Regarding “The Value of Rotational Venography Versus Anterior–Posterior Venography in 100 Consecutive IVC Filter Retrievals”

Zhongzhi Jia¹ · Shaoqin Li¹ · Guomin Jiang¹

Received: 19 November 2015 / Accepted: 6 December 2015 / Published online: 24 December 2015

© Springer Science+Business Media New York and the Cardiovascular and Interventional Radiological Society of Europe (CIRSE) 2015

To the Editor,

We read with great interest the recent article by Kiefer et al. [1]. They raised an important issue on the value of rotational venography versus anterior–posterior (AP) venography. The authors concluded rotational venograms allow for more accurate detection of tip-embedded IVC filters compared to AP views alone. However, the authors did not define the IVC filter tip-embedded, and we would like to elaborate on the IVC filter tip-embedded.

It is known that the tilt was defined as the angulation between the long axes of the filter and the vena cava [2], and the tip-embedded was defined as filter tip adherent to the vessel wall as a result of endothelialization and fibrin formation [3], and there is a close relationship between of them. The diagnosis of tip-embedded dependent on CT scan, and the venography cannot accurate diagnosis of tip-embedded.

The tip-embedded was dependent on filter tilt and filter dwell time (usually more than 15 days). However, the shortest dwell time of IVC filter in this study was 11 days, and we do not think this short dwelling time will made the tip-embedded. Although most of the patients in this study were proved with tip-embedded, we believe the conclusion

will be more appropriately be “rotational venograms allow for more accurate detection of IVC filters tilt compared to AP views alone” for many option filters’ dwell time are less than half month, such as OptEase filter and Aegisy filter, and most patients in such condition will be filter tilt other than tip-embedded.

Acknowledgments No funding was obtained for this study.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Conflict of interest None.

References

1. Kiefer RM, Pandey N, Trerotola SO, et al. The value of rotational venography versus anterior–posterior venography in 100 consecutive IVC filter retrievals. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol*. 2015;. doi:10.1007/s00270-015-1183-3.
2. Zhu X, Tam MD, Bartholomew J, et al. Retrievability and device-related complications of the G2 filter: a retrospective study of 139 filter retrievals. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. 2011;22:806–12.
3. de Gregorio MA, Gamboa P, Gimeno MJ, et al. The Günther Tulip retrievable filter: prolonged temporary filtration by repositioning within the inferior vena cava. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. 2003;14:1259–65.

✉ Guomin Jiang
747094035@qq.com

¹ Department of Interventional Radiology, No. 2 People’s Hospital of Changzhou, Nanjing Medical University, Xing long road 29#, Chang zhou 213003, Jiangsu province, China