
We would like to share some concerns regarding the information on CHIVA included in the recently published guidelines on the management of chronic venous disease.\(^1\)

First, the objective of CHIVA is erroneously described as “to obtain a well drained superficial venous system with low pressure and high flow”, when it should say: “to suppress the overloading flow/pressure, respecting the outflow that drains the tissues”.

Furthermore, unfortunately the authors of the guidelines did not include the Cochrane Review about CHIVA published in 2013,\(^2\) which included more randomized controlled trials (RCTs), using a more sensitive search, with a complete evaluation of the evidence. As a result, we do not agree with the following statements about CHIVA included in the guidelines: the bias concerning the randomization in one of the RCTs included; the type of anesthesia as a confounder for the evaluation of the post-operative side effects; and the lack of a definition of recurrence in the studies included. None of these arguments is consistent.

Finally, data from three RCTs should give a level of evidence of ‘A’; however, the guidelines gave CHIVA a level of evidence of ‘B’. Did the authors of the guidelines really think that the ASVAL technique, based on cohort and no controlled studies, has the same level and a better class of evidence than CHIVA?

The inaccurate, missing, and contradictory data require an explanation and, if deemed appropriate, a correction.
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