
25  
26  
27

28 **Word count:** 1714

29  
30 **Funding:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public,  
31  
32 commercial or not-for-profit sectors  
33

34  
35 **Competing interests:** All authors declare of no competing interests  
36

37  
38 **Data Statement:** The data will be provided by corresponding author per requested  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## Abstract

**Introduction.** Endovenous ablations are the new standard procedures for treatment of great saphenous vein (GSV) reflux. These included endovenous laser ablation (EVLA), radiofrequency ablation (RFA), endovenous steam ablation (EVSA), mechano-chemical ablation (MOCA), cyanoacrylate injection, and ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy (UGFS). EVLA and RFA demonstrated similar anatomical success to surgery for short term outcome but controversial results for longer term ( $\geq 5$  years). Additional evidences from randomized controlled trials (RCT) have been published with varying follow-up times. This study is therefore conducted to directly and indirectly compare outcomes among all procedures stratify by short and long term follow-up.

**Methods and analysis.** Medline and Scopus will be searched from 2000 to May 2018 with predefined search strategy. Interventions of interest are open surgery (i.e., saphenofemoral or high ligation (HL) with stripping) and endovenous ablations (i.e., EVLA, RFA, EVSA, MOCA, cyanoacrylate injection and UGFS). The primary outcomes are anatomical success. Two independent reviewers will select studies, extract data, assess risk of bias of included studies. Disagreement will be adjudicated by the third party. Outcomes will be directly pooled if there are at least 3 studies in that comparison. A fixed effect model will be used unless heterogeneity is present, a random effect model will be applied. Source of heterogeneity will be explored using meta-regression analysis, sub-group analysis will be done accordingly. Publication bias will be assessed using Egger's test and funnel plot. A network meta-analysis will be applied to indirect compare all interventions including RFA, EVLA, EVLA with HL, UGFS, UGFS with HL, and HL with stripping. Probability being best intervention will be estimated and ranked. Inconsistency assumption be checked using a design-treatment interaction model.

**Ethics and dissemination.** Ethical approval is not required for systematic review and network meta-analysis. The study will be published in a peer-reviewed journal.

**PROSPERO registration number.** CRD42018096794

**Keywords.** Endovenous, stripping, varicose vein, saphenous vein reflux, saphenofemoral ligation, sclerotherapy

## Article summary

### Strengths and limitations of this study

- This review will include all relevant RCTs comparing outcomes between endovenous ablation and surgery since 2000 to March 2018.
- Stratify analysis by short and long term follow up will be performed
- Probability of being a best procedure will be estimated and provided

## INTRODUCTION

Chronic venous disease is common condition affected both men and women with prevalence rate of 30-50%.<sup>1,2</sup> This has led to significant health spending, about 1%-2% of health care budgets had been spent for venous disease in European countries.<sup>3</sup> Great saphenous vein (GSV) reflux is the most common site of reflux accounting for about 80% of all reflux sites.<sup>4</sup> GSV ablation is recommended to improve symptoms and quality of life of patients.<sup>5,6</sup>

To ablate GSV, endovenous ablations are recommended over surgery as a new standard treatment.<sup>6</sup> The benefits over open surgery are less postoperative pain, lower rate of surgical site infection, faster return to normal activities and work.<sup>7</sup> However, it is accompanied with higher equipment costs.<sup>8</sup> Many techniques of endovenous ablation have

1  
2  
3 therefore emerged including endovenous laser ablation (EVLA), radiofrequency ablation  
4 (RFA), endovenous steam ablation (EVSA), and ultrasound-guided sclerotherapy (UGFS).  
5  
6  
7 Two novel techniques of non-tumescent non-thermal endovenous ablation (NTNT) including  
8  
9  
10 mechano-chemical ablation (MOCA) and cyanoacrylate injection had been introduced for  
11  
12 several years with promising early results.<sup>9</sup>  
13

14  
15 Directly-related outcome after GSV ablation is anatomical success, which is patency  
16  
17 of the GSV after ablation. However, failure or recurrence cannot be avoided which is  
18  
19 classified as technical failure, periprocedural, early, midterm, and late failure when it is  
20  
21 occurred  $\leq 3$  days,  $\leq 1$  month, 1 year, 1-3 years, and  $> 3$  years after operation. Sources of  
22  
23 recurrences could be neovascularization and reflux in tributaries in which the former might  
24  
25 occur more after open surgery whereas the later often occurred after endovenous ablation  
26  
27 without high ligation.<sup>10 11</sup> Another important outcome is patient's-reported outcome  
28  
29 measurements or PROMs, which measured patients' perspective in both generic and  
30  
31 specific quality of life.<sup>6</sup>  
32  
33

34  
35 Previous evidences about efficacy of these procedures had been pooled considering  
36  
37 short to long term outcomes. The first systematic review in 2012 included 28 RCTs to  
38  
39 compare short-midterm outcomes of endovenous procedures with surgery. It found  
40  
41 benefits of endovenous procedures (i.e. EVLA, RFA, and UGFS) over open surgery in  
42  
43 postoperative pain, morbidity, and faster recovery with similar efficacies for EVLA and RFA  
44  
45 but less efficacy for UGFS.<sup>7</sup> Other two systematic reviews in 2017<sup>10</sup> and 2018<sup>11</sup> considered  
46  
47 only long term outcomes by including 12 and 9 RCTs with  $> 5$  year follow up, respectively.  
48  
49 Although the former meta-analysis<sup>12</sup> considered only RCTs, they pooled outcome data (i.e.,  
50  
51 success/recurrent reflux rates and mean difference) comparing before vs after of each  
52  
53 intervention without directly compared these outcomes between groups. As a result,  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 randomization may be broken and thus bias the results. The latest meta-analysis<sup>11</sup> could not  
4  
5 detect whether recurrence rates between EVLA, RFA, and surgery were different due to  
6  
7 small numbers of included studies and subjects.  
8

9  
10 Some additional RCTs comparing endovenous procedures and open surgery or  
11  
12 comparing among endovenous ablations have been later published with varying follow up  
13  
14 time and also surgical techniques (i.e., with or without high ligation).<sup>13-26</sup> In addition, RCTs  
15  
16 comparing among endovenous techniques including NTNT (i.e., EVSA, MOCA, and  
17  
18 cyanoacrylate injection) have also been published. These data have not yet been updated in  
19  
20 the aforementioned meta-analyses with long term outcomes. In addition, accurate and  
21  
22 precise magnitude of benefit of endovenous procedures over surgery along time horizon of  
23  
24 treatment is important for economic analysis.<sup>27</sup> Therefore, this systematic review and  
25  
26 network meta-analysis is conducted which aim to directly and indirectly compare clinical  
27  
28 outcomes between interventions stratifying by time of follow up including anatomical  
29  
30 success, clinical recurrence, and quality of life. Postoperative outcomes include  
31  
32 postoperative pain, time to return to normal activities and work, and complications (i.e.  
33  
34 wound infection, hematoma, paresthesia, ecchymosis, and deep venous thrombosis) will be  
35  
36 pooled using all available data. In addition, source of recurrences (i.e., neovascularization,  
37  
38 and reflux in tributaries) and reintervention rates will also be pooled. Probability being best  
39  
40 intervention will be estimated and ranked for each outcome. Risk and benefit will be then  
41  
42 compared.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

## 48 **METHODS**

49  
50  
51 The protocol was developed according to PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for  
52  
53 Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses) statement for reporting systematic reviews and  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

1  
2  
3 meta-analyses<sup>28</sup> and extension statement for systematic reviews incorporating network  
4  
5 meta-analyses of health care interventions.<sup>29</sup>  
6

