Do we still need selective ovarian venography in diagnosis of pelvic venous disease in 2021?
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ABSTRACT

Pelvic venous disease (PeVD) is an overlooked condition that can affect daily life of patients. Although medical history and physical examination may lead to suspicion of PeVD, accurate imaging is important for establishing the diagnosis with high certainty. Despite the increasing popularity of magnetic resonance imaging and Duplex ultrasound as non-invasive imaging methods, selective venography remains the gold-standard imaging method to establish the diagnosis of PeVD. In addition, venography provides an opportunity for treatment in a single procedure. In this chapter, we define the techniques for selective ovarian venography and discuss its clinical importance in diagnosis of PeVD.
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Pelvic venous disease (PeVD) is one of a wide array of diseases in the differential diagnosis of chronic pelvic pain. Due to the broad nature of chronic pelvic pain, it is often a challenge to identify the correct underlying disease. If the cause of pelvic pain is PeVD, patients are usually treated with minimally invasive interventions. Although medical history and physical examination may lead to suspicion of PeVD, accurate imaging is important for establishing the diagnosis with high certainty. Additionally, imaging aids us in selecting the most optimal treatment options and approach.

Non-invasive imaging methods such as Duplex ultrasound (DUS), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and computed tomography (CT) are recommended as the first-line imaging tools in radiological examination. These imaging methods are also used to diagnose additional pelvic pathologies associated with PeVD. Intravascular ultrasound (IVUS) and conventional venography as invasive imaging methods are often utilized in patients scheduled for an intervention. The need for IVUS to establish the diagnosis of PeVD is very rare. It is mostly applied to diagnose compressive syndromes.[1] Despite the increasing popularity of MRI and DUS, catheter-directed venography is still considered the gold-standard diagnostic test for the evaluation of PeVD.[1-6] Its major disadvantage is that it is an invasive procedure with potential risks in terms of ionizing radiation exposure, intravenous iodinated contrast, and vascular complications. An advantage is the possibility to use catheter-directed venography as an opportunity for diagnostic and therapeutic purposes in a single procedure.[7] However, we should keep in mind that without three-dimensional pre-
interventional imaging of the abdomen and pelvis, we are not informed about any specific anatomical variations in the patient.

TECHNIQUE

Selective catheter-directed venography is performed percutaneously via the femoral, internal jugular or cubital vein by using an intravenous contrast medium. The study can be done under local anesthesia or/and conscious sedation. After vascular access is provided with placement of an access sheath using a direct venous puncture, the study is performed on a tilt table with the option of using fluoroscopy in various positions to obtain more dynamic flow information and measurements from the venous collection and drainage system while, if needed, changing patient position.[8,9] Selective catheterization of the ovarian and internal iliac veins is performed routinely using different types of 4F to 5F catheters, such as the Simmons I or II, Multipurpose or Cobra II, usually over hydrophilic guidewires (regular and/or stiff).[3,9] Selective catheterization allows for the use of less intravenous contrast medium than non-selective catheterization. In addition, using vertebral bony landmarks not only facilitates catheterization, but also allows us to perform the procedure in less fluoroscopy time.[10] In a study, the lowest renal vein level was found to correspond to L1 vertebral body in 17.3%, L1-2 disc space in 36.5%, L2 vertebral body in 34.6%, L2-3 disc space in 7.7%, and L3 vertebral body in 3.8%.[10] The left gonadal vein (GV) drains into the left renal vein (Figure 1), whereas the right drains directly into the inferior vena cava (IVC) (Figure 2). The mean distance the left GV from the edge of the IVC orifice is 35 mm.[11] Its orifice was found within the first 30 mm to the left of spine in all cases.[9] The mean distance of insertion of the right GV below the ostium of the renal vein is found 18 mm, and 84% of GV were within 25 mm below the renal vein ostium.[11] It usually arises from the lateral or anterolateral wall of the IVC and can rarely originate from the right renal vein (RRV).[9] After the selective catheterization, diagnostic enhancing maneuvers such as Valsalva or elevating the head of the table can be often performed to reveal pathological reflux.[12,13] The patient should be tilted into the semi-erect position before images are taken. The same the procedure is, then, repeated for the right side.[6] The basic protocol begins with the catheterization of the left renal vein, with simultaneous

Figure 1. Catheterization of the left renal vein with visualization of an (incompetent) proximal left ovarian vein.

