1 Application of 4D flow MRI for exploring the anatomical and haemodynamic

2 characteristics o	of pelvic veins and their correlation
---------------------	---------------------------------------

- 3 Author
- 4 Chengli Nie^{1#} 390988893@qq.com
- 5 Li Tao^{1#} tlhunter@163.com
- 6 Jiangwei Chen¹ chenjiangwei@163.com
- 7 Jianghu Yang¹ 1983801360@qq.com
- 8 Wen Huang^{1*} 382269637@qq.com
- 9 [#]: Chengli Nie and Li Tao contributed equally.
- 10 *: Correspondence author
- 11 Affiliation
- 12 1: The First Affiliated Hospital of Chongqing Medical University
- 13 Abstract:

Objective: There is currently a lack of studies evaluating the anatomy and haemodynamics of the pelvic veins in clinical practice. Four-dimensional flow magnetic resonance imaging (4D flow MRI) can simultaneously obtain information on vascular anatomy and haemodynamics. The goal of this study was to use 4D flow MRI to explore the anatomical and haemodynamic characteristics of pelvic veins and their correlations in an asymptomatic population.

20 Methods: Four-dimensional flow MRI was used to measure anatomical 21 parameters, including the pelvic vein area, common iliac vein-inferior vena cava angle, 22 iliac vein tortuosity, and common iliac vein stenosis rate, and haemodynamic

parameters, including the pelvic venous blood flow, average blood flow velocity, and
external iliac vein-inferior vena cava pressure difference, in 30 asymptomatic
volunteers. The correlation between iliac vein anatomy and haemodynamics was
analysed.

27 Results: There were correlations between the anatomical parameters of the iliac 28 vein and the haemodynamic parameters. A larger iliac vein area was correlated with a 29 higher blood flow. A greater iliac vein stenosis rate was correlated with a lower blood 30 flow, lower mean velocity of the external iliac vein, and higher external iliac 31 vein-inferior vena cava pressure difference. A greater common iliac vein-inferior vena 32 cava angle was associated with a lower iliac vein flow velocity and a higher external 33 iliac vein-inferior vena cava pressure difference. Finally, a greater the iliac vein 34 tortuosity was correlated with a lower iliac vein velocity and higher external iliac 35 vein-inferior vena cava pressure difference. There were differences in the anatomical 36 and haemodynamic parameters of the bilateral common iliac vein and external iliac 37 vein. The left pelvic vein common iliac-inferior vena cava angle, iliac vein tortuosity 38 and iliac vein stenosis rate were higher than those of the right side. The flow and 39 average velocity of the left common iliac vein and the left external iliac vein were lower 40 than those of the right, and the pressure of the left external iliac vein was higher than 41 that of the right.

42 Conclusion: The anatomical structure of the pelvic vein, including the iliac vein
43 area, common iliac vein-inferior vena cava angle, iliac vein tortuosity, and iliac vein
44 stenosis rate, are important factors that affect haemodynamic changes in the pelvic vein.

45	There are correlations between parameters related to the anatomical structures and
46	haemodynamic changes of the pelvic veins. Differences in the anatomy and
47	haemodynamics of the bilateral pelvic veins may be one reason why the left extremity
48	is more prone to chronic venous disease (CVD)-related symptoms.
49	Key words: Pelvic veins, Anatomic, Haemodynamics, Asymptomatic population,

- 50 Four-dimensional flow magnetic resonance imaging
- 51 **1. Introduction**

52 Chronic venous disease (CVD) of the lower extremities is a common clinical syndrome whose incidence increases with age. Patients often present with symptoms 53 such as lower extremity heaviness, lethargy and swelling and signs such as lower 54 55 extremity varicose veins, lower extremity oedema, skin pigmentation, and venous 56 ulcers. The reason for these symptoms is the development of lower extremity venous 57 stasis caused by various factors, including obstructive factors such as pulmonary 58 hypertension, heart failure, Budd-Chiari syndrome and iliac vein stenosis and 59 regurgitation factors such as tricuspid regurgitation and lower extremity venous valve 60 insufficiency. Clinical studies have found that iliac vein stenosis is an important factor 61 leading to venous reflux disorders in the lower extremities, but it is not clear how it 62 leads to changes in iliac vein haemodynamics. Iliac vein stenosis can be identified and 63 treated in clinical practice, but sometimes these treatments cannot relieve the symptoms of lower extremity venous insufficiency. Therefore, it is clinically important to 64 65 understand the characteristics of pelvic vein haemodynamics.