### 7 8 **Search strategy**

9  
10 Medline and Scopus will be searched from August 2011 to September 2018, and will  
11  
12 be updated every 3 months till August 2019. Search terms are constructed according to  
13  
14 patients and intervention/comparator as follows: "Varicose veins"[Mesh] OR "Saphenous  
15  
16 vein"[Mesh] OR varicose OR saphenous NOT esophageal; radiofrequency OR RFA OR VNUS  
17  
18 OR endovenous OR EVLT OR EVLA OR laser OR sclerotherapy[Mesh] OR foam sclerotherapy  
19  
20 OR UGFS OR stripping OR sapheno-femoral ligation OR surgery OR steam OR glue OR  
21  
22 cyanoacrylate OR clarivein OR mechanochemical OR mechano-chemical. These search terms  
23  
24 of the two domains will be combined with AND with limited to clinical trial, human, and  
25  
26 English articles. Reference lists from previous meta-analysis and all eligible papers will be  
27  
28 reviewed for relevant studies.  
29  
30  
31

### 32 33 **Study selection**

34  
35 Study selection will be done by two independent authors (BS and TB). Title and  
36  
37 abstract will be screened for eligible criteria, full text will then be reviewed if decision  
38  
39 cannot be made. Any disagreement will be adjudicated by a third party (AT). Data from  
40  
41 multiple publication studies will be combined as one publication for analysis.  
42  
43

44  
45 RCTs studied in patients with GSV reflux will be included if they meet following  
46  
47 criteria: Had any pair of following interventions including endovenous thermal ablation (i.e.,  
48  
49 EVLA, RFA, and EVSA), endovenous non-thermal non-tumescent ablations (i.e., MOCA, UGFS  
50  
51 cyanoacrylate injection), and surgery; had at least one following outcomes including  
52  
53 anatomical success, postoperative pain, wound infection, hematoma, ecchymosis, deep vein  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 thrombosis, time to return to normal activities and work, clinical recurrence, and quality of  
4  
5 life. Studies will be excluded if they have insufficient data for pooling.  
6

### 7 **Interventions**

8  
9 Interventions of interest are open surgery (i.e., saphenofemoral or high ligation (HL) with  
10 stripping of the GSV), endovenous thermal ablations (i.e., EVLA, RFA, and EVSA), and non-  
11 thermal nontumescent endovenous ablation (i.e. MOCA, cyanoacrylate injection). EVLA  
12 ablates GSV using laser energy with varying wavelength such as 810, 940, 980, 1470, and  
13 1560 nm.<sup>30 31</sup> RFA generates heat by radiofrequency energy. Both RFA and EVLA are usually  
14 performed with tumescent anesthesia to prevent thermal injury to adjacent tissue. EVSA  
15 used heat from steam to ablate GSV. MOCA both mechanically and chemically injured  
16 endothelium of targeted vein. Cyanoacrylate was polymerized into solid form to occlude  
17 vein after injection. UGFS damages endothelium causing occlusion of vein, is injected to the  
18 GSV by either direct puncture or via catheter.<sup>32</sup> Foam sclerosant can be developed manually  
19 or by manufacture. HL might or might not be applied with endovenous procedures.  
20  
21 Comparison of interests will be any pair among different types of ablations or the same type  
22 of ablations but different techniques (e.g., different sclerosants and/or concentrations for  
23 UGFS, short versus long wavelengths or pull back types for laser) if data are sufficient for  
24 pooling and there are common comparators in the network mapping.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

### 44 **Outcomes**

45  
46 The primary outcome of interest is anatomical success, which variously defined  
47 according to original studies as incomplete stripping (in open surgery), non-occlusion of  
48 GSV, partially opened without reflux, or reflux of GSV diagnosed by duplex scan. This  
49 outcome will be considered according to time frame of follow up, i.e., periprocedural, early,  
50 midterm, and late failure.<sup>6</sup>  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Secondary outcomes of interest are clinical recurrence, postoperative pain, time to  
4  
5 return to normal activities and work, self-reported quality of life, reintervention rate, and  
6  
7 postoperative complications (i.e. hematoma, ecchymosis, paresthesia, and deep vein  
8  
9 thrombosis). Quality of life will be compared according to time frame of follow up. Clinical  
10  
11 recurrence will be defined as clinical detected recurrence of varicose vein.  
12  
13  
14 Neovascularization and reflux in tributaries will also be extracted and compared.  
15

### 16 **Data extraction**

17  
18  
19 Two independent authors (BS and KS) will extract data using standardized data  
20  
21 extraction forms. General characteristics of studies and interventions including patients'  
22  
23 severity, age, detailed of intervention, duration of follow up, type of anesthesia,  
24  
25 compression method, tumescent anesthesia, primary outcome definition, concomitant  
26  
27 phlebectomy and sclerotherapy will be extracted. These data will be used for exploring  
28  
29 source of heterogeneity. Mean (SD) and frequencies of outcomes data by intervention will  
30  
31 be extracted for pooling. Mean difference or risk ratio will be used in case of no summary  
32  
33 data provided in the study. Inconsistent data will be solved by consensus with third party  
34  
35 (AT) and finalize. Author will contact corresponding authors twice for missing data.  
36  
37  
38

### 39 **Risk of bias assessment**

40  
41  
42 Studies will be assessed for risk of bias using Cochrane Collaboration's tool<sup>33</sup> by two  
43  
44 independent researchers (BS and SO). This tool consists of 7 domains: random sequence  
45  
46 generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of  
47  
48 outcome assessors, incomplete outcome reports, selective outcome reports, and other  
49  
50 source of bias. Disagreement will be resolved by third party (AT).  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Grading evidence

Quality of evidence will be graded separately for each outcome using a tool suggested by the GRADE Working Group.<sup>34</sup> Five domains will be assessed including study limitations, consistency, indirectness, imprecision, and publication bias. The evidence will be downgraded one and two levels for serious and very serious concerns, respectively.

### Statistical analysis

#### *Direct meta-analysis*

Data will be directly pooled if there are at least 3 studies for each comparison. Risk ratios (RR) with 95% confidence interval (CI) will be estimated for dichotomous outcome. A continuity correction will be used if there is a zero cell. The RRs will be pooled using inverse variance, and Dersimonian and Laird for data without and with heterogeneity, respectively. For continuous outcome, unstandardized or standardised mean difference (MD) with 95%CI will be estimated and pooled across studies if outcome measures are the same and different scales, respectively. Mean and standard deviation (SD) will be estimated from median and range/interquartile If study did not report mean and SD.<sup>35</sup>

Heterogeneity will be assessed using degree of heterogeneity ( $I^2$ ) and  $Q$  test. If either  $I^2 \geq 25\%$  or  $Q$  test is significant with  $p < 0.10$ , the results will be considered as heterogeneous and random effect model will be applied. Possible source of heterogeneity will be explored by fitting studies' characteristics (i.e., concomitant phlebectomy or foam sclerotherapy, type of anesthesia, and compression method), different of interventional techniques in each type of endovenous ablation (i.e., laser wavelength, catheter use in UGFS, and type of sclerosant and concentration), outcomes definition (i.e., non-occlusion, partially opened without reflux, and reflux) and patient's characteristics (i.e., age, severity) in a meta-regression model if data are sufficient for doing. Subgroup or sensitivity analysis



1  
2  
3 will be performed accordingly to factors that can reduce a degree of heterogeneity.

