Why timing is everything in AMD

Surgeons’ goal should be maintaining functional vision in a higher proportion of patients

RGC THERAPY

ONE STEP CLOSER TO GLAUCOMA GOAL

Progress occurring on several fronts is creating optimism that retinal ganglion cell (RGC) replacement may become a reality for preserving or restoring vision in patients with glaucoma. “All available medical and surgical treatments for glaucoma target IOP, but while IOP is a risk factor for glaucoma, the underlying disease is an optic neuropathy characterized by loss of RGCs,” according to Jeffrey L. Goldberg, MD, PhD.

ANTI-VASCULAR ENDOTHELIAL growth factor (VEGF) treatment has undoubtedly revolutionized how ophthalmologists manage patients with wet age-related macular degeneration (AMD). Unfortunately, after more than a decade of the current anti-VEGF monotherapy treatment paradigm, we have plateaued.

Why have we leveled out? More importantly, how do we break through the plateau? It’s simple: Detect wet AMD earlier, before patients lose several lines of vision. As physicians, we intuitively know that patients have better outcomes if we detect disease trials, have demonstrated that lesion size and visual acuity at the time of wet AMD diagnosis are two of the best predictors of visual outcomes following anti-VEGF treatments.1,2

Given what we know and what has been studied, early detection of wet AMD is an urgent matter that requires our focus. Our goal should not be the number of letters gained. Our goal should be maintaining functional vision in a higher proportion of our patients. Gaining 2 or 3 lines is irrelevant

(Continues on page 14: Timing)
INDICATION
RHOPRESSA® (netarsudil ophthalmic solution) 0.02% is a Rho kinase inhibitor indicated for the reduction of elevated intraocular pressure in patients with open-angle glaucoma or ocular hypertension.

Dosage and Administration: The recommended dosage is one drop in the affected eye(s) once daily in the evening.

IMPORTANT SAFETY INFORMATION
Dosage and Administration: Twice a day dosing is not well tolerated and is not recommended. If RHOPRESSA® is to be used concomitantly with other topical ophthalmic drug products to lower IOP, administer each drug product at least 5 minutes apart.

Warnings and Precautions:
Bacterial Keratitis - There have been reports of bacterial keratitis associated with the use of multiple-dose containers of topical ophthalmic products. These containers had been inadvertently contaminated by patients who, in most cases, had a concurrent corneal disease or a disruption of the ocular epithelial surface.

Adverse Reactions: The most common ocular adverse reaction observed in controlled clinical studies with RHOPRESSA® dosed once daily was conjunctival hyperemia, reported in 53% of patients. Other common (approximately 20%) adverse reactions were: corneal verticillata, instillation site pain, and conjunctival hemorrhage. Instillation site erythema, corneal staining, blurred vision, increased lacrimation, erythema of eyelid, and reduced visual acuity were reported in 5-10% of patients.

The corneal verticillata seen in RHOPRESSA®-treated patients were first noted at 4 weeks of daily dosing. This reaction did not result in any apparent visual functional changes. Most corneal verticillata resolved upon discontinuation of treatment.

For full Prescribing Information, please visit Rhopressa.com.
Why timing is everything in AMD

Surgeons’ goal should be maintaining functional vision in a higher proportion of patients

By Allen C. Ho, MD
Special to Ophthalmology Times

ANTI-VASCULAR ENDOTHELIAL growth factor (VEGF) treatment has undoubtedly revolutionized how ophthalmologists manage patients with wet age-related macular degeneration (AMD). Unfortunately, after more than a decade of the current anti-VEGF monotherapy treatment paradigm, we have plateaued.

Why have we leveled out? More importantly, how do we break through the plateau? It’s simple: Detect wet AMD earlier, before patients lose several lines of vision. As physicians, we intuitively know that patients have better outcomes if we detect disease in its earliest stages. We know that the longer the disease goes undetected and undiagnosed, the larger the lesion will be and that more letters will be lost.

Multiple studies, including randomized clinical trials, have demonstrated that lesion size and visual acuity at the time of wet AMD diagnosis are two of the best predictors of visual outcomes following anti-VEGF treatments.1,2

Given what we know and what has been studied, early detection of wet AMD is an urgent matter that requires our focus. Our goal should not be the number of letters gained. Our goal should be maintaining functional vision in a higher proportion of our patients. Gaining 2 or 3 lines is irrelevant

(Continues on page 14: Timing)

IN VIEW: Detect wet AMD earlier, before patients lose several lines of vision. The longer the disease goes undetected and undiagnosed, the larger the lesion will be and that more letters will be lost. (Image courtesy of Heidelberg Engineering)
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A fresh set of eyes
An outsider’s view of the ophthalmology certification examination

By James Lifton, MBA

THIS PAST JUNE I was invited to observe the oral certification examination being administered by the American Board of Ophthalmology to more than 300 ophthalmologists. The experience gave me a deeper appreciation for what physicians have to do in order to become board certified. And, as a public (non-physician) member of the American Board of Medical Specialties, I feel better equipped to discuss issues related to physician certification.

I learned that the path to certification in ophthalmology is similar to the process used by several other specialty boards: a computer-based qualification examination followed by the oral certification exam.

The oral certification examination lasted three hours. Examinees were assigned to panels of six, along with six examiners and a panel leader. Over three hours examinees rotated through six stations, each covering a different area of ophthalmology (glaucoma, neuro-ophthalmology, pediatrics, and so forth), and each with a different examiner. Following the session, examiners and the panel leader met to discuss the physicians that they had just examined. The certification decision is based on input from these panels.

Administering the oral examination is no small undertaking, even after the patient management problems have been written, field-tested, and formatted for the exam. It involved 150 physician examiners, some mentoring first-time examiners, as well as the panel leaders and physicians who provided orientation and training.