66	4D flow MRI can simultaneously obtain vascular anatomy and haemodynamic
67	information and dynamically display haemodynamic changes, including blood flow
68	velocity, blood flow shear force, and kinetic energy. It can also visualise the direction
69	and state of blood flow in the form of flow diagrams and trace diagrams and aid in
70	quantitatively and qualitatively analysing blood vessels ¹ , which can help in
71	investigating the causes of vascular disease and the factors affecting disease
72	progression. In addition, by excluding contrast enhancement from 4D flow MRI
73	analysis, its interference on blood flow is excluded, resulting in a more realistic
74	reflection of the haemodynamic state of the body.
75	We used 4D flow MRI for the first time to investigate the haemodynamic

75 we used 4D now MRI for the first time to investigate the naemodynamic 76 characteristics of the iliac veins in young asymptomatic people. We intend to study 77 baseline pelvic vein anatomy and haemodynamics data and provide a basis for further 78 research on the pathogenesis of CVD of the lower extremities.

79 **2. Method**

80 2.1 Study subjects

This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of our hospital. A homemade questionnaire was distributed to young volunteers from September 2022 to March 2023 to determine whether they have symptoms related to chronic venous insufficiency of the lower extremity and to determine whether the lower extremities had signs of oedema, varicose veins, skin pigmentation and/or venous ulcers by physical examination. Subjects were recruited according to the results of the questionnaire and physical examination according to the following inclusion criteria:(1) no

88	vascular-related symptoms (swelling, oedema, hyperpigmentation and venous ulcers)
89	or confirmed vascular disease (ulcers varicose, deep vein thrombosis,
90	thrombophlebitis); (2) body mass index (BMI)<28kg/m ² ; (3) no vein-related pressure
91	or drug treatment; (4) no contraindications related to MRI scanning. Four-dimensional
92	flow MRI examinations were performed after obtaining informed consent from the
93	included subjects. The exclusion criteria were congenital heart valve insufficiency,
94	anatomic abnormalities of the inferior vena cava and iliac vein, a venous
95	thromboembolism (VTE)-related family history, and lateral branch formation. The
96	demographic and medical records of the volunteers were collected, and their initial
97	clinical status was assessed according to the VCSS and Villalta scores.

98 2.2 Anatomical and haemodynamic parameters

99 Anatomical images were obtained with an MR device (Ingenia DNA 3.0T, Philips, 100 The Netherlands) using the Qflow BH sequence during end-expiratory breath-hold 101 with the patient in the supine position at standard coronal and sagittal orientations, 102 starting 1 cm above the iliac vein bifurcation (slice thickness 8 mm). QFLOW analysis 103 software was used to initially measure the inferior vena cava blood flow velocity Vc, and the velocity encoding (VENC) value was calculated as $Vc^*(1 \pm 20\%)$. 104 105 Haemodynamic information from the inferior vena cava, bilateral common iliac veins 106 and proximal external iliac veins for 1 cardiac cycle was acquired using the 107 4D-FLOW-PC sequence in the axial orientation. After the original sequence scan was 108 completed, two sets of data, the modular (M) image and the phase contrast MR 109 angiography (PCA) image, were automatically generated. The PCA image was removed, and the M image of the first group and the reconstructed phase (P) image in
the right-left (RL), foot-head (FH), and anterior-posterior (AP) directions were used for
postprocessing analysis.

113 2.3 Anatomical parameters: vessel area, stenosis rate, common iliac vein-inferior

114 vena cava angle, and tortuosity

To determine the vessel area, vessel regions of interest (ROIs) were delineated at the distal end of the inferior vena cava, the proximal end of the bilateral common iliac vein (wherein the proximal end of the left common iliac artery is the distal end of the right common iliac artery crossing the left common iliac vein), and the proximal vessel area of bilateral external iliac vein.

Stenosis rate: We used the area stenosis rate of the vessel in the axial orientation to calculate the vessel stenosis rate. In the axial plane, we measured the areas where the vessel was narrowest (Smin) and widest (Smax) at the distal end of the common iliac vein, attempting to avoid the bifurcation of the common iliac vein and the site where it converges into the inferior vena cava when selecting the largest plane. Then, the vascular stenosis rate was calculated as $\left(1 - \frac{S_{min}}{S_{max}}\right) \times 100\%$.