4  
5 Publication bias will be assessed by funnel plot and Egger test. If there is evidence of  
6  
7 asymmetry of the funnel by either two, a contour-enhanced plot will be constructed to  
8  
9 distinguish whether a source of asymmetry due to heterogeneity or missing studies.  
10

### 11 12 *Network meta-analysis*

13  
14 A network meta-analysis<sup>36</sup> will be performed to indirectly compare among  
15  
16 interventions including RFA, EVLA, EVLA with HL, UGFS, UGFS with HL, EVSA, MOCA,  
17  
18 cyanoacrylate injection, and HL with stripping. HL with stripping will be used as a common  
19  
20 comparator. Analysis will be performed as following steps: First, relative intervention effect,  
21  
22 i.e., risk ratio (RR) along with its variance-covariance will be estimated by binary regression  
23  
24 analysis. A multivariate random-effect meta-analysis with consistency mode will be then  
25  
26 used to pool RRs across studies. Mixed intervention comparisons will be next estimated.  
27  
28 Probability being best intervention will be estimated and ranked using surface under  
29  
30 cumulative ranking (SUCRA) method, rankogram will be plotted accordingly. Cluster rank  
31  
32 plot will be constructed by comparing probability being risk and benefit.  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 The inconsistency assumption (i.e., whether direct effects agree with the indirect  
38  
39 effects) will be checked using a design-treatment interaction model. If this assumption does  
40  
41 not meet, an inconsistency factor (IF, i.e.,  $\ln(\text{RR}_{\text{direct}}) - \ln(\text{RR}_{\text{indirect}})$ ) will be estimated and  
42  
43 tested. In addition, a comparison-adjusted funnel plot taking into account different  
44  
45 comparisons will be plotted to explore whether there is evidence of small study effect for  
46  
47 the whole network.<sup>36 37</sup>  
48  
49

50  
51 Analyses will be performed using STATA version 15.0. A *p* value of less than 0.05 will  
52  
53 be considered as statistically significant, except heterogeneity test where *p* value <0.10 will  
54  
55 be used.  
56  
57

### **Patient and public involvement**

Patients and public will not involve in the study.

### **ETHIC and DISSEMINATION**

Ethical consideration and ethic committee approval are not required from the nature of systematic review and network meta-analysis. Results of the study will be presented in international meeting. The manuscript will be submitted to peer-reviewed journal.

### **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

BS generated research question, writing part of the protocol, KS wrote and register protocol, SO wrote and register protocol, TB wrote and comment on protocol, KR wrote and comment on protocol, and AT wrote and comment on protocol.

### **REFERENCE**

1. Carpentier PH, Maricq HR, Biro C, et al. Prevalence, risk factors, and clinical patterns of chronic venous disorders of lower limbs: a population-based study in France. *Journal of vascular surgery* 2004;40(4):650-9.
2. Beebe-Dimmer JL, Pfeifer JR, Engle JS, et al. The epidemiology of chronic venous insufficiency and varicose veins. *Annals of epidemiology* 2005;15(3):175-84.
3. Ruckley CV. Socioeconomic impact of chronic venous insufficiency and leg ulcers. *Angiology* 1997;48(1):67-9.
4. Kanchanabat B, Stapanavatr W. Venous ultrasonography findings and clinical correlations in 104 Thai patients with chronic venous insufficiency of the legs. *Singapore medical journal* 2018;59(3):155-58.

- 1  
2  
3 5. Siribumrungwong B, Noorit P, Wilasrusmee C, et al. Quality of life after great saphenous  
4  
5 vein ablation in Thai patients with great saphenous vein reflux. *Asian J Surg*  
6  
7 2017;40(4):295-300.  
8
- 9  
10 6. Gloviczki P, Comerota AJ, Dalsing MC, et al. The care of patients with varicose veins and  
11  
12 associated chronic venous diseases: clinical practice guidelines of the Society for  
13  
14 Vascular Surgery and the American Venous Forum. *Journal of vascular surgery*  
15  
16 2011;53(5 Suppl):2s-48s.  
17
- 18  
19 7. Siribumrungwong B, Noorit P, Wilasrusmee C, et al. A systematic review and meta-  
20  
21 analysis of randomised controlled trials comparing endovenous ablation and surgical  
22  
23 intervention in patients with varicose vein. *European journal of vascular and*  
24  
25 *endovascular surgery : the official journal of the European Society for Vascular*  
26  
27 *Surgery* 2012;44(2):214-23.  
28
- 29  
30 8. Siribumrungwong B, Noorit P, Wilasrusmee C, et al. Cost-utility analysis of great  
31  
32 saphenous vein ablation with radiofrequency, foam and surgery in the emerging  
33  
34 health-care setting of Thailand. *Phlebology* 2016;31(8):573-81.  
35  
36
- 37  
38 9. Vos CG, Unlu C, Bosma J, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of two novel  
39  
40 techniques of nonthermal endovenous ablation of the great saphenous vein. *Journal*  
41  
42 *of vascular surgery Venous and lymphatic disorders* 2017;5(6):880-96.  
43
- 44  
45 10. Disselhoff BC, der Kinderen DJ, Kelder JC, et al. Five-year results of a randomised clinical  
46  
47 trial of endovenous laser ablation of the great saphenous vein with and without  
48  
49 ligation of the saphenofemoral junction. *European journal of vascular and*  
50  
51 *endovascular surgery : the official journal of the European Society for Vascular*  
52  
53 *Surgery* 2011;41(5):685-90.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

- 1  
2  
3 11. Theivacumar NS, Darwood R, Gough MJ. Neovascularisation and recurrence 2 years after  
4  
5 varicose vein treatment for sapheno-femoral and great saphenous vein reflux: a  
6  
7 comparison of surgery and endovenous laser ablation. *European journal of vascular*  
8  
9 *and endovascular surgery : the official journal of the European Society for Vascular*  
10  
11 *Surgery* 2009;38(2):203-7.  
12  
13
- 14 12. Kheirelseid EAH, Crowe G, Sehgal R, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of  
15  
16 randomized controlled trials evaluating long-term outcomes of endovenous  
17  
18 management of lower extremity varicose veins. *Journal of vascular surgery Venous*  
19  
20 *and lymphatic disorders* 2018;6(2):256-70.  
21  
22
- 23 13. Rass K, Frings N, Glowacki P, et al. Comparable effectiveness of endovenous laser  
24  
25 ablation and high ligation with stripping of the great saphenous vein: Two-year  
26  
27 results of a randomized clinical trial (RELACS study). *Archives of dermatology*  
28  
29 *2012;148(1):49-58.*  
30  
31
- 32 14. Basela H, Aydina C, Aya Y, et al. Endovenous laser ablation (EVLA) versus high ligation  
33  
34 and stripping (HL/S): Two-years follow up. *Eastern Journal of Medicine* 2012;17(2):83-  
35  
36 87.  
37  
38
- 39 15. Flessenkämper I, Hartmann M, Stenger D, et al. Endovenous laser ablation with and  
40  
41 without high ligation compared with high ligation and stripping in the treatment of  
42  
43 great saphenous varicose veins: Initial results of a multicentre randomized controlled  
44  
45 trial. *Phlebology* 2013;28(1):16-23.  
46  
47
- 48 16. Mozafar M, Atqiaee K, Haghghatkhah H, et al. Endovenous laser ablation of the great  
49  
50 saphenous vein versus high ligation: long-term results. *Lasers in medical science*  
51  
52 *2014;29(2):765-71.*  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 17. Shadid N, Ceulen R, Nelemans P, et al. Randomized clinical trial of ultrasound-guided  
4  
5 foam sclerotherapy versus surgery for the incompetent great saphenous vein. *The*  
6  
7 *British journal of surgery* 2012;99(8):1062-70.  
8
- 9  
10 18. Yin H, He H, Wang M, et al. Prospective Randomized Study of Ultrasound-Guided Foam  
11  
12 Sclerotherapy Combined with Great Saphenous Vein High Ligation in the Treatment  
13  
14 of Severe Lower Extremity Varicosis. *Annals of vascular surgery* 2017;39:256-63.  
15
- 16  
17 19. Venermo M, Saarinen J, Eskelinen E, et al. Randomized clinical trial comparing surgery,  
18  
19 endovenous laser ablation and ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy for the  
20  
21 treatment of great saphenous varicose veins. *The British journal of surgery*  
22  
23 2016;103(11):1438-44.  
24
- 25  
26 20. Brittenden J, Cotton SC, Elders A, et al. A randomized trial comparing treatments for  
27  
28 varicose veins. *The New England journal of medicine* 2014;371(13):1218-27.  
29
- 30  
31 21. Biemans AAM, Kockaert M, Akkersdijk GP, et al. Comparing endovenous laser ablation,  
32  
33 foam sclerotherapy, and conventional surgery for great saphenous varicose veins.  
34  
35 *Journal of vascular surgery* 2013;58(3):727-34.  
36
- 37  
38 22. Mendes CA, Martins AA, Fukuda JM, et al. Randomized trial of radiofrequency ablation  
39  
40 versus conventional surgery for superficial venous insufficiency: If you don't tell,  
41  
42 they won't know. *Clinics* 2016;71(11):650-56.  
43
- 44  
45 23. Sydnor M, Mavropoulos J, Slobodnik N, et al. A randomized prospective long-term (>1  
46  
47 year) clinical trial comparing the efficacy and safety of radiofrequency ablation to  
48  
49 980 nm laser ablation of the great saphenous vein. *Phlebology* 2017;32(6):415-24.  
50
- 51  
52 24. Bozoglan O, Mese B, Eroglu E, et al. Comparison of Endovenous Laser and  
53  
54 Radiofrequency Ablation in Treating Varicose Veins in the Same Patient. *Vascular*  
55  
56 *and endovascular surgery* 2016;50(1):47-51.  
57  
58  
59