Dr. George Bartley, Chief Executive Officer of the American Board of Ophthalmology (ABO) as well as a practicing ophthalmologist, was my host. During one of our conversations he commented that from time to time, ABO leadership reconsiders whether or not the oral exam is worthwhile, as administering it is expensive and the costs fall to ophthalmologists who typically are not yet financially established. In light of my experience, I believe it is.

WHY ADMINISTER AN ORAL EXAM?
An obvious reason is that it tests different things than the computer-based multiple choice examination. The qualifying exam requires ophthalmologists to demonstrate that they have the knowledge at their disposal—sometimes called “walking around knowledge”—necessary to practice independently. The oral examination requires ophthalmologists to exercise judgement in applying that knowledge to a variety of patients and conditions.

A MODEL OF PROFESSIONALISM
In addition to assessing a physician’s judgement and underlying knowledge, I believe the oral examination has three benefits.

First, the panel meeting following each exam session provides an opportunity to discuss physicians who didn’t clearly pass or fail the oral exam. No matter how an examination is structured, there will always be candidates who fall in this category. Having a process to evaluate these physicians, using a dialog between seven practicing ophthalmologists, and especially just after interacting with the candidates, seems to me as reasonable and fair.

Second, the oral examination meeting provides physicians being examined an opportunity to meet new colleagues, and develop or nurture peer relationships.

Finally, and I believe most importantly, it offers a model of professionalism to ophthalmologists, most just beginning their careers. (In a recent Editorial, Dr. Peter McDonnell illustrated the importance of role models in acquiring knowledge.) The examiners volunteer their time and pay their own way to the exam site, where they welcome all candidates as peers. Physician examiners look and act like the professionals they are, and that their younger colleagues can aspire to become.

Physicians may feel themselves under pressure, faced with ever higher expectations, sometimes leading to “burnout” and its manifestations. Developing peer relationships and having role models can help physicians maintain their sense of professionalism and fulfillment in what they do. I believe that this benefits physicians, as well as those of us who rely on them for care.
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Xidi® (lifitegrast ophthalmic solution) 5% is indicated for the treatment of the signs and symptoms of dry eye disease (DED).

Dosage and Administration
Instill one drop of Xidi® twice daily (approximately 12 hours apart) into each eye using a single-use container. Discard the single-use container immediately after using in each eye. Contact lenses should be removed prior to the administration of Xidi® and may be reinserted 15 minutes following administration.

CONTRAINDICATIONS
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ADVERSE REACTIONS
Clinical Trials Experience
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MYOPIC TRACTION maculopa (MTM) and macular hole retinal detachments (MHRDs) are complex scenarios that demand accurate diagnoses and high surgical expertise. Internal limiting membrane (ILM) peeling and foveal-sparing ILM flap techniques are showing improved macular hole (MH) closure rates in difficult cases.

These pathologies fall into four categories, each of which requires a different treatment approach, according to Hiroko Terasaki, MD.

The first three categories—schisis only, schisis and retinal detachment, and full-thickness macular hole (FTMH)—are the prodromal stages of MHRDs, the fourth category, said Dr. Terasaki, who is chairman and professor, Department of Ophthalmology, Nagoya University, Graduate School of Medicine, Nagoya, Japan.

**SIMPLE SCHISIS, SCHISIS, AND RETINAL DETACHMENT**

In eyes with schisis without a foveal detachment—i.e., schisis only—total ILM peeling is performed. At first, the posterior vitreous membrane and residual vitreous cortex are removed. Triamcinolone is injected again and the ILM is peeled gently.

“Correct diagnosis is the important factor,” said Dr. Terasaki, describing an eye that had more than just simple schisis. Those eyes should be included in the group with foveal retinal detachments, which are seen clearly on swept-source optical coherence tomography (SS-OCT).

When considering these more complicated eyes, previous studies have reported that MHs develop in about 10% of eyes after total ILM peeling. Interestingly, macular holes have been reported much less often or do not develop after ILM peeling that spared the fovea to treat myopic schisis, Dr. Terasaki noted.

Even in eyes with schisis only, schisis with a deep pseudohole, i.e., schisis shaped like a champagne flute, would be an indication for this method.

**CASE STUDY**

She described the case of a 76-year-old man with myopic schisis with foveal detachments bilaterally who was treated with a foveal-sparing technique. In the right eye, the posterior hyaloid membrane, which resembles an ILM, was totally peeled. Triamcinolone was again injected and the ILM was peeled toward the edge of the fovea.

During the trimming procedure of this peeled ILM, Dr. Terasaki advised that the port of the cutter should always face in the direction opposite to the fovea.

In this case, Brilliant Blue dye (BBD) was used to identify the ILM more clearly during trimming. An OCT scan performed intraop-
eratively showed the area of attachment of the trimmed ILM. In this case of one eye, the ILM was visible for at least 4 months postoperatively. She noted that an unpeeled ILM can become an epiretinal membrane (ERM).

In the second eye of this patient, after the posterior vitreous cortex was peeled, the ILM was stained with BBD. ILM forceps were used to peel the ILM toward the edge of the fovea. The flapping ILM was trimmed using the vitreous cutter, after which the ILM was peeled further up to immediately before the edge of the fovea to prevent postoperative ERM, Dr. Terasaki noted.

Use of OCT intraoperatively has an important function in cases such as these.

“Intraoperative OCT showed how close the ILM was peeled to the fovea,” Dr. Terasaki said. She demonstrated on spectral-domain OCT and SS-OCT images that the minute remnant of the ILM became invisible shortly after surgery in this eye.

FULL-THICKNESS MACULAR HOLE

The third prodromal stage under discussion is that of eyes with FTMHs with and without schisis. In a study of highly myopic macular holes conducted at Nagoya University, two (6%) of 33 eyes failed to achieve closure of the macular holes after total peeling of the ILM. These holes were larger than 500 μm in the minimal diameter, Dr. Terasaki noted.

“The ILM flap technique has been recommended for large MHs,” she said. “The macular hole closure rates have been generally good even in eyes with a long axial length.”