Common iliac vein-inferior vena cava angle: Using the postprocessed coronal 4D flow MR images, the angle between the central line of the bilateral common iliac vein and the extension line of the inferior vena cava was measured as the iliac-inferior vena cava angle (Figure 1).



130

- 131 Figure1: The blue arrow is the IVC, the white arrow is the LCIV, the green arrow is the RCIV. The
- angles α and β are the angles of the extension lines of the inferior vena cava and central line of
- 133 right and left common iliac vein.
- 134 Tortuosity: The length L between the two ends of the iliac vein and the actual vessel
- length H were measured and used to define the tortuosity as S=H/L*100% (Figure 2).



136

- 137 Figure2: Length of iliac vein center line is L and maximum chord height is H
- 138 2.4 Haemodynamic parameters: flow, velocity, pressure difference

139 After the vascular ROIs were delineated on cvi42 from Circle Cardiovascular

- 140 Imaging (Version 5.14, Calgary, Canada), the following parameters were calculated;
- 141 blood flow and average flow velocity at the distal end of the inferior vena cava, the
- 142 proximal ends of the bilateral common iliac veins (wherein the proximal end of the left
- 143 common iliac artery is the distal end of the right common iliac artery crossing the left

144	common iliac vein), and the proximal vessel of bilateral external iliac vein; the flow
145	difference between the bilateral common iliac vein and the external iliac vein; and the
146	pressure difference between the proximal end of the bilateral external iliac vein and the
147	distal end of the inferior vena cava. The inferior vena cava plane was selected 2-3 cm
148	away from the site where the bilateral common iliac converges into the inferior vena
149	cava to reduce the impact of confluent blood flow on the measurement.

150 **3. Data analysis**

All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS version 23.0 statistical package (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA). Continuous variables are reported as mean ± standard deviation (SD) or median (quartile) and categorical variables as frequency or percentage of events. The bivariate Spearman's test was used for correlation analysis. The relationships among the common iliac vein-inferior vena cava angle, stenosis rate, tortuosity, vessel area and iliac vein flow, velocity and pressure difference were analysed. A P value <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

158 **4. Results**

159 4.1 Volunteers' characteristics

Thirty-three people were initially recruited to undergo 4D flow MRI scans, 3 of whom were excluded: 1 person failed the scan due to an excessively elevated heart rate (>110 beats/min), 1 person could not complete the scan due to large heart rate fluctuations, and 1 person could not fully display the bilateral iliac veins after reconstruction. A total of 30 people (60 limbs) were included in the study. The mean age of all volunteers was 24 years, the female to male ratio was 1:1, and the average

166 BMI was 21.71 ± 2.69 kg/m²(as shown in Table I).

Characteristic	Median (range) or % (No.)
Age, years	24 (24~26)
Female gender	15 (30)
Height,cm	166.83±7.85
Weight,kg	60.88±11.23
BMI,kg/m2	21.71±2.69

167 Table I. Volunteer characteristics(n=30)

168 4.2 The median (interquartile range) of the Villalta score for all lower extremities

169 was 0 (0-0), and the median venous clinical severity score (VCSS) was 0 (Figure 3).







172 4.3 Anatomical parameters

173 All limbs anatomical parameters are shown in Table II.

Vessel area: The median area of the inferior vena cava in all volunteers was 211.50

- 175 $(170.00 \sim 307.00) \text{ mm}^2$, and the areas of the left common iliac and external iliac veins
- 176 were larger than those of the opposite side, but the difference was not statistically

177 significant.

178	Stenosis rate: The average stenosis rate of the left iliac vein was significantly
179	higher than that of the right side. The median stenosis rate of all limbs was 23.35%
180	(15.73%-30.29%); the average stenosis rate was $28.13%(12.87%-57.74%)$ on the left
181	side and 17.12% \pm 7.33% on the right side (P<0.001) .
182	Common iliac vein-inferior vena cava angle and tortuosity: The left iliac
183	vein-inferior vena cava angle and tortuosity were greater than those of the right. The
184	average iliac-vena cava angle of all limbs was 36.37±21.88°; on the left and right sides,
185	the average angles were 51.67 $\pm17.75^\circ$ and 17.07 $\pm6.30^\circ~(P{<}0.001)~$, respectively. The
186	median tortuosity of all limbs was 14.94% (10.07%~19.70%) ; the average tortuosity
187	of the left limb was 19.41%±3.32%, and that of the right limb was 10.94%±2.78%,
188	(P<0.001).