- 1  
2  
3 25. Mese B, Bozoglan O, Eroglu E, et al. A Comparison of 1,470-nm Endovenous Laser  
4  
5 Ablation and Radiofrequency Ablation in the Treatment of Great Saphenous Veins 10  
6  
7 mm or More in Size. *Annals of vascular surgery* 2015;29(7):1368-72.  
8  
9  
10 26. Nordon IM, Hinchliffe RJ, Brar R, et al. A prospective double-blind randomized controlled  
11  
12 trial of radiofrequency versus laser treatment of the great saphenous vein in patients  
13  
14 with varicose veins. *Annals of surgery* 2011;254(6):876-81.  
15  
16  
17 27. Permsuwan U, Guntawongwan K, Buddhawongsa P. Handling time in economic  
18  
19 evaluation studies. *Journal of the Medical Association of Thailand = Chotmaihet*  
20  
21 *thangphaet* 2014;97 Suppl 5:S50-8.  
22  
23  
24 28. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic  
25  
26 reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions:  
27  
28 explanation and elaboration. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2009;339:b2700.  
29  
30  
31 29. Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, et al. The PRISMA extension statement for reporting  
32  
33 of systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses of health care  
34  
35 interventions: checklist and explanations. *Annals of internal medicine*  
36  
37 2015;162(11):777-84.  
38  
39  
40 30. Cavallini A. Endovenous laser treatment of saphenous veins: is there clinical difference  
41  
42 using different endovenous laser wavelengths? *International angiology : a journal of*  
43  
44 *the International Union of Angiology* 2015;34(1):1-8.  
45  
46  
47 31. Galanopoulos G, Lambidis C. Minimally invasive treatment of varicose veins: Endovenous  
48  
49 laser ablation (EVLA). *International journal of surgery (London, England)*  
50  
51 2012;10(3):134-9.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 32. van Eekeren RR, Boersma D, de Vries JP, et al. Update of endovenous treatment  
4  
5 modalities for insufficient saphenous veins--a review of literature. *Seminars in*  
6  
7 *vascular surgery* 2014;27(2):118-36.  
8  
9  
10 33. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for  
11  
12 assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2011;343:d5928.  
13  
14 34. Puhan MA, Schunemann HJ, Murad MH, et al. A GRADE Working Group approach for  
15  
16 rating the quality of treatment effect estimates from network meta-analysis. *BMJ*  
17  
18 *(Clinical research ed)* 2014;349:g5630.  
19  
20  
21 35. Hozo SP, Djulbegovic B, Hozo I. Estimating the mean and variance from the median,  
22  
23 range, and the size of a sample. *BMC medical research methodology* 2005;5:13.  
24  
25  
26 36. White IR. Network meta-analysis. *Stata Journal* 2015;15(4):951-85.  
27  
28 37. Chaimani A, Salanti G. Using network meta-analysis to evaluate the existence of small-  
29  
30 study effects in a network of interventions. *Research synthesis methods*  
31  
32 2012;3(2):161-76.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Reporting checklist for protocol of a systematic review.

Based on the PRISMA-P guidelines.

## Instructions to authors

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the PRISMA-P reporting guidelines, and cite them as:

Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev.* 2015;4(1):1.

		Reporting Item	Page Number
Identification	<a href="#">#1a</a>	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	<a href="#">#1b</a>	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	1
	<a href="#">#2</a>	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	4
Contact	<a href="#">#3a</a>	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	1-2
Contribution	<a href="#">#3b</a>	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	11
	<a href="#">#4</a>	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important	-



		protocol amendments	
1			
2	Sources	<a href="#">#5a</a> Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	2
3			
4	Sponsor	<a href="#">#5b</a> Provide name for the review funder and / or sponsor	2
5			
6	Role of sponsor or	<a href="#">#5c</a> Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and / or institution(s),	-
7	funder	if any, in developing the protocol	
8			
9			
10	Rationale	<a href="#">#6</a> Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is	4-6
11		already known	
12			
13			
14	Objectives	<a href="#">#7</a> Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will	6
15		address with reference to participants, interventions,	
16		comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	
17			
18			
19	Eligibility criteria	<a href="#">#8</a> Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study	7
20		design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such	
21		as years considered, language, publication status) to be used	
22		as criteria for eligibility for the review	
23			
24			
25			
26	Information	<a href="#">#9</a> Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic	6
27	sources	databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other	
28		grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	
29			
30			
31	Search strategy	<a href="#">#10</a> Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one	6-7
32		electronic database, including planned limits, such that it	
33		could be repeated	
34			
35			
36	Study records -	<a href="#">#11a</a> Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage	7-8
37	data management	records and data throughout the review	
38			
39	Study records -	<a href="#">#11b</a> State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such	7
40	selection process	as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the	
41		review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-	
42		analysis)	
43			
44			
45	Study records -	<a href="#">#11c</a> Describe planned method of extracting data from reports	8
46	data collection	(such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate),	
47	process	any processes for obtaining and confirming data from	
48		investigators	
49			
50			
51	Data items	<a href="#">#12</a> List and define all variables for which data will be sought	8
52		(such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data	
53		assumptions and simplifications	
54			
55			
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			

1	Outcomes and	<a href="#">#13</a>	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought,	8
2	prioritization		including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with	
3			rationale	
4				
5				
6	Risk of bias in	<a href="#">#14</a>	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of	8-9
7	individual studies		individual studies, including whether this will be done at the	
8			outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will	
9			be used in data synthesis	
10				
11				
12				
13	Data synthesis	<a href="#">#15a</a>	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively	9
14			synthesised	
15				
16				
17		<a href="#">#15b</a>	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe	9-10
18			planned summary measures, methods of handling data and	
19			methods of combining data from studies, including any	
20			planned exploration of consistency (such as I <sup>2</sup> , Kendall's $\tau$ )	
21				
22				
23				
24		<a href="#">#15c</a>	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as	9-10
25			sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	
26				
27		<a href="#">#15d</a>	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type	9-10
28			of summary planned	
29				
30				
31	Meta-bias(es)	<a href="#">#16</a>	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as	9-10
32			publication bias across studies, selective reporting within	
33			studies)	
34				
35				
36				
37	Confidence in	<a href="#">#17</a>	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be	9
38	cumulative		assessed (such as GRADE)	
39	evidence			
40				
41				

42 The PRISMA-P checklist is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License  
 43 CC-BY 4.0. This checklist can be completed online using <https://www.goodreports.org/>, a tool made  
 44 by the [EQUATOR Network](#) in collaboration with [Penelope.ai](#)  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60

# BMJ Open

## Endovenous ablation and surgery in great saphenous vein reflux: A systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials protocol.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-024813.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Nov-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Siribumrungwong, Boonying; Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University; Center of Excellence in Applied Epidemiology, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University Srikuea, Kanoklada; Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University Orrapin, Saritphat; Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University Benyakorn, Thoetphum ; Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University Rerkasem, Kittipan ; Division of Vascular and Endovascular Surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University Thakkestian, Ammarin; Faculty of Medicine Ramathibodi Hospital, Mahidol University, Section for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Surgery
Secondary Subject Heading:	Surgery
Keywords:	endovenous, saphenous vein reflux, stripping, saphenofemoral ligation, sclerotherapy

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 **Endovenous ablation and surgery in great saphenous vein reflux: A systematic review and**  
4 **network meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials protocol.**  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Boonying Siribumrungwong, M.D., PhD

11  
12 Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine,

13  
14 Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand

15  
16 Center of Excellence in Applied Epidemiology, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University

17  
18 Hospital, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Kanoklada Srikuea, M.D.