She described the case of a 69-year-old woman with a high myopic MH with a minimal diameter of 627 μm. The inverted ILM flap technique to treat the MH was performed after the patient had undergone a previous failed vitrectomy. The ILM remained in the eye.

In the surgery under discussion, the ILM was peeled toward the edge of the MH, folded over, and slid into the edge of the MH using a diamond-dusted eraser. OCT images obtained intraoperatively showed the multi-layered ILM plugging the MH.

The technique used in this surgery was the classic multi-layered flap technique. However,
other techniques exist, such as the single-layer technique, which is not performed for myopia. For large myopic MHs, gentle insertion is recommended.

MACULAR HOLE RETINAL DETACHMENTS

The reported MH closure rates are low in these eyes following vitrectomy.

In light of this, Dr. Terasaki noted that the ILM flap technique has been recommended for all eyes with a MHRD. A 74-year-old woman with MHRD underwent vitrectomy and ILM peeling.

After the ILM was peeled to the edge of the MH and trimmed, the inverted ILM flap insertion technique was performed in which the ILM was inserted into the macular hole. Intraocular OCT showed that the ILM was in the macular hole. Autologous neurosensory retinal free flap method has been reported recently to close a refractory MH in a 69-year-old woman who had undergone two previous retinal detachment surgeries in failed attempts to close the MH. During surgery, a retinal free flap was translocated from the periphery of the retina. The postoperative findings indicated that the macular hole was closed using the retinal flap from the periphery.

“Although this may work to prevent recurrence of the macular hole, the effect on the visual function has yet to be determined,” Dr. Terasaki said.
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Neuroregeneration being pursued as ultimate goal for glaucoma therapy

To focus on IOP, the underlying optic nerve could be treated with an innovative RGC therapy

By Cheryl Guttman Krader; Reviewed by Jeffrey L. Goldberg, MD

PROGRESS OCCURRING on several fronts is creating optimism that retinal ganglion cell (RGC) replacement may become a reality for preserving or restoring vision in patients with glaucoma, according to Jeffrey L. Goldberg, MD, PhD.

“All available medical and surgical treatments for glaucoma target IOP, but while IOP is a risk factor for glaucoma, the underlying disease is an optic neuropathy characterized by loss of RGCs,” said Dr. Goldberg, Professor and Chair, Byers Eye Institute, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.

“The real hope for advancing glaucoma care in the future is to discover therapies that target the RGCs to stave off or even restore the vision loss that can be so profound with this disease. We have encouraging evidence supporting the potential for RGC therapies, but there are many questions yet to be answered and much work needs to be done.”

Important advances are occurring both in basic research and in clinical trials. Among the developments taking place in the laboratory, there has been progress delineating molecular pathways for generating RGC-like cells from human stem cells.

Dr. Goldberg noted that results from previous research in animal models demonstrated that RGC cells delivered into the vitreous migrated to and integrated into the retina and then grew lengthy axons projecting down the optic nerve and extending to the brain. However, a low rate of RGC differentiation from progenitor or stem cells in vitro limited further development of RGC cell therapy.

but it has been more challenging to define the pathway for specifying RGC fate,” Dr. Goldberg told Ophthalmology Times.

To solve this problem, Dr. Goldberg and colleagues undertook a screen of developmentally expressed transcription factors. In their work, they discovered that a molecular pathway involving Sox4/Sox11 was required for RGC differentiation and optic nerve formation in mice in vivo and was sufficient for promoting differentiation of human induced pluripotent cells and human embryonic stem cells into RGC-like cells in culture [Chang KC, et al. J Neurosci. 2017;37(19):4967-4981].

“The induced cells are structurally and functionally similar to endogenous RGCs. Not only do they look like RGCs and express protein markers typically expressed by the RGCs, but they also mimic RGCs in terms of electrophysiologic activity,” Dr. Goldberg said.

BIOMARKERS

Research developing new biomarkers as study endpoints is also progressing and is important and exciting because of its implications for facilitating the process of candidate discovery and decreasing the time needed to demonstrate efficacy.

“One of the major challenges in the neuroprotection arena is the lack of high-fidelity post mortem testing. In contrast, some of the biomarkers we believe are promising are non-invasive and can be used to test candidates in animal models and, potentially, in humans,” Dr. Goldberg said.

Development of new imaging modalities and study endpoints is also progressing and is important and exciting because of its implications for facilitating the process of candidate discovery and decreasing the time needed to demonstrate efficacy.

“By using these biomarkers, we can test new candidates for neuroprotection and vision restoration in a shorter time frame, and that should help us to accelerate investigations towards finding new treatments for glaucoma,” Dr. Goldberg said.

The new biomarkers include new imaging modalities being developed in the laboratory of Alfredo Dubra, PhD, Associate Professor of Ophthalmology, Stanford University School of Medicine.

“Dr. Dubra and colleagues are creating new adaptive optics-based imaging modalities that are providing very high resolution measurements of RGCs, their axons, and even the subcellular elements inside the axons that we think will give us insight on the mitochondrial health of the cells,” said Dr. Goldberg.

“With this noninvasive modality, we will be able to determine with confidence whether investigational agents are having biologic effects in early phase clinical testing,” Dr. Goldberg said.

CLINICAL TRIALS UNDERWAY

Promising candidates for neuroprotection in glaucoma that target RGC viability are being investigated in clinical trials. Two studies are underway at Stanford University, and Dr. Goldberg is the principal investigator for the trials.

Topical treatment with recombinant human nerve growth factor (Dompé Farmaceutici) is being evaluated in a Phase 1 single center, double-masked, placebo-controlled study is being conducted at Stanford and includes 60 patients with primary open angle glaucoma. Eligible patients had progressive disease despite maximal therapy or stable IOP but diminished vision. The trial has a 32-week duration.

Stanford is also participating in a phase 2 multicenter, single-masked randomized trial of NT-501 Encapsulated Cell Therapy (Neurotech), an intravitreal device that secretes ciliary neurotrophic factor (CNTF). Other participating sites are Glaucoma Associates of Texas, Dallas, Columbia University, NY, and New York University, NY.