189	Table II. Anatomical	parameters of all limbs(n=60)	
-----	----------------------	-------------------------------	--

	Average(n		
Anatomical parameters	Left	Right	P value
CIV area(mm2)	154.30±60.39	135.10±52.43	0.194
EIV area (mm2)	116.63±39.41	108.47±39.73	0.427
Stenosis rate (%)	28.13% (12.87%~57.74%)	17.12%±7.33%	< 0.001
CIV-IVC angle (°)	51.67±17.75°	17.07±6.30°	< 0.001
Iliac vein tortuosity (%) 19.41%±3.32%	10.94%±2.78%	< 0.001

190 CIV, Common iliac vein; EIV, external iliac vein; IVC , inferior vena cava

191 Data presented as median (range) or mean±standard deviation. A P value <0.05 was

192 considered statistically significant.

193 4.4 Haemodynamic parameters

All limbs haemodynamic parameters are shown in Table III.

195	Flow velocity: We found that the average flow velocity of the left common iliac
196	and external iliac veins was lower than that of the contralateral side. The average flow
197	velocity of the inferior vena cava in all volunteers was 12.71±3.15 cm/s. The average
198	flow velocity of the common iliac vein of all limbs was 10.84 ± 3.94 cm/s, among which
199	that of the left common iliac was 9.27±4.43 cm/s, and that of the right common iliac
200	was 12.41±3.83 cm/s (P=0.001<0.01) . The average flow velocity of external iliac vein
201	of all limbs was 8.69±2.37 cm/s, among which the average velocity of the left iliac was
202	7.43 \pm 1.65 cm/s, and the average velocity of the right iliac was 9.94 \pm 2.34 cm/s
203	(P<0.001).

Flow: The blood flow of the left common iliac and external iliac veins was lower than that of the opposite side. The mean blood flow of inferior vena cava of all volunteers was 14.53±4.74 ml/s. The mean blood flow of common iliac vein across all volunteers and that of the left and right common iliac veins were 7.50±3.12 ml/s, 6.70±2.88 ml/s, and 8.31±3.19 ml/s (P=0.045<0.05). For all limbs, the mean blood flow of external iliac vein was 5.60±1.96 ml/s, that of left external iliac was 5.08±1.85 ml/s, and that of right external iliac was 6.11±1.96 ml/s.

Flow difference: The average common iliac vein-external iliac vein flow difference of all limbs was 1.66 ($0.675 \sim 3.250$ ml/s), while the flow differences between the left and right common iliac vein and the external iliac vein were 1.62 ± 1.68 ml/s, and 2.19 ± 2.69 ml/s(P=0.36>0.05), respectively. The right iliac vein flow difference was

higher than that of the left iliac vein, but the difference was not statistically significant.
Pressure difference: We found that the left external iliac vein pressure was higher
than that of the right side. The pressure difference between the proximal end of the
bilateral external iliac vein and the proximal end of the inferior vena cava at rest was
measured. The results showed that the average pressure difference on the left side was
0.046±0.173 mmHg, the average pressure difference on the right side was
-0.088±0.164 mmHg(P=0.003<0.01), and the difference between the two sides (right

- 222 vs left) was -0.13±0.22 mmHg.
- **Talbe III.** Hemodynamic parameters of all limbs(n=60)

	Average(
Haemodynamic	Left	Right	P value
parameters			
CIV blood flow ml/s	6.70±2.88ml/s	8.3±3.19ml/s	0.045
EIV blood flow ml/s	5.08±1.85 ml/s	6.11±1.96 ml/s	0.041
CIV-EIV flow	1.62±1.68ml/s	2.19±2.69 ml/s	0.360
difference ml/s			
CIV average flow	9.27±3.43cm/s	12.41±3.83 cm/s	0.001
velocity cm/s			
EIV average flow	7.43±1.65cm/s	9.94±2.34cm/s	< 0.001
velocity cm/s			
EIV-IVC pressure	0.046±0.173mmHg	-0.088±0.164mmHg	< 0.001
difference (mmHg)			

224 CIV, Common iliac vein; EIV, external iliac vein; IVC, inferior vena cava

Data presented as median (range) or mean± standard deviation. A P value <0.05 was
 considered statistically significant.