26  
27 Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine,

28  
29 Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 Saritphat Orrapin, M.D.

36  
37 Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine,

38  
39 Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Thoetphum Benyakorn, M.D.

46  
47 Division of vascular and endovascular surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine,

48  
49 Thammasat University Hospital, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 Kittipan Rerkasem, M.D., PhD

56  
57 Division of Vascular and Endovascular Surgery, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine,

58  
59 Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, Thailand  
60

1  
2  
3 Ammarin Thakkinstian, PhD.

4  
5 Section for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Faculty of Medicine, Ramathibodi  
6  
7 Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 **Corresponding author**

14  
15 Ammarin Thakkinstian, PhD.

16  
17 Section for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Faculty of Medicine, Ramathibodi  
18  
19 Hospital, Mahidol University, Rama VI road, Rachatevi, Bangkok, 10400, Thailand  
20  
21

22  
23 Phone number: +662-2011762 Fax number: +662-2011284

24  
25 Email: Ammarin.tha@mahidol.ac.th  
26  
27

28  
29  
30 **Word count:** 1714

31  
32 **Funding:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public,  
33  
34 commercial or not-for-profit sectors  
35

36  
37 **Competing interests:** All authors declare no competing interests  
38

39  
40 **Data Statement:** The data will be provided by corresponding author upon request  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

**Introduction.** Endovenous ablations are the new standard procedures for treatment of great saphenous vein (GSV) reflux including endovenous laser ablation (EVLA), radiofrequency ablation (RFA), endovenous steam ablation (EVSA), mechano-chemical ablation (MOCA), cyanoacrylate injection, and ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy (UGFS). EVLA and RFA have demonstrated similar anatomical success for short term outcome, but results are controversial for longer term ( $\geq 5$  years). Additional evidences from randomised controlled trials (RCT) have been published. This study is therefore conducted to directly and indirectly compare outcomes among all procedures stratifying by short and long term follow-up.

**Methods and analysis.** Medline and Scopus will be searched from 2000 to September 2018 with predefined search strategy. Interventions of interest are open surgery (i.e., saphenofemoral or high ligation (HL) with stripping) and endovenous ablations (i.e., EVLA, RFA, EVSA, MOCA, cyanoacrylate injection and UGFS). The primary outcome is anatomical success. Two independent reviewers will select studies, extract data, and assess risk of bias. Disagreement will be adjudicated by the third party. Outcomes will be directly pooled if there are at least 3 studies in that comparison. A fixed-effect model will be used unless heterogeneity is present, in which case a random-effect model will be applied. Sources of heterogeneity will be explored using meta-regression analysis, and sub-group analysis will be done accordingly. Publication bias will be assessed using Egger's test and funnel plot. A network meta-analysis will be applied to indirect compare all interventions including RFA, EVLA, EVLA with HL, UGFS, UGFS with HL, and HL with stripping. Probability of being best intervention will be estimated and ranked. Inconsistency assumption will be checked using a design-treatment interaction model.

1  
2  
3 **Ethics and dissemination.** Ethical approval is not required for systematic review and  
4  
5 network meta-analysis. The study will be published in a peer-reviewed journal.  
6  
7

8 **PROSPERO registration number.** CRD42018096794  
9

10 **Keywords.** Endovenous, stripping, varicose vein, saphenous vein reflux, saphenofemoral  
11  
12 ligation, sclerotherapy  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

## 18 **Article summary**

### 19 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 20 • This review will include all relevant RCTs comparing outcomes between  
21  
22 endovenous ablation and surgery since 2000 to September 2018.  
23  
24 • Stratified analysis by short and long term follow up will be performed  
25  
26  
27  
28 • Probability of being the best procedure will be estimated and provided  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

## 35 **INTRODUCTION**

36  
37 Chronic venous disease is a common condition which affects both men and women  
38  
39 with prevalence rate of 30-50%.<sup>1,2</sup> This has led to significant health spending, and about 1%-  
40  
41 2% of health care budgets have been spent for venous disease in European countries.<sup>3</sup> Great  
42  
43 saphenous vein (GSV) reflux is the most common site of reflux accounting for about 80% of  
44  
45 all reflux sites.<sup>4</sup> GSV ablation is recommended to improve symptoms and quality of life of  
46  
47 patients.<sup>5,6</sup>  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 To ablate GSV, endovenous ablations are recommended over surgery as a new  
53  
54 standard treatment.<sup>6</sup> The benefits over open surgery are less postoperative pain, lower rate  
55  
56 of surgical site infection, faster return to normal activities and work.<sup>7</sup> However, they are  
57  
58 accompanied with higher equipment costs.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, many techniques of endovenous  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 ablation have emerged including endovenous laser ablation (EVLA), radiofrequency ablation  
4 (RFA), endovenous steam ablation (EVSA), and ultrasound-guided sclerotherapy (UGFS).

7  
8 Two novel techniques of non-tumescent non-thermal endovenous ablation (NTNT) including  
9  
10 mechano-chemical ablation (MOCA) and cyanoacrylate injection have been introduced for  
11  
12 several years with promising early results.<sup>9</sup>

15  
16 Directly-related outcome after GSV ablation is anatomical success, which is patency  
17  
18 of the GSV after ablation. However, failure or recurrence cannot be avoided which is  
19  
20 classified as technical failure, periprocedural, early, midterm, and late failure when it occurs  
21  
22  $\leq 3$  days,  $\leq 1$  month, 1 year, 1-3 years, and  $> 3$  years after operation. Sources of recurrences  
23  
24 could be neovascularisation and reflux in tributaries in which the former might occur more  
25  
26 after open surgery whereas the later often occurs after endovenous ablation without high  
27  
28 ligation.<sup>10 11</sup> Another important outcome is patient's-reported outcome measurements or  
29  
30 PROMs, which measures patients' perspective in both generic and specific quality of life.<sup>6</sup>

33  
34  
35 Previous evidences about efficacy of these procedures had been pooled considering  
36  
37 short to long term outcomes. The first systematic review in 2012 included 28 RCTs to  
38  
39 compare short-midterm outcomes of endovenous procedures with surgery. It found  
40  
41 benefits of endovenous procedures (i.e. EVLA, RFA, and UGFS) over open surgery in  
42  
43 postoperative pain, morbidity, and faster recovery with similar efficacies for EVLA and RFA,  
44  
45 but less efficacy for UGFS.<sup>7</sup> Two other systematic reviews in 2017<sup>10</sup> and 2018<sup>11</sup> considered  
46  
47 only long term outcomes by including 12 and 9 RCTs with  $> 5$  year follow up, respectively.  
48  
49  
50 Although the former meta-analysis<sup>12</sup> considered only RCTs, they pooled outcome data (i.e.,  
51  
52 success/recurrent reflux rates and mean difference) comparing before vs after of each  
53  
54 intervention without directly comparing these outcomes between groups. As a result,  
55  
56 randomisation may be broken and thus bias the results. The latest meta-analysis<sup>11</sup> could not  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 detect whether recurrence rates between EVLA, RFA, and surgery were different due to  
4  
5 small numbers of included studies and subjects.  
6  
7