Enrolled patients received NT-501 or underwent sham surgery. The primary outcome analysis will be performed at 6 months and follow-up will continue to 2 years.

JEFFREY L. GOLDBERG, MD, PHD

This article is based on a presentation given by Dr. Goldberg at the 2017 Glaucoma Subspecialty Day meeting. Dr. Goldberg has no financial interests in the products discussed.
MANAGING BIOBURDEN

AVENOVA IS THE MISSING PIECE IN ANY MGD DRY EYE OR BLEPHARITIS REGIMEN

- Avenova has patient study results demonstrating bacteria load reduction on the skin around the eyes.
- Avenova is the *only pure* hypochlorous acid without bleach impurities.
- Avenova is designed to complement all daily management regimens for patients with MGD Dry Eye and Blepharitis.
if the patient is still unable to have functional independence—the ability to drive, read, watch television, see their grandkids—because this is the outcome that matters most to our patients.

**WHAT THE NUMBERS TELL US**

Decreasing the time between onset of disease and initiating anti-VEGF treatment is the key to improving outcomes and maintaining functional vision. However, the reality is that too many patients are diagnosed late with poor baseline vision.

One analysis suggested that patients have wet AMD for 7.7 months prior to being treated with anti-VEGF monotherapy. The negative impact to visual acuity is devastating. Additionally, real-world data and clinical trials showed us that few newly diagnosed eyes were detected when visual acuity was 20/40 or better.

The AAO IRIS Registry (Intelligent Research in Sight) retrospective cohort study of more than 150,000 patients with neovascular AMD included nearly five years of data (January 2013 to June 2017). The study included eyes with a diagnosis of wet AMD (as designated by the first anti-VEGF injection) and a second anti-VEGF intravitreal injection in the study eye less than 45 days from the first. Eyes receiving anti-VEGF injections prior to the diagnosis of wet AMD were excluded. The IRIS study reaffirms an alarming statistic—only a small percentage (34%) have vision of 20/40 or better when initiating anti-VEGF therapy. The mean visual acuity at diagnosis was 20/83, far from functional. Even under the careful management of a treating physician, the second eye fared only slightly better with a mean visual acuity of 20/79. Intermediate AMD often escapes detection until functional vision is lost.

**THE PHYSICIAN’S ROLE**

Our current standard of care includes the Amsler grid, a self-administered and subjective vision test, which helps patients identify areas of the retina that are affected by macular degeneration. However, relying solely on subjective assessments may not be sufficient to detect all early signs of disease. It is critical for ophthalmologists to use objective diagnostic tools such as optical coherence tomography (OCT) to accurately identify the presence and extent of macular degeneration.

**TAKE-HOME**

- Decreasing time between disease onset and treatment is key to maintaining functional vision.

**Baseline VA PREDICTS Long-Term Outcomes**

Mean VA at 1-year post-diagnosis by baseline VA group

Mean visual acuity at 1-year in the comparison of age-related macular degeneration treatments trials (CATT) study

**FIGURE 1** IRIS registry results correlate with those seen in CATT: patients with better VA at diagnosis had better VA at 1-year.

---

**SOLIHULL-HEADQUARTERED**

Blink Medical has been acquired by US-based private equity-backed Katena Products in a deal advised on by Castle Donington-based Cooper Parry Corporate Finance. Blink Medical is a supplier of single-use medical instruments in the ophthalmic surgical sector. Blink’s product range has since expanded to include dermatology, ENT, cosmetic and plastic surgery.

Supplying NHS hospitals and private hospital groups and independent clinics, Blink also export to more than 20 countries. The business has been snapped up by Katena, which makes ophthalmic products and operates in 110 countries, in its first UK acquisition.

Blink Medical founder and managing director Roger Tyler is to remain at the company. Sally Saunders of Cooper Parry Corporate Finance acted as the lead adviser to the shareholders of the Solihull company on the deal.

Tyler said: “The synergies created in the ophthalmic sector, by offering multiple instrument solutions to our customers will help both companies achieve their business objectives.”

Saunders added: “Medical Products is a sector that is generating a lot of interest. It was good to work with the investors in Katena, Audax Private Equity based in the US. “There remains to be a lot of money in private equity, and we’re seeing more and more buy and build opportunities in the sector.”

Katina chief executive Mark J Fletcher said: “The acquisition of Blink Medical strengthens and expands Katena’s offering in high quality ophthalmic instrumentation. “Single-use instruments are important to our strategy and the addition of Blink also offers Katena the benefits of a physical presence in Europe.”
INDICATION

VYZULTA™ (latanoprostene bunod ophthalmic solution), 0.024% is indicated for the reduction of intraocular pressure (IOP) in patients with open-angle glaucoma or ocular hypertension.

IMPORTANT SAFETY INFORMATION

• Increased pigmentation of the iris and periorbital tissue (eyelid) can occur. Iris pigmentation is likely to be permanent.

• Gradual changes to eyelashes, including increased length, increased thickness, and number of eyelashes, may occur. These changes are usually reversible upon treatment discontinuation.

• Use with caution in patients with a history of intraocular inflammation (iritis/uveitis). VYZULTA should generally not be used in patients with active intraocular inflammation.

• Macular edema, including cystoid macular edema, has been reported during treatment with prostaglandin analogs. Use with caution in aphakic patients, in pseudophakic patients with a torn posterior lens capsule, or in patients with known risk factors for macular edema.

IMPORTANT SAFETY INFORMATION (CONTINUED)

• There have been reports of bacterial keratitis associated with the use of multiple-dose containers of topical ophthalmic products that were inadvertently contaminated by patients.

• Contact lenses should be removed prior to the administration of VYZULTA and may be reinserted 15 minutes after administration.

• Most common ocular adverse reactions with incidence ≥2% are conjunctival hyperemia (6%), eye irritation (4%), eye pain (3%), and instillation site pain (2%).