4.5 The relationship between anatomy and haemodynamics

228 The relationship between anatomy and haemodynamics is shown in Table IV. We 229 found correlations between pelvic vein anatomical parameters and haemodynamic 230 parameters. A larger iliac vein area was correlated with a higher the blood flow; a 231 higher iliac vein stenosis rate was correlated with a lower blood flow, leading to a 232 decrease in the average external iliac vein velocity and an increase in the external 233 iliac-inferior vena cava pressure difference; a greater common iliac vein-inferior vena 234 cava angle was correlated with a lower iliac vein flow velocity and higher the external 235 iliac vein-inferior vena cava pressure difference. A greater iliac vein tortuosity was 236 correlated with a lower iliac vein velocity and higher external iliac vein-inferior vena 237 cava pressure difference. Limbs with a greater tortuosity and angle had a lower 238 common iliac vein flow, external iliac vein flow, average common iliac vein flow 239 velocity, and average external iliac vein flow velocity and a higher external 240 iliac-inferior vena cava pressure difference.

241 Table IV. Correlation between anatomy and haemodynamics of iliac vein

	CIV blood	EIV	CIV average	EIV average	EIV-IVC pressure
Spearman's	flow	blood	flow velocity	flow velocity	difference
correlation		flow			
CIV-IVC	-0.331**	-0.260*	-0.359**	-0.519**	0.407** (0.001)
angle (°)					
Iliac vein	-0.142	-0.198	-0.299*	-0.499**	0.406** (0.001)

tortuosity					
(%)					
Stenosis	-0.394*	-0.388*	-0.155	-0.380**	0.272* (0.036)
rate (%)					
CIV area	0.524**	-	-0.059	-	0.134 (0.306)
(mm2)					
EIV area	-	0.511**	-	0.021	0.197 (0.131)
(mm2)					

242 Note:*and**mean significant correlation at P<0.05 and extremely significant

correlation at P<0.01

244 **5. Discussion**

Venous stasis in the lower extremities is considered to be an important 245 246 haemodynamic change in the occurrence and development of CVD. Some studies have reported that the obstruction and reflux disorder of the lower extremities caused by iliac 247 248 vein stenosis are a reason for venous insufficiency of the lower extremities and the subsequent formation of $CVD^{2,3}$. The clinical use of iliac vein stents to correct stenosis 249 has been shown to be effective 4-6, but studies have shown that iliac vein stenosis rates 250 do not exactly match symptom severity⁷. Asymptomatic iliac vein stenosis is a normal 251 anatomical variation rather than a pathological change^{8,9}. 252

In recent years, studies have found that abnormal haemodynamics are closely related to the occurrence and development of vascular diseases. The common iliac and external iliac veins are the channels for venous reflux of the lower extremities. We

believe that the anatomical parameters of the iliac veins, such as vessel area, stenosis
rate, and vessel course, may affect iliac vein haemodynamic parameters, such as flow,
velocity, and pressure, which will lead to progression in CVD. In addition, in clinical
practice, the prevalence of CVD on the left and right sides has been shown to be
inconsistent^{10,11}, and we hypothesize that this inconsistency is related to a certain
degree with the anatomical differences between the bilateral limbs.

262 At present, the diagnosis and evaluation of vascular diseases are very dependent 263 on imaging data, such as Doppler ultrasound, computed tomography angiography 264 (CTA), magnetic resonance angiography (MRA), digital subtraction angiography (DSA), and intravascular ultrasound (IVUS), but few of the above methods can 265 266 accurately, objectively and dynamically collect the haemodynamic parameters of the 267 patients. 4D flow MRI has great application prospects in the research of vascular 268 diseases due to its noninvasiveness, lack of radiation, lack of contrast agent 269 enhancement, and wide coverage. It can provide a large number of haemodynamic 270 parameters and visualize blood flow status and changes and allows analysis of postprocessed images offline for retrospectively assessing blood flow parameters¹². 271 272 The ability of 4D flow MRI to perform qualitative and quantitative analysis allows a 273 comprehensive assessment of pelvic venous blood flow and can help clarify the 274 relationship between haemodynamic changes and the development of CVD. In this 275 paper, 4D flow MRI was first used to collect the anatomical and haemodynamic 276 parameters of the pelvic vein and to explore the anatomical and haemodynamic

277 characteristics of the iliac vein in asymptomatic people and their correlations,

278 providing a reference for further exploring abnormal changes in fluid dynamics.