8           Some additional RCTs comparing endovenous procedures and open surgery or  
9  
10 comparing among endovenous ablations have been published later with varying follow up  
11  
12 times and also surgical techniques, i.e., with or without high ligation.<sup>13-26</sup> In addition, RCTs  
13  
14 comparing among endovenous techniques including NTNT (i.e., EVSA, MOCA, and  
15  
16 cyanoacrylate injection) have also been published. These data have not yet been updated in  
17  
18 the aforementioned meta-analyses with long term outcomes. In addition, accurate and  
19  
20 precise magnitude of benefit of endovenous procedures over surgery along time horizon of  
21  
22 treatment is important for economic analysis.<sup>27</sup> Therefore, this systematic review and  
23  
24 network meta-analysis is conducted which aims to directly and indirectly compare clinical  
25  
26 outcomes between interventions stratifying by time of follow up including anatomical  
27  
28 success, clinical recurrence, and quality of life. Postoperative outcomes including  
29  
30 postoperative pain, time to return to normal activities and work, and complications (i.e.  
31  
32 wound infection, hematoma, paresthesia, ecchymosis, and deep venous thrombosis) will be  
33  
34 pooled using all available data. In addition, source of recurrences (i.e., neovascularisation  
35  
36 and reflux in tributaries) and reintervention rates will also be pooled. Probability of being  
37  
38 the best intervention will be estimated and ranked for each outcome. Risk and benefit will  
39  
40 be then compared.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

## 49 **METHODS**

50  
51  
52           The protocol was developed according to PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for  
53  
54 Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses) statement for reporting systematic reviews and  
55  
56 meta-analyses<sup>28</sup> and extension statement for systematic reviews incorporating network  
57  
58 meta-analyses of health care interventions.<sup>29</sup>  
59  
60

### Search strategy

Medline and Scopus will be searched from 2000 to September 2018, and will be updated every 3 months until August 2019. Search terms are constructed according to patients and intervention/comparator as follows: "Varicose veins"[Mesh] OR "Saphenous vein"[Mesh] OR varicose OR saphenous NOT esophageal; radiofrequency OR RFA OR VNUS OR endovenous OR EVLT OR EVLA OR laser OR sclerotherapy[Mesh] OR foam sclerotherapy OR UGFS OR stripping OR sapheno-femoral ligation OR surgery OR steam OR glue OR cyanoacrylate OR clarivein OR mechanochemical OR mechano-chemical. These search terms of the two domains will be combined with AND with limited to clinical trial, human, and English articles. Reference lists from previous meta-analysis and all eligible papers will be reviewed for relevant studies.

### Study selection

Study selection will be done by two independent authors (BS and TB). Title and abstract will be screened for eligible criteria, full text will then be reviewed if a decision cannot be made. Any disagreement will be adjudicated by a third party (AT). Data from multiple publication studies will be combined as one publication for analysis.

RCTs studied in patients with GSV reflux will be included if they meet the following criteria: had any pair of the following interventions including endovenous thermal ablation (i.e., EVLA, RFA, and EVSA), endovenous non-thermal non-tumescent ablations (i.e., MOCA, UGFS cyanoacrylate injection), and surgery; had at least one following outcomes including anatomical success, postoperative pain, wound infection, hematoma, ecchymosis, deep vein thrombosis, time to return to normal activities and work, clinical recurrence, and quality of life. Studies will be excluded if they have insufficient data for pooling.

### Interventions

Interventions of interest are open surgery (i.e., saphenofemoral or high ligation (HL) with stripping of the GSV), endovenous thermal ablations (i.e., EVLA, RFA, and EVSA), and non-thermal nontumescent endovenous ablation (i.e. UGFS, MOCA, cyanoacrylate injection). EVLA ablates GSV using laser energy with varying wavelength such as 810, 940, 980, 1470, and 1560 nm.<sup>30 31</sup> RFA generates heat by radiofrequency energy. Both RFA and EVLA are usually performed with tumescent anesthesia to prevent thermal injury to adjacent tissue. EVSA uses heat from steam to ablate GSV. MOCA both mechanically and chemically injured endothelium of targeted vein. Cyanoacrylate is polymerised into solid form to occlude vein after injection. UGFS damages endothelium causing occlusion of vein, which is injected to the GSV by either direct puncture or via catheter.<sup>32</sup> Foam sclerosant can be developed manually or by manufacture. HL might or might not be applied with endovenous procedures. Comparison of interests will be any pair among different types of ablations or the same type of ablations, but different techniques (e.g., different sclerosants and/or concentrations for UGFS, short versus long wavelengths or pull back types for laser), if data are sufficient for pooling and there are common comparators in the network mapping.

### Outcomes

The primary outcome of interest is anatomical success, which was originally defined as incomplete stripping for open surgery and non-occlusion of GSV with or without reflux diagnosed by duplex scan. This outcome will be considered according to time frame of follow up i.e., periprocedural, early, midterm, and late failure.<sup>6</sup>

Secondary outcomes of interest are clinical recurrence, postoperative pain, time to return to normal activities and work, self-reported quality of life, reintervention rate, and postoperative complications (i.e. hematoma, ecchymosis, paresthesia, and deep vein

1  
2  
3 thrombosis). Quality of life will be compared according to time frame of follow up. Clinical  
4  
5 recurrence will be defined as clinical detected recurrence of varicose vein.  
6

7  
8 Neovascularisation and reflux in tributaries will also be extracted and compared.  
9

### 10 **Data extraction**

11  
12 Two independent authors (BS and KS) will extract data using standardised data  
13  
14 extraction forms. General characteristics of studies and interventions including patients'  
15  
16 severity, age, details of intervention, duration of follow up, type of anesthesia, compression  
17  
18 method, tumescent anesthesia, primary outcome definition, concomitant phlebectomy and  
19  
20 sclerotherapy will be extracted. These data will be used for exploring source of  
21  
22 heterogeneity. Mean (SD) and frequencies of outcomes data by intervention will be  
23  
24 extracted for pooling. Mean difference or risk ratio will be used in case of no summary data  
25  
26 provided in the study. Inconsistent data will be solved by consensus with third party (AT)  
27  
28 and finalised. Author will contact corresponding authors twice for missing data.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

### 34 **Risk of bias assessment**

35  
36  
37 Studies will be assessed for risk of bias using Cochrane Collaboration's tool<sup>33</sup> by two  
38  
39 independent researchers (BS and SO). This tool consists of 7 domains: random sequence  
40  
41 generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of  
42  
43 outcome assessors, incomplete outcome reports, selective outcome reports, and other  
44  
45 source of bias. Disagreement will be resolved by third party (AT).  
46  
47  
48

### 49 **Grading evidence**

50  
51  
52 Quality of evidence will be graded separately for each outcome using a tool  
53  
54 suggested by the GRADE Working Group.<sup>34</sup> Five domains will be assessed including study  
55  
56 limitations, consistency, indirectness, imprecision, and publication bias. The evidence will be  
57  
58 downgraded one and two levels for serious and very serious concerns, respectively.  
59  
60

## Statistical analysis

### *Direct meta-analysis*

Data will be directly pooled if there are at least 3 studies for each comparison. Risk ratios (RR) with 95% confidence interval (CI) will be estimated for dichotomous outcome. A continuity correction will be used if there is a zero cell. The RRs will be pooled using inverse variance, and Dersimonian and Laird for data without and with heterogeneity, respectively. For continuous outcome, unstandardised or standardised mean difference (MD) with 95%CI will be estimated and pooled across studies if outcome measures are the same and different scales, respectively. Mean and standard deviation (SD) will be estimated from median and range/interquartile, if a study did not report mean and SD.<sup>35</sup>

Heterogeneity will be assessed using degree of heterogeneity ( $I^2$ ) and  $Q$  test. If either  $I^2 \geq 25\%$  or  $Q$  test is significant with  $p < 0.10$ , the results will be considered as heterogeneous and random effect model will be applied. Possible source of heterogeneity will be explored by fitting studies' characteristics (i.e., concomitant phlebectomy or foam sclerotherapy, type of anesthesia, and compression method), different of interventional techniques in each type of endovenous ablation (i.e., laser wavelength, catheter use in UGFS, and type of sclerosant and concentration), outcomes definition (i.e., non-occlusion, non-occlusion with or without reflux) and patient's characteristics (i.e., age, severity) in a meta-regression model, if data are sufficient. Subgroup or sensitivity analysis will be performed accordingly to factors that can reduce the degree of heterogeneity. Publication bias will be assessed by funnel plot and Egger test. If there is evidence of asymmetry of the funnel by either of these two, a contour-enhanced plot will be constructed to distinguish whether a source of asymmetry is due to heterogeneity or missing studies.