For more information, please see Brief Summary of Prescribing Information on next page.
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For more information about VYZULTA and how it works, visit vyzultanow.com

VYZULTA DELIVERS A DUAL MECHANISM OF ACTION

FOR THE REDUCTION OF IOP IN GLAUCOMA PATIENTS

ONE MOLECULE. TWO OUTFLOW PATHWAYS. PROVEN IOP REDUCTION1-3*

‘In studies up to 12 months’ duration, the IOP-lowering effect was up to 7.5 to 9.1 mmHg, in patients with an average baseline IOP of 26.7 mmHg.

VYZULTA and the V design are trademarks of Bausch & Lomb Incorporated or its affiliates. ©2018 Bausch & Lomb Incorporated. All rights reserved. VYZ.0118.USA.18
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BRIEF SUMMARY OF PRESCRIBING INFORMATION
This Brief Summary does not include all the information needed to use VYZULTA safely and effectively. See full Prescribing Information for VYZULTA.

VYZULTA™ (latanoprostene bunod ophthalmic solution), 0.024%, for topical ophthalmic use.
Initial U.S. Approval: 2017

1 INDICATIONS AND USAGE
VYZULTA™ (latanoprostene bunod ophthalmic solution) 0.024% is indicated for the reduction of intraocular pressure (IOP) in patients with open-angle glaucoma or ocular hypertension.

4 CONTRAINDICATIONS
None

5 WARNINGS AND PRECAUTIONS
5.1 Pigmentation
VYZULTA™ (latanoprostene bunod ophthalmic solution), 0.024% may cause changes to pigmented tissues. There have been infrequently reported changes with prostaglandin analogs have been increased pigmentation of the iris and periorbital tissue (eyelid).

The following adverse reactions are described in the Warnings and Precautions section: pigmentation (iris/eyelid) and should generally not be used in patients with active intraocular inflammation as it may exacerbate this condition.

5.4 Macular Edema
Macular edema, including cystoid macular edema, has been reported during treatment with prostaglandin analogs. VYZULTA should be used with caution in aphakic patients, in pseudophakic patients with a torn posterior lens capsule, or in patients with known risk factors for macular edema.

5.5 Bacterial Keratitis
There have been reports of bacterial keratitis associated with the use of multiple-dose containers of topical ophthalmic products. These containers had been inadvertently contaminated by patients who, in most cases, had a concurrent corneal disease or a disruption of the ocular epithelial surface.

5.6 Use with Contact Lens
Contact lenses should be removed prior to the administration of VYZULTA because this product contains benzalkonium chloride. Lenses may be reinserted 15 minutes after administration.

6 ADVERSE REACTIONS
The following adverse reactions are described in the Warnings and Precautions section: pigmentation (5.1), eyelash changes (5.2), intraocular inflammation (5.3), macular edema (5.4), bacterial keratitis (5.5), use with contact lens (5.6).

6.1 Clinical Trials Experience
Because clinical trials are conducted under widely varying conditions, adverse reaction rates observed in the clinical trials of a drug cannot be directly compared to rates in the clinical trials of another drug and may not reflect the rates observed in practice.

VYZULTA was evaluated in 811 patients in 2 controlled clinical trials of up to 12 months duration. The most common ocular adverse reactions observed in patients treated with latanoprostene bunod were: conjunctival hyperemia (6%), eye irritation (4%), eye pain (3%), and instillation site pain (2%). Approximately 0.6% of patients discontinued therapy due to ocular adverse reactions including conjunctival hyperemia, conjunctival irritation, eye irritation, eye pain, conjunctival edema, vision blurred, punctate keratitis and foreign body sensation.

8 USE IN SPECIFIC POPULATIONS
8.1 Pregnancy
Risk Summary
There are no available human data for the use of VYZULTA during pregnancy to inform any drug associated risks.

Latanoprostene bunod has caused miscarriages, abortion, and fetal harm in rabbits. Latanoprostene bunod was shown to be abortifacient and teratogenic when administered intravenously (IV) to pregnant rabbits at exposures ≥ 0.28 times the clinical dose.

Doses ≥ 20 μg/kg/day (23 times the clinical dose) produced 100% embryofetal lethality. Structural abnormalities observed in rabbit fetuses included anomalies of the great vessels and aortic arch vessels, domed head, sterna and vertebral skeletal anomalies, limb hypertension and malrotation, abdominal distension and edema. Latanoprostene bunod was not teratogenic in the rat when administered IV at 150 mcg/kg/day (87 times the clinical dose) [see Data].

The background risk of major birth defects and miscarriage for the indicated population is unknown. However, the background risk in the U.S. general population of major birth defects is 2 to 4%, and of miscarriage is 15 to 20%, of clinically recognized pregnancies.

Data
Animal Data
Embryofetal studies were conducted in pregnant rabbits administered latanoprostene bunod daily by intravenous injection on gestation days 7 through 19, to target the period of organogenesis. The doses administered ranged from 0.24 to 80 mcg/kg/day. Abortion occurred at doses ≥ 0.24 mcg/kg/day latanoprostene bunod (0.28 times the clinical dose) in a body surface area basis, assuming 100% absorption). Embryofetal lethality (resorption) was increased in latanoprostene bunod treatment groups, as evidenced by increases in early resorptions at doses ≥ 0.24 mcg/kg/day and late resorptions at doses ≥ 0.6 mcg/kg/day (approximately 7 times the clinical dose). No fetuses survived in any rabbit pregnancy at doses of 20 mcg/kg/day (23 times the clinical dose) or greater.

Latanoprostene bunod produced structural abnormalities at doses ≥ 0.24 mcg/kg/day (0.28 times the clinical dose). Malformations included anomalies of sternum, coarctation of the aorta with pulmonary trunk dilution, retroesophageal subclavian artery with absent brachiocephalic artery, domed head, forepaw hyperextension and hindlimb malrotation, abdominal distension/edema, and missing/fused caudal vertebrae.