279 We measured the anatomical parameters of the iliac vein in asymptomatic 280 individuals and found that the average angle of the common iliac vein as it converged 281 into the inferior vena cava in all limbs was $36.37\pm21.88^{\circ}$, with average angles on the 282 left and right of $51.67\pm17.75^{\circ}$ and $17.07\pm6.30^{\circ}$ (P<0.001), respectively. The angle at 283 which the left common iliac vein converged into the inferior vena cava was larger than 284 that on the right side. This suggests that it may be more appropriate to choose about 50° 285 for the bevelled opening angle of the iliac vein-specific stent in current clinical practice. 286 The median (interquartile range) tortuosity of all limbs was 14.94% (10.07%-19.70%), 287 among which the mean tortuosity of the left iliac vein was 19.41%±3.32%, and the 288 mean tortuosity of the right iliac vein was $10.94\% \pm 2.78\%$ (P<0.001), showing that the 289 tortuosity of the left iliac vein was greater than that of the contralateral side. The course 290 of the right common iliac vessels is steeper and straighter than the left, which is consistent with the research results of Arjun Jayaraj¹³ et al. The tortuosity of the left 291 292 iliac vein is large, a greater tortuosity requires higher compliance for the middle section 293 of the iliac vein stent, as this would allow better adaptation to the tortuosity of the iliac 294 vein and adherence to the vein wall, suggesting that support and flexibility should be considered when selecting materials for the design of iliac vein stents. Raju¹⁴ et al. used 295 296 colour Doppler ultrasound to measure the common iliac and external iliac diameters of 297 healthy volunteers, obtaining values of 13.3 (11-15.8) mm and 11.5 (8.7-13.9) mm, 298 respectively; this study found that the average diameters of left and right common iliac

veins of the volunteers were 14.02 mm and 12.19 mm, respectively, while the average
diameters of the left and right external iliac veins were 13.12 mm and 11.75 mm,
respectively, which may also serve as reference values for the design of iliac vein
stents.

303 Iliac vein stenosis is very common worldwide, but most people have iliac vein 304 stenosis without obvious clinical symptoms. Iliac vein compression syndrome (IVCS) often occurs in the left lower extremity and is more common in women than in men¹⁵. 305 Kibbe et al.⁸ found that among asymptomatic patients with lower extremity 306 307 compression, approximately 24% had left common iliac vein compression greater than 308 50%. In this study, the iliac vein stenosis rate was >50% in 20% (6/30) of the left limbs 309 of all volunteers as measured by 4D flow MRI, consistent with the findings of Kibbe et 310 al. The mean stenosis rate of the left limb was higher than that of the right side 311 (34.04%±13.74% vs. 17.12%±7.33%, P<0.001).

312 Currently, the relationship between iliac vein anatomy and haemodynamics is 313 unclear. We used 4D flow MRI to measure the mean velocity and blood flow of the 314 bilateral iliac veins and the pressure difference between the external iliac vein and 315 inferior vena cava in an asymptomatic population. This study found significant 316 correlations between iliac vein anatomy and haemodynamic parameters. A larger iliac 317 vein area was correlated with a higher blood flow; a larger common iliac vein-inferior 318 vena cava angle was correlated with a lower iliac vein velocity and a higher external 319 iliac-inferior cavity pressure difference. Finally, a greater iliac vein tortuosity was 320 correlated with a lower iliac vein velocity and a higher external iliac vein-inferior vena

321 cava pressure difference.

322	This study found that an iliac vein stenosis rate of more than 50% affected the
323	blood flow and pressure differences of the iliac vein. Specifically, compared with a
324	stenosis rate of less than 50%, the absolute blood flow of the iliac vein decreased. While
325	the relative blood flow (the difference between the common iliac and external iliac
326	blood flows) decreased, the venous pressure increased, and the average iliac vein
327	velocity decreased. However, none of these differences was significant, suggesting that
328	compensatory velocity acceleration may occur at the site of venous stenosis (Table V).
329	According to Poiseuille's law, changes in intravascular flow velocity and pressure
330	differences will lead to changes in blood flow. The flow velocity can be compensatorily
331	increased at the site of stenosis and decreased at sites near the stenosis, so the flow
332	velocity does not objectively reflect the status of venous reflux. Another study by our
333	center ¹⁶ suggested that changes in the common iliac-external iliac flow difference at the
334	lower extremities, that is, a decrease in relative flow, may be related to the severity of
335	the patient's symptoms. A low or even negative flow difference may be associated with
336	more severe limb symptoms (higher Villalta scores).

