

A comparison between Caucasian and Asian superficial venous anatomy and reflux pattern – Implications for potential precision endovenous ablation therapy

INTRODUCTION

- Chronic venous insufficiency (CVI) is a common condition and the prevalence increases with age.
- Radiofrequency ablation (RFA) or endovenous laser ablation (EVLA) are first-line treatment for truncal reflux¹ but are commonly associated with discomfort and risk of skin and nerve damage².
- Non-thermal, non-tumescent (NTNT) technologies have been introduced to improve the patient experience^{3,4}. The treatment of choice depends on individuals' venous anatomical characteristics and superficial reflux patterns.
- However, most device-related venous outcome data were derived from Caucasian cohorts and may not extrapolate to other ethnicities.

OBJECTIVES

To investigate possible differences between Caucasians and Asians with regards to their pre-operative venous reflux patterns and truncal vein characteristics.

METHODS

- Prospective study of patients with CVI in Changi General Hospital (Asian cohort) and a private practice in Bellevue, Washington, USA (Caucasian cohort).
- Demographic, clinical and vein characteristics from duplex ultrasound were collected.
- These characteristics were compared between patients from the 2 sites using Mann-Whitney U test, Chi-square or Fisher's exact test, as appropriate, using legs as the unit of analysis.

RESULTS

Table 1: Patient demographics

Variable	Singapore (n = 127)	US (n = 137)	P
Age, median (range)	64 (18 – 88)	51 (23 – 92)	<0.01
Male gender, n (%)	64 (50.4)	32 (23.4)	<0.01
Race, n (%)			
Singapore Asians			
Chinese	82 (64.6)	0	
Malays	33 (26.0)	0	
Indians	10 (7.9)	0	
US Asians	0	10 (7.3)	
Eurasian	2 (1.6)	0	
Caucasian	0	120 (87.6)	
Hspanic	0	6 (4.4)	
Black	0	1 (0.7)	
Body mass index, median (range)	26.0 (16.8 – 41.4)	26.6 (17.5 – 48.5)	0.41

Table 2: Presentation of venous disease

Variable	Singapore (n = 200 legs)	US (n = 200 legs)	p
Side, n (%)			
Left	99 (49.5)	103 (51.5)	0.76
Right	101 (50.5)	97	
CEAP, n (%)			
1-2	62 (31.0)	109 (54.5)	<0.01
3	78 (39.0)	56 (28.0)	
4a	28 (19.5)	15 (7.5)	
4b	13 (6.5)	9 (4.5)	
5-6	8 (4.0)	11 (5.5)	
Venous Clinical Severity Score (VCSS), median (range)	8 (3-22)	6 (1-22)	<0.01

CEAP: Clinical, aetiological, anatomical and pathophysiological elements

Table 3: Great saphenous vein (GSV) diameter and location comparison

Variable	Singapore (n=200 legs)	US (n= 200 legs)	P
Vein sizes (mm), median (range)			
Proximal calf	3.0 (1.0-7.0)	4.6 (0-14.0)	<0.01
Mid-calf	2.55 (1.0-7.0)	3.35 (1.4-13.3)	<0.01
Knee	3.0 (1.0-8.0)	4.75 (0-15.7)	<0.01
Mid-thigh	3.0 (1.0-16.0)	5.8 (1.8-19.5)	<0.01
Proximal thigh	5.0 (1.0-15.0)	6.5 (2.7-19.0)	<0.01
GSV reflux, n (%)	197 (98.5)	18.1 (90.5)	<0.01
Start site, n (%)			<0.01
Ankle	1 (0.5)	1 (0.6)	
Mid-calf	2 (1.0)	23 (12.7)	
Knee	11 (5.6)	7 (3.9)	
SFJ	171 (86.8)	132 (72.9)	
Thigh	12 (6.1)	13 (7.2)	
Pelvic	0	5 (2.8)	
End site, n (%)			<0.01
Ankle	184 (93.4)	84 (46.4)	
Mid-calf	9 (4.6)	58 (32.0)	
Knee	3 (1.5)	12 (6.6)	
Thigh	1 (0.5)	27 (14.9)	
Out of fascia (OOF), n (%)	61 (30.5)	47 (23.5)	0.32
Site, n (%)			<0.01
Ankle	6 (9.8)	0	
Mid-calf	17 (27.9)	11 (23.4)	
Knee	15 (24.6)	4 (8.5)	
Thigh	23 (37.7)	32 (68.1)	

- Patients from Singapore tended to present with **more severe venous disease** and **worse symptoms on presentation** compared to their Caucasian counterparts.
- Vein diameters were larger in the US cohort compared to the Singaporean cohort (median 5.7 mm vs. 2.9 mm, p<0.01).
- There was a correlation between vein size and VCSS scores in both groups, suggesting a relationship between large thigh GSV diameter and advanced venous symptoms.

CONCLUSION

- The predominantly Asian cohort from Singapore had smaller diameter truncal veins, longer segments of truncal vein reflux and presented later with more advanced CVI compared to their American counterparts.
- Having such information could potentially help clinicians select a more suitable type of endovenous treatment for the individual.
- Future randomized trials investigating venous device efficacy should include Asian patients to compare outcomes.

References:

- Van *et al.* Jvasc Surg. 2009;49:230-239
- 2.2. Lane, *et al.* Phlebology. 2017;32:89-98
3. Morrison *et al.* J Vasc Surg. 2015;61:985-994
4. Tang *et al.* Phlebology. 2017;32:6-12