An embryofetal study was conducted in pregnant rats administered latanoprostene bunod daily by intravenous injection on gestation days 7 through 17, to target the period of organogenesis. The doses administered ranged from 150 to 1500 mcg/kg/day. Maternal toxicity was produced at 1500 mcg/kg/day (870 times the clinical dose), on a body surface area basis, assuming 100% absorption), as evidenced by reduced maternal weight gain. Embryofetal lethality (resorption and fetal death) and structural anomalies were produced at doses ≥ 300 mcg/kg/day (174 times the clinical dose).

Malformations included anomalies of the sternum, domed head, forepaw hyperextension and hindlimb malrotation, vertebral anomalies and delayed ossification of distal limb bones. A no observed adverse effect level (NOAEL) was established at 150 mcg/kg/day (87 times the clinical dose) in this study.

8.2 Lactation
Risk Summary
There are no data on the presence of VYZULTA in human milk, the effects on the breastfed infant, or the effects on milk production. The developmental and health benefits of breastfeeding should be considered, along with the mother’s clinical need for VYZULTA, and any potential adverse effects on the breastfed infant from VYZULTA.

8.4 Pediatric Use
Use in pediatric patients aged 16 years and younger is not recommended because of potential safety concerns related to increased pigmentation following long-term chronic use.

8.5 Geriatric Use
No overall clinical differences in safety or effectiveness have been observed between elderly and other adult patients.

13 NONCLINICAL TOXICOLOGY
13.1 Carcinogenesis, Mutagenesis, Impairment of Fertility
Latanoprostene bunod was not mutagenic in bacteria and did not induce micronuclei formation in the in vivo rat bone marrow micronucleus assay. Chromosomal aberrations were observed in vitro with human lymphocytes in the absence of metabolic activation.

Latanoprostene bunod has not been tested for carcinogenic activity in long-term animal studies. Latanoprost acid is a main metabolite of latanoprostene bunod. Exposure of rats and mice to latanoprost acid, resulting from oral dosing with latanoprost in lifetime rodent bioassays, was not carcinogenic.

Fertility studies have not been conducted with latanoprostene bunod. The potential to impact fertility can be partially characterized by exposure to latanoprost acid, a common metabolite of both latanoprostene bunod and latanoprost. Latanoprost acid has not been found to have any effect on male or female fertility in animal studies.

13.2 Animal Toxicology and/or Pharmacology
A 9-month toxicology study administered topical ocular doses of latanoprostene bunod to one eye of cynomolgus monkeys: control (vehicle only), one drop of 0.024% bid, one drop of 0.04% bid and two drops of 0.04% per dose, bid. The systemic exposure was equivalent to 4.2-fold, 7.9-fold, and 13.5-fold the clinical dose, respectively, on a body surface area basis (assuming 100% absorption). Microscopic evaluation of the lungs after 9 months observed pleural/subpleural chronic fibrosis/inflammation in the 0.04% dose male groups, with increasing incidence and severity compared to controls. Lung toxicity was not observed at the 0.024% dose.

Distributed by:
Bausch + Lomb, a division of Valeant Pharmaceuticals North America LLC
Bridgewater, NJ 08807 USA
U.S. Patent Numbers: 6,211,233; 7,273,946; 7,629,345; 7,910,767; 8,058,467.
VYZULTA is a trademark of Bausch & Lomb Incorporated or its affiliates.
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test. This is an outdated and antiquated method yielding unreliable results.

We are capable of better and equipped with telemonitoring technologies to provide us with highly effective way to detect wet AMD earlier. Conducting a highly sensitive, objective test in the convenience of a patient’s home is a reasonable and necessary option to preserve vision. Simply put, telemonitoring offers at-risk patients a viable alternative to daily office visits.

Several technologies currently exist. Mobile visual technology such as the FDA-cleared Paxos (DigitSight Technologies) and mVT App (Vital Art and Science LLC) offer a visual monitoring solution, and the ForeseeHome (Notal Vision) testing device has definitively proven efficacy in early disease detection.

The AREDS2 HOME Study compared outcomes between patients using the Amsler grid and the ForeseeHome device and Amsler grid. Ninety-four percent who converted to wet AMD maintained ≥20/40 compared with 64% of patients using other methods. The disparity in outcomes between ForeseeHome and the current standard of care was so significant that the Data Safety and Monitoring Committee terminated the study early so that all patients could have access to this sight-preserving technology. The ForeseeHome device is covered by Medicare for patients with 20/60 or better visual acuity and intermediate dry AMD.

WHAT PATIENTS DO WE NEED TO MONITOR MORE CLOSELY?

A simplified risk scoring system was developed by the AREDS Research Group that assigns one risk factor for the presence of one or more large drusen and one risk factor for the presence of any pigment abnormality. The risk factors are then summed across both eyes. Three risk factors represent a 25% risk of develop-
Patients who start with better vision have the best outcomes, and conversely, patients who start with poor vision end up with poor outcomes.

be to monitor these patients more closely, with objective monitoring technologies.

For the sake of simplicity, the patients to whom you recommend an AREDS2-formulated vitamin are most likely candidates for intensive home monitoring. Many of these patients are Medicare patients and fortunately for them, ForeseeHome is covered as long as the patient has intermediate AMD and best-corrected visual acuity of 20/60 or better.

**References:**


**Novartis to spin off Alcon**

**NOVARTIS HAS ANNOUNCED** plans to spin off Alcon into a separately traded, stand-alone company.

If shareholders approve the move, Novartis will continue to operate the ophthalmic drug business while Alcon will focus on surgical and vision care. The move, expected to close in early 2019, will leave Novartis entirely as a prescription-medicine company.

The split will enable both companies to “focus fully on their respective growth strategies,” according to a Novartis press release.

In a call with reporters, Novartis’ CEO Vas Narasimhan, MD, explained his decision to spin off Alcon. In a rapidly-evolving technological landscape, Narasimhan said, Novartis needs to concentrate its capital on the use of digital technology.