Hemodynamic parameters mean \pm standard deviation							
	CIV blood EIV blood CIV-EIV CIV EIV EIV-IVC						
	flow ml/s	flow ml/s	flow	average	average	pressure	
			difference	flow	flow	difference	
			ml/s	velocity	velocity	mmHg	
				cm/s	cm/s		

337 TableV. Correlation of degree of stenosis and hemodynamics

Stenosis	7.26±2.79	5.47±1.71	1.78 ± 1.68	9.46±3.34	7.58±1.76	0.029±0.169
rate≤50%						
Stenosis	4.47±2.17	3.53±1.71	$0.94{\pm}1.67$	8.50±4.00	6.83±1.05	0.113±0.189
rate >50%						
P value	0.031	0.019	0.280	0.550	0.332	0.295

338 Twenty percent of the volunteers had a left iliac vein stenosis rate of >50% but no 339 symptoms related to lower extremity venous insufficiency (such as varicose veins or 340 oedema). We believe that stenosis can lead to changes in iliac vein haemodynamics, but 341 the reason for the lack of clinical symptoms is related to the fact that although a certain 342 degree of iliac vein stenosis is a physiological anatomical structure, it is also a potential 343 pathological change. The changes in venous flow due to venous stenosis in the normal 344 population may have a "threshold effect", and a decrease in venous flow may not be 345 sufficient to cause symptoms or signs related to the veins of the lower extremities. 346 Symptoms associated with venous insufficiency of the lower extremity may be induced 347 if the stenosis causes the flow or flow difference to reach this threshold.

348 After stratified analysis of iliac vein angle and tortuosity, we found that the 349 common iliac vein flow, external iliac vein flow, average common iliac vein velocity, 350 and average external iliac vein flow velocity were all lower in limbs with greater iliac 351 vein angles and tortuosity values, while the external iliac-inferior vena cava pressure 352 difference was higher (Table VI, VII). Compared with those of the right side, the 353 tortuosity and common iliac vein-inferior vena cava angle of the left side were larger. 354 The average flow and velocity in the right common and external iliac veins were higher 355 than in the left limb, and the pressure in the left external iliac vein was higher than that

356	in the right side. The average pressure difference between the left external iliac vein and
357	the right external iliac vein was 0.13 ± 0.22 mmHg. We believe that the differences in the
358	bilateral iliac vein tortuosity and venous inflow angle may also be a reason for the
359	difference in haemodynamic parameters of bilateral iliac veins, which can explain why
360	lower extremity venous insufficiency in CVD patients mostly occurs in the left side.
361	Lower extremity venous insufficiency was also more common on the left side in
362	patients with no iliac vein stenosis on angiography. This is closely related to the larger
363	angle of the left common iliac vein as it converges into the inferior vena cava and its
364	larger tortuosity.

365 Table VI. Correlation of curvature and hemodynamics

Hemodynamic parameters mean \pm standard deviation						
Limbs	CIV	EIV	CIV-EIV	CIV	EIV	EIV-IVC
	blood	blood	flow	average	average	pressure
	flow ml/s	flow ml/s	difference	flow	flow	difference
			ml/s	velocity	velocity	mmHg
				cm/s	cm/s	
curvature≤15%	8.25±2.82	6.10±1.93	2.15±2.31	12.35±3.88	10.05±2.32	-0.084 ± 0.170
curvature>15%	6.40±2.36	4.54±1.40	$1.84{\pm}1.78$	9.33±3.44	7.32±1.48	0.427 ± 0.170
P value	0.008	0.001	0.564	0.002	< 0.001	0.005

366 Table VII. Correlation of angle of common iliac vein-inferior vena cava and

367 hemodynamics

Hemodynamic parameters mean \pm standard deviation						
Limbs	CIV blood	EIV blood	CIV-EIV	CIV	EIV	EIV-IVC
	flow ml/s	flow ml/s	flow	average	average	pressure
			difference	flow	flow	difference

			ml/s	velocity	velocity	mmHg
				cm/s	cm/s	
Angle≤37°	8.10 ± 2.67	5.88±1.85	2.20±	12.01 ±	9.48±2.34	-0.092±0.15
				3.67		
Angle>37°	6.08±2.42	4.43±1.48	1.68 ±	8.96±	7.41±1.85	0.093±0.16
				3.68		
P value	0.005	0.002	0.166	0.003	0.001	0.000

368 6. Conclusion

The anatomical structure of the pelvic vein, including the iliac vein area, common iliac vein-inferior vena cava angle, iliac vein tortuosity, and iliac vein stenosis rate, are important factors that affect the haemodynamic changes in the pelvic vein. There are correlations between parameters related to anatomical structure and haemodynamic changes in the pelvic veins. Differences in the anatomy and haemodynamics of the bilateral pelvic veins may be one of the reasons why the left extremity is more prone to CVD-related symptoms.