### *Network meta-analysis*

1  
2  
3 A network meta-analysis<sup>36</sup> will be performed to indirectly compare among  
4 interventions including RFA, EVLA, EVLA with HL, UGFS, UGFS with HL, EVSA, MOCA,  
5 cyanoacrylate injection, and HL with stripping. HL with stripping will be used as a common  
6 comparator. Analysis will be performed by the following steps: First, relative intervention  
7 effect, i.e., risk ratio (RR) along with its variance-covariance will be estimated by binary  
8 regression analysis. A multivariate random-effect meta-analysis with consistency mode will  
9 then be used to pool RRs across studies. Mixed intervention comparisons will be next  
10 estimated. Probability of being the best intervention will be estimated and ranked using  
11 surface under cumulative ranking (SUCRA) method, and rankogram will be plotted  
12 accordingly. Cluster rank plot will be constructed by comparing probability of being risk and  
13 benefit.

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30 The inconsistency assumption (i.e., whether direct effects agree with the indirect  
31 effects) will be checked using a design-treatment interaction model. If this assumption is not  
32 met, an inconsistency factor (IF, i.e.,  $\ln(\text{RR}_{\text{direct}}) - \ln(\text{RR}_{\text{indirect}})$ ) will be estimated and  
33 tested. In addition, a comparison-adjusted funnel plot taking into account different  
34 comparisons will be plotted to explore whether there is evidence of small study effect for  
35 the whole network.<sup>36 37</sup>

36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45 Analyses will be performed using STATA version 15.0. A *p* value of less than 0.05 will  
46 be considered as statistically significant, except heterogeneity test where *p* value <0.10 will  
47 be used.

#### 48 49 50 51 **Patient and public involvement**

52  
53  
54 Patients and public will not be involved in this study.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ETHIC and DISSEMINATION

Ethical consideration and ethic committee approval are not required from the nature of systematic review and network meta-analysis. Results of the study will be presented in international meeting. The manuscript will be submitted to peer-reviewed journal.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

BS initiated research question design review methods, and wrote the protocol, KS wrote and registered protocol, SO wrote and registered protocol, TB wrote and commented on protocol, KR wrote and commented on protocol, and AT designed review methods, wrote and commented on protocol.

## REFERENCES

1. Carpentier PH, Maricq HR, Biro C, et al. Prevalence, risk factors, and clinical patterns of chronic venous disorders of lower limbs: a population-based study in France. *Journal of vascular surgery* 2004;40(4):650-9.
2. Beebe-Dimmer JL, Pfeifer JR, Engle JS, et al. The epidemiology of chronic venous insufficiency and varicose veins. *Annals of epidemiology* 2005;15(3):175-84.
3. Ruckley CV. Socioeconomic impact of chronic venous insufficiency and leg ulcers. *Angiology* 1997;48(1):67-9.
4. Kanchanabat B, Stapanavatr W. Venous ultrasonography findings and clinical correlations in 104 Thai patients with chronic venous insufficiency of the legs. *Singapore medical journal* 2018;59(3):155-58.
5. Siribumrungwong B, Noorit P, Wilasrusmee C, et al. Quality of life after great saphenous vein ablation in Thai patients with great saphenous vein reflux. *Asian J Surg* 2017;40(4):295-300.

- 1  
2  
3 6. Gloviczki P, Comerota AJ, Dalsing MC, et al. The care of patients with varicose veins and  
4  
5 associated chronic venous diseases: clinical practice guidelines of the Society for  
6  
7 Vascular Surgery and the American Venous Forum. *Journal of vascular surgery*  
8  
9 2011;53(5 Suppl):2s-48s.  
10  
11
- 12  
13 7. Siribumrungwong B, Noorit P, Wilasrusmee C, et al. A systematic review and meta-  
14  
15 analysis of randomised controlled trials comparing endovenous ablation and surgical  
16  
17 intervention in patients with varicose vein. *European journal of vascular and*  
18  
19 *endovascular surgery : the official journal of the European Society for Vascular*  
20  
21 *Surgery* 2012;44(2):214-23.  
22  
23
- 24  
25 8. Siribumrungwong B, Noorit P, Wilasrusmee C, et al. Cost-utility analysis of great  
26  
27 saphenous vein ablation with radiofrequency, foam and surgery in the emerging  
28  
29 health-care setting of Thailand. *Phlebology* 2016;31(8):573-81.  
30  
31
- 32  
33 9. Vos CG, Unlu C, Bosma J, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of two novel  
34  
35 techniques of nonthermal endovenous ablation of the great saphenous vein. *Journal*  
36  
37 *of vascular surgery Venous and lymphatic disorders* 2017;5(6):880-96.  
38  
39
- 40  
41 10. Disselhoff BC, der Kinderen DJ, Kelder JC, et al. Five-year results of a randomised clinical  
42  
43 trial of endovenous laser ablation of the great saphenous vein with and without  
44  
45 ligation of the saphenofemoral junction. *European journal of vascular and*  
46  
47 *endovascular surgery : the official journal of the European Society for Vascular*  
48  
49 *Surgery* 2011;41(5):685-90.  
50  
51
- 52  
53 11. Theivacumar NS, Darwood R, Gough MJ. Neovascularisation and recurrence 2 years after  
54  
55 varicose vein treatment for sapheno-femoral and great saphenous vein reflux: a  
56  
57 comparison of surgery and endovenous laser ablation. *European journal of vascular*  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 *and endovascular surgery : the official journal of the European Society for Vascular*  
4  
5 *Surgery* 2009;38(2):203-7.  
6  
7
- 8 12. Kheirelseid EAH, Crowe G, Sehgal R, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of  
9  
10 randomized controlled trials evaluating long-term outcomes of endovenous  
11  
12 management of lower extremity varicose veins. *Journal of vascular surgery Venous*  
13  
14 *and lymphatic disorders* 2018;6(2):256-70.  
15  
16
- 17 13. Rass K, Frings N, Glowacki P, et al. Comparable effectiveness of endovenous laser  
18  
19 ablation and high ligation with stripping of the great saphenous vein: Two-year  
20  
21 results of a randomized clinical trial (RELACS study). *Archives of dermatology*  
22  
23 2012;148(1):49-58.  
24  
25  
26
- 27 14. Basela H, Aydina C, Aya Y, et al. Endovenous laser ablation (EVLA) versus high ligation  
28  
29 and stripping (HL/S): Two-years follow up. *Eastern Journal of Medicine* 2012;17(2):83-  
30  
31 87.  
32  
33  
34
- 35 15. Flessenkämper I, Hartmann M, Stenger D, et al. Endovenous laser ablation with and  
36  
37 without high ligation compared with high ligation and stripping in the treatment of  
38  
39 great saphenous varicose veins: Initial results of a multicentre randomized controlled  
40  
41 trial. *Phlebology* 2013;28(1):16-23.  
42  
43  
44
- 45 16. Mozafar M, Atqiaee K, Haghighatkah H, et al. Endovenous laser ablation of the great  
46  
47 saphenous vein versus high ligation: long-term results. *Lasers in medical science*  
48  
49 2014;29(2):765-71.  
50  
51
- 52 17. Shadid N, Ceulen R, Nelemans P, et al. Randomized clinical trial of ultrasound-guided  
53  
54 foam sclerotherapy versus surgery for the incompetent great saphenous vein. *The*  
55  
56 *British journal of surgery* 2012;99(8):1062-70.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
18. Yin H, He H, Wang M, et al. Prospective Randomized Study of Ultrasound-Guided Foam Sclerotherapy Combined with Great Saphenous Vein High Ligation in the Treatment of Severe Lower Extremity Varicosis. *Annals of vascular surgery* 2017;39:256-63.
  19. Venermo M, Saarinen J, Eskelinen E, et al. Randomized clinical trial comparing surgery, endovenous laser ablation and ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy for the treatment of great saphenous varicose veins. *The British journal of surgery* 2016;103(11):1438-44.
  20. Brittenden J, Cotton SC, Elders A, et al. A randomized trial comparing treatments for varicose veins. *The New England journal of medicine* 2014;371(13):1218-27.
  21. Biemans AAM, Kockaert M, Akkersdijk GP, et al. Comparing endovenous laser ablation, foam sclerotherapy, and conventional surgery for great saphenous varicose veins. *Journal of vascular surgery* 2013;58(3):727-34.
  22. Mendes CA, Martins AA, Fukuda JM, et al. Randomized trial of radiofrequency ablation versus conventional surgery for superficial venous insufficiency: If you don't tell, they won't know. *Clinics* 2016;71(11):650-56.
  23. Sydnor M, Mavropoulos J, Slobodnik N, et al. A randomized prospective long-term (>1 year) clinical trial comparing the efficacy and safety of radiofrequency ablation to 980 nm laser ablation of the great saphenous vein. *Phlebology* 2017;32(6):415-24.
  24. Bozoglan O, Mese B, Eroglu E, et al. Comparison of Endovenous Laser and Radiofrequency Ablation in Treating Varicose Veins in the Same Patient. *Vascular and endovascular surgery* 2016;50(1):47-51.
  25. Mese B, Bozoglan O, Eroglu E, et al. A Comparison of 1,470-nm Endovenous Laser Ablation and Radiofrequency Ablation in the Treatment of Great Saphenous Veins 10 mm or More in Size. *Annals of vascular surgery* 2015;29(7):1368-72.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
26. Nordon IM, Hinchliffe RJ, Brar R, et al. A prospective double-blind randomized controlled trial of radiofrequency versus laser treatment of the great saphenous vein in patients with varicose veins. *Annals of surgery* 2011;254(6):876-81.
  27. Permsuwan U, Guntawongwan K, Buddhawongsa P. Handling time in economic evaluation studies. *Journal of the Medical Association of Thailand = Chotmaihet thangphaet* 2014;97 Suppl 5:S50-8.
  28. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2009;339:b2700.
  29. Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, et al. The PRISMA extension statement for reporting of systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses of health care interventions: checklist and explanations. *Annals of internal medicine* 2015;162(11):777-84.
  30. Cavallini A. Endovenous laser treatment of saphenous veins: is there clinical difference using different endovenous laser wavelenghts? *International angiology : a journal of the International Union of Angiology* 2015;34(1):1-8.
  31. Galanopoulos G, Lambidis C. Minimally invasive treatment of varicose veins: Endovenous laser ablation (EVLA). *International journal of surgery (London, England)* 2012;10(3):134-9.
  32. van Eekeren RR, Boersma D, de Vries JP, et al. Update of endovenous treatment modalities for insufficient saphenous veins--a review of literature. *Seminars in vascular surgery* 2014;27(2):118-36.
  33. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2011;343:d5928.