After struggling with flat sales for several years, Alcon was reorganized in January 2016 and put under strategic review a year later. The division has recently shown signs of a turnaround, however.

“Alcon has returned to a position of strength and it is time to give the business more flexibility to pursue its own growth strategy,” said Narasimhan, a Harvard-trained doctor who assumed the role of Novartis’ CEO earlier this year.

Mike Ball will become chairman-designate of Alcon, tasked with prepping the company for the split. Alcon COO David Endicott will be promoted to Alcon CEO. Both appointments were effective July 1.
ILUVIEN® is a CONTINUOUS MICRODOSING™ Delivery System specifically engineered for the treatment of DME in patients who have been previously treated with a course of corticosteroids and did not have a clinically significant rise in intraocular pressure.

In pivotal studies, ILUVIEN demonstrated efficacy in visual acuity through 24 months (primary endpoint), which was sustained for up to 36 months.1,2,3

Adverse reactions in the ILUVIEN Phase 3 clinical trials were consistent with other corticosteroid treatments.1

INDICATION
ILUVIEN® (fluocinolone acetonide intravitreal implant) 0.19 mg is indicated for the treatment of diabetic macular edema (DME) in patients who have been previously treated with a course of corticosteroids and did not have a clinically significant rise in intraocular pressure.

IMPORTANT SAFETY INFORMATION

Contraindications
• ILUVIEN is contraindicated in patients with active or suspected ocular or periorcular infections including most viral diseases of the cornea and conjunctiva including active epithelial herpes simplex keratitis (dendritic keratitis), vaccinia, varicella, mycobacterial infections and fungal diseases.
• ILUVIEN is contraindicated in patients with glaucoma who have cup to disc ratios of greater than 0.8.
• ILUVIEN is contraindicated in patients with known hypersensitivity to any components of this product.

Warnings and Precautions
• Intravitreal injections, including those with ILUVIEN, have been associated with endophthalmitis, eye inflammation, increased intraocular pressure, and retinal detachments. Patients should be monitored following the intravitreal injection.
• Use of corticosteroids including ILUVIEN may produce posterior subcapsular cataracts, increased intraocular pressure and glaucoma. Use of corticosteroids may enhance the establishment of secondary ocular infections due to bacteria, fungi, or viruses. Corticosteroids are not recommended to be used in patients with a history of ocular herpes simplex because of the potential for reactivation of the viral infection.
• Patients in whom the posterior capsule of the lens is absent or has a tear are at risk of implant migration into the anterior chamber.

Adverse Reactions
• In controlled studies, the most common adverse reactions reported were cataract development (ILUVIEN 82%, sham 50%) and intraocular pressure elevation of ≥10 mm Hg (ILUVIEN 34%, sham 10%).
BRIEF SUMMARY OF FULL PRESCRIBING INFORMATION

ILUVIEN® (fluocinolone acetonide intravitreal implant) 0.19 mg
For Intravitreal Injection

INDICATIONS AND USAGE

ILUVIEN® (fluocinolone acetonide intravitreal implant) 0.19 mg is indicated for the treatment of diabetic macular edema in patients who have been previously treated with a course of corticosteroids and did not have a clinically significant rise in intraocular pressure.

CONTRAINDICATIONS

Ocular or Periocular Infections: ILUVIEN® is contraindicated in patients with active or suspected ocular or periocular infections, including most viral diseases of the cornea and conjunctiva including active epithelial herpes simplex keratitis (dendritic keratitis), vaccinia, varicella, mycobacterial infections and fungal diseases.

Glaucoma: ILUVIEN® is contraindicated in patients with glaucoma, who have cup to disc ratios of greater than 0.8.

Hypersensitivity: ILUVIEN® is contraindicated in patients with known hypersensitivity to any components of this product.

WARNINGS AND PRECAUTIONS

Intravitreal Injection-related Effects: Intravitreal injections, including those with ILUVIEN®, have been associated with endophthalmitis, eye inflammation, increased intraocular pressure, and retinal detachments. Patients should be monitored following the intravitreal injection.

Steroid-related Effects: Use of corticosteroids including ILUVIEN® may produce posterior subcapsular cataracts, increased intraocular pressure and glaucoma. Use of corticosteroids may enhance the establishment of secondary ocular infections due to bacteria, fungi, or viruses. Corticosteroids are not recommended to be used in patients with a history of ocular herpes simplex because of the potential for reactivation of the viral infection.

Risk of Implant Migration: Patients in whom the posterior capsule of the lens is absent or has a tear are at risk of implant migration into the anterior chamber.

ADVERSE REACTIONS

Clinical Studies Experience: Because clinical trials are conducted under widely varying conditions, adverse reaction rates observed in the clinical trials of a drug cannot be directly compared to rates in the clinical trials of another drug and may vary in varying conditions, adverse reaction rates observed in the clinical trials of a drug cannot reflect the rates observed in practice. Because they are reported voluntarily, estimates of frequency cannot be made. The reactions, which have been chosen for inclusion due to either their seriousness, frequency of reporting, possible causal connection to ILUVIEN®, or a combination of these factors, include reports of drug administration error and reports of the drug being ineffective.