376 7. Limitations

It is important to bear in mind the limitations of this study. First, the sample size of this study was small. Second, our study failed to explain the effect of circadian rhythm, respiratory rate, body position, and exercise on blood flow. In addition, when the participant is in the supine position, the 4D flow MRI scan is not dynamic and may not reflect the anatomic structures when the participant is standing and moving. We also did not acquire measurement data for IVCS patients and older persons as controls. More

383 prospective studies with high quality and larger sample sizes should be designed in

- the future.
- 385 Reference:
- 386 1.Takehara Y. 4D Flow when and how? Radiol med. 2020 Sep;125(9):838–50.
- 387 2.Larkin TA, Hovav O, Dwight K, Villalba L. Common iliac vein obstruction in a
- symptomatic population is associated with previous deep venous thrombosis, and with
- chronic pelvic pain in females. J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord. 2020
 Nov;8(6):961–9.
- 391 3.Lattimer CR, Mendoza E, Kalodiki E. The current status of air-plethysmography in
 392 evaluating non-thrombotic iliac vein lesions. Phlebology. 2018 Feb;33(1):3–4.
- 4.Raju S. Best management options for chronic iliac vein stenosis and occlusion. J
 Vasc Surg. 2013 Apr;57(4):1163–9.
- 5.Lattimer CR, Mendoza E, Kalodiki E. The current status of air-plethysmography in
 evaluating non-thrombotic iliac vein lesions. Phlebology. 2018 Feb;33(1):3–4.
- 397 6.Speranza G, Sadek M, Jacobowitz G. Common iliac vein stenting for May-Thurner
- syndrome and subsequent pregnancy. J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord. 2022
 Mar;10(2):348–52.
- 7.Cheng L, Zhao H, Zhang FX. Iliac Vein Compression Syndrome in an
 Asymptomatic Patient Population: A Prospective Study. Chin Med J (Engl). 2017 Jun
 5;130(11):1269–75.
- 8.Kibbe MR, Ujiki M, Goodwin AL, Eskandari M, Yao J, Matsumura J. Iliac vein
 compression in an asymptomatic patient population. Journal of Vascular Surgery.
 2004 May 1;39(5):937–43.
- 9.Brinegar KN, Sheth RA, Khademhosseini A, Bautista J, Oklu R. Iliac vein
 compression syndrome: Clinical, imaging and pathologic findings. World J Radiol.
 2015 Nov 28;7(11):375–81.
- 409 10. Joseph N, B A, Thouseef MF, Devi UM, Abna A, Juneja I. A multicenter review
- 410 of epidemiology and management of varicose veins for national guidance. Annals of
- 411 Medicine & Surgery. 2016 Jun;8:21–7.
- 412 11.Das K, Ahmed S, Abro S, Arain MS. VARICOSE VEINS;: OUTCOME OF
- 413 SURGICAL MANAGEMENT AND RECURRENCES. The Professional Medical
 414 Journal. 2014 Jun 10;21(03):509–13.
- 415 12.Stankovic Z. Four-dimensional flow magnetic resonance imaging in cirrhosis.
 416 WJG. 2016;22(1):89.
- 417 13.Jayaraj A, Raju S. Iliofemoral venous configurations from three-dimensional
 418 computed tomography venogram and their relevance to stent design. J Vasc Surg
 419 Venous Lymphat Disord. 2022 Nov;10(6):1310-1317.e1.
- 420 14.Raju S, Buck WJ, Crim W, Jayaraj A. Optimal sizing of iliac vein stents.
 421 Phlebology. 2018 Aug;33(7):451–7.
- 422 15.Vuylsteke ME, Thomis S, Guillaume G, Modliszewski ML, Weides N, Staelens I.
- 423 Epidemiological study on chronic venous disease in Belgium and Luxembourg:

424 prevalence, risk factors, and symptomatology. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg. 2015
425 Apr;49(4):432–9.

- 426 16.Chen ZH, Huang Y, Wang LP, Peng MY, Li C, Huang W. Preliminary study of
- 427 hemodynamics of iliac venous compression syndrome using magnetic resonance
- 428 imaging. J Vasc Surg Venous Lymphat Disord. 2022 Jan;10(1):131-138.e3.

429