1  
2  
3 34. Puhan MA, Schunemann HJ, Murad MH, et al. A GRADE Working Group approach for  
4 rating the quality of treatment effect estimates from network meta-analysis. *BMJ*  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

(*Clinical research ed*) 2014;349:g5630.

35. Hozo SP, Djulbegovic B, Hozo I. Estimating the mean and variance from the median, range, and the size of a sample. *BMC medical research methodology* 2005;5:13.

36. White IR. Network meta-analysis. *Stata Journal* 2015;15(4):951-85.

37. Chaimani A, Salanti G. Using network meta-analysis to evaluate the existence of small-study effects in a network of interventions. *Research synthesis methods* 2012;3(2):161-76.

# Reporting checklist for protocol of a systematic review.

Based on the PRISMA-P guidelines.

## Instructions to authors

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the PRISMA-P reporting guidelines, and cite them as:

Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev.* 2015;4(1):1.

		Reporting Item	Page Number
Identification	<a href="#">#1a</a>	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	<a href="#">#1b</a>	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	1
	<a href="#">#2</a>	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	4
Contact	<a href="#">#3a</a>	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	1-2
Contribution	<a href="#">#3b</a>	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	11
	<a href="#">#4</a>	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important	-

		protocol amendments	
1			
2	Sources	<a href="#">#5a</a> Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	2
3			
4	Sponsor	<a href="#">#5b</a> Provide name for the review funder and / or sponsor	2
5			
6	Role of sponsor or	<a href="#">#5c</a> Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and / or institution(s),	-
7	funder	if any, in developing the protocol	
8			
9	Rationale	<a href="#">#6</a> Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is	4-6
10		already known	
11			
12	Objectives	<a href="#">#7</a> Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will	6
13		address with reference to participants, interventions,	
14		comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	
15			
16	Eligibility criteria	<a href="#">#8</a> Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study	7
17		design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such	
18		as years considered, language, publication status) to be used	
19		as criteria for eligibility for the review	
20			
21	Information	<a href="#">#9</a> Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic	6
22	sources	databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other	
23		grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	
24			
25	Search strategy	<a href="#">#10</a> Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one	6-7
26		electronic database, including planned limits, such that it	
27		could be repeated	
28			
29	Study records -	<a href="#">#11a</a> Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage	7-8
30	data management	records and data throughout the review	
31			
32	Study records -	<a href="#">#11b</a> State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such	7
33	selection process	as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the	
34		review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-	
35		analysis)	
36			
37	Study records -	<a href="#">#11c</a> Describe planned method of extracting data from reports	8
38	data collection	(such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate),	
39	process	any processes for obtaining and confirming data from	
40		investigators	
41			
42	Data items	<a href="#">#12</a> List and define all variables for which data will be sought	8
43		(such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data	
44		assumptions and simplifications	
45			
46			
47			
48			
49			
50			
51			
52			
53			
54			
55			
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			

1	Outcomes and	<a href="#">#13</a>	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought,	8
2	prioritization		including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with	
3			rationale	
4				
5				
6	Risk of bias in	<a href="#">#14</a>	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of	8-9
7	individual studies		individual studies, including whether this will be done at the	
8			outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will	
9			be used in data synthesis	
10				
11				
12				
13	Data synthesis	<a href="#">#15a</a>	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively	9
14			synthesised	
15				
16				
17		<a href="#">#15b</a>	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe	9-10
18			planned summary measures, methods of handling data and	
19			methods of combining data from studies, including any	
20			planned exploration of consistency (such as I <sup>2</sup> , Kendall's $\tau$ )	
21				
22				
23				
24		<a href="#">#15c</a>	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as	9-10
25			sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	
26				
27		<a href="#">#15d</a>	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type	9-10
28			of summary planned	
29				
30				
31	Meta-bias(es)	<a href="#">#16</a>	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as	9-10
32			publication bias across studies, selective reporting within	
33			studies)	
34				
35				
36				
37	Confidence in	<a href="#">#17</a>	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be	9
38	cumulative		assessed (such as GRADE)	
39	evidence			
40				
41				

42 The PRISMA-P checklist is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License  
 43 CC-BY 4.0. This checklist can be completed online using <https://www.goodreports.org/>, a tool made  
 44 by the [EQUATOR Network](#) in collaboration with [Penelope.ai](#)  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60