Figure 2. Catheterization of the right ovarian vein with after contrast injection visualization of the (dilated) right ovarian vein. Distally, we can see coils in the left and right internal iliac veins.
pressure gradient measurements to investigate for the nutcracker syndrome. The evidence for a true gradient differential over the renal vein is scarce, and it is technically difficult to execute right. However, a reno-caval pressure gradient of ≥3 mmHg is defined as renal venous hypertension. Then, the catheter is moved to the left iliac vein to investigate ilio-caval pressure gradient measurement for the May-Thurner syndrome. Subsequently, GVs and, finally, internal iliac veins, are investigated. The Valsalva maneuver may provide easy evaluation of the venous insufficiency and pelvic escape point determination during internal iliac vein venography. Left ovarian vein insufficiency has been suggested to be assessed in three reflux grades by Hiromura et al. Grade I refers to the retrograde flow confined in the left ovarian vein, not reaching to the paraartereine veins; Grade II to the retrograde flow advancing into the ipsilateral paraartereine veins; and Grade III to the retrograde flow crossing the midline and reaching the contralateral periuterine venous plexus or further (Figures 3-5).

Four anatomic zones of the abdomen and pelvis are defined to explain the symptoms, signs, and pathophysiological manifestations of PeVD according to a recently published classification, namely the "symptoms-varices-pathophysiology (SVP) classification system, issued by the American Vein & Lymphatic Society (AVLS) International Working Group. Venography provides important information about venous anatomy, collateral venous circulation, diameter of ovarian and pelvic veins, venous incompetence, venous congestion, and retrograde filling. It can also show the first three zones directly. Therefore, The SVP classification system requires a complete assessment of the pelvic venous anatomy and flow patterns, which mandates venography.

The diagnostic criteria for pelvic congestion syndrome with venography examination are defined in the International Union of Phlebology/L’Union Internationale de Phlébologie (UIP) consensus document, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Criteria for pelvic congestion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ovarian vein diameter</th>
<th>&gt;6 mm*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contrast retention</td>
<td>&gt;20 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion of pelvic venous plexus and/or opacification of the ipsilateral/contralateral internal iliac vein</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filling of vulvovaginal and thigh varicosities</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As a side note, it remains important to be careful while deciding on a treatment indication on imaging, in particular vein diameter, alone.

Figure 3. Image showing the grades of left ovarian vein insufficiency.

IVC: Inferior vena cava; LK: Left kidney; U: Uterus; O: ovary.
Ovarian vein diameter is considered normal, if it is measured within 1 to 4 mm; moderate, 5 to 8 mm; and severe, ≥8 mm. In a study, the diameter of left ovarian vein in patients with PeVD was significantly larger in symptomatic individuals, compared to healthy individuals. In addition, the positive predictive value of GV insufficiency for a left ovarian vein diameter of 5 mm was found to be 71% and of 6 mm was found to be 83%. Although, ovarian vein diameter is a diagnostic criteria in the UIP consensus document, it has been shown to be a poor predictor of GV reflux. The aforementioned study showed a sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy of a diagnosis according to this 8-mm cut-off value of 53%, 60%, and 56%, respectively. Moreover, in an another study, PeVD symptoms did not depend on the degree of expansion of the pelvic veins. Although the incidence of PeVH increased with the increased vein diameters in the recent SVP classification, the authors abstained from specifying the exact vessel diameter.

In conclusion, venography is ideally performed for confirmation of diagnosis, further evaluation of the venous anatomy and collateral venous circulation, and decision making to treat and where to treat. Although non-invasive imaging modalities provide important information about pelvic vascular and non-vascular structures, in particular anatomy, selective venography of ovarian and internal iliac veins for diagnosis of pelvic venous pathologies continues to remain the gold-standard imaging method to establish the diagnosis. Moreover, venography provides an opportunity for treatment in a single procedure. The question remains, what patients benefit the most from, a non-invasive analysis first or a (potentially diagnostic) direct intervention.
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