Table 1: Ocular Adverse Reactions Reported by ≥1% of Patients and Non-ocular Adverse Reactions Reported by ≥5% of Patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverse Reactions</th>
<th>ILUVIEN (N=375) n (%)</th>
<th>Sham (N=185) n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ocular</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataract1</td>
<td>192/235* (82%)</td>
<td>61/121* (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myopia</td>
<td>80 (21%)</td>
<td>17 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye pain</td>
<td>57 (15%)</td>
<td>25 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctival haemorrhage</td>
<td>50 (13%)</td>
<td>21 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posterior capsule opacification</td>
<td>35 (9%)</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye irritation</td>
<td>30 (8%)</td>
<td>11 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitreous detachment</td>
<td>26 (7%)</td>
<td>12 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctivitis</td>
<td>14 (4%)</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corneal oedema</td>
<td>13 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign body sensation in eyes</td>
<td>12 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye ptosis</td>
<td>10 (3%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocular hyperaemia</td>
<td>10 (3%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optic atrophy</td>
<td>9 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocular discomfort</td>
<td>8 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photophobia</td>
<td>7 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retinal edulutes</td>
<td>7 (2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anterior chamber cell</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye discharge</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes cataract, cataract nuclear, subcapsular cataract cortical and cataract diabetic in patients who were phakic at baseline. Among these patients, 80% of ILUVIEN® subjects vs. 27% of sham-controlled subjects underwent cataract surgery.

2 235 of the 375 ILUVIEN® subjects were phakic at baseline; 121 of 185 sham-controlled subjects were phakic at baseline.

Increased Intraocular Pressure

Table 2: Summary of Elevated IOP-related Adverse Reactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>ILUVIEN (N=375) n (%)</th>
<th>Sham (N=185) n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-ocular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOP elevation ≥10 mm Hg from baseline</td>
<td>127 (34%)</td>
<td>18 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOP elevation ≥30 mm Hg</td>
<td>75 (20%)</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any IOP-lowering medication</td>
<td>144 (38%)</td>
<td>26 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any surgical intervention for elevated intraocular pressure</td>
<td>18 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Mean IOP during the study

Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverse Reactions</th>
<th>ILUVIEN (N=375) n (%)</th>
<th>Sham (N=185) n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-ocular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemia</td>
<td>40 (11%)</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headache</td>
<td>33 (9%)</td>
<td>11 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal failure</td>
<td>32 (9%)</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumonia</td>
<td>28 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes cataract, cataract nuclear, subcapsular cataract cortical and cataract diabetic in patients who were phakic at baseline. Among these patients, 80% of ILUVIEN® subjects vs. 27% of sham-controlled subjects underwent cataract surgery.

2 235 of the 375 ILUVIEN® subjects were phakic at baseline; 121 of 185 sham-controlled subjects were phakic at baseline.

Cataracts and Cataract Surgery

At baseline, 235 of the 375 ILUVIEN® subjects were phakic; 121 of 185 sham-controlled subjects were phakic. The incidence of cataract development in patients who had a phakic study eye was higher in the ILUVIEN® group (82%) compared with sham (50%). The median time of cataract being reported as an adverse event was approximately 12 months in the ILUVIEN® group and 19 months in the sham group. Among these patients, 80% of ILUVIEN® subjects vs. 27% of sham-controlled subjects underwent cataract surgery, generally within the first 18 months (Median Month 15 for both ILUVIEN® group and for sham) of the studies.

Postmarketing Experience: The following reactions have been identified during postmarketing use of ILUVIEN® in clinical practice. Because they are reported voluntarily, estimates of frequency cannot be made. The reactions, which have been chosen for inclusion due to either their seriousness, frequency of reporting, possible causal connection to ILUVIEN®, or a combination of these factors, include reports of drug administration error and reports of the drug being ineffective.

USE IN SPECIFIC POPULATIONS

Pregnancy: Pregnancy Category C.

There are no adequate and well-controlled studies of ILUVIEN® in pregnant women. Animal reproduction studies have not been conducted with fluocinolone acetonide. Corticosteroids have been shown to be teratogenic in laboratory animals when administered systemically at relatively low dosage levels. ILUVIEN® should be used during pregnancy only if the potential benefit justifies the potential risk to the fetus.

Nursing Mothers: Systemically administered corticosteroids are present in human milk and can suppress growth and interfere with endogenous corticosteroid production. The systemic concentration of fluocinolone acetonide following intravitreal treatment with ILUVIEN® is low. It is not known whether intravitreal treatment with ILUVIEN® could result in sufficient systemic absorption to produce detectable quantities in human milk. Exercise caution when ILUVIEN® is administered to a nursing woman.

Pediatric Use: Safety and effectiveness of ILUVIEN® in pediatric patients have not been established.

Geriatric Use: No overall differences in safety or effectiveness have been observed between elderly and younger patients.

CONTINUOUS MICRODOSING is a trademark of Alimera Sciences, Inc. ILUVIEN® is a registered trademark of Alimera Sciences, Inc. Copyright © 2018 Alimera Sciences, Inc. All rights reserved. 1-844-445-8843. Printed in USA. US-ILV-MMM-0560. 03/2018
Dr. Dell’s conclusions on maximizing functional outcomes with implantation of multifocal IOLs are based on findings from a physician-initiated multicenter study that included data from 82 patients who received the ZKB00 single-piece, diffractive aspheric +2.75 D add multifocal IOL (ZKB00; TECNIS Multifocal IOL +2.75 D, J&J Vision) in the dominant eye and either the +3.25 D add (ZLB00) or +4.0 D add (ZMB00) model of the same IOL in the non-dominant eye.

The results showed the +2.75 D/+3.25 D combination provided better near, intermediate, and distance uncorrected visual acuity (UCVA) and was associated with better overall satisfaction compared with the +2.75 D/+4.0 D approach. In addition, near UCVA in the +2.75 D/+3.25 D group surpassed that achieved in FDA registration trials evaluating bilateral implantation of the +2.75 D and +3.25 D add models, reported Dr. Dell, medical director, Dell Laser Consultants, Austin, TX.

“This prospective study was undertaken based on data showing an increase in patient satisfaction with multifocal IOLs as add powers have decreased. This may be due to lower incidences of photic phenomena, better intermediate vision, or both,” he said.

Dr. Dell’s co-investigators in the multicenter study were Farrell “Toby” Tyson, MD, Kevin L. Waltz, MD, and Jeffrey C. Whitsett, MD. Patients were eligible for participation if they had visual potential of 20/32 or better and were expected to have ≤0.5 D astigmatism postoperatively in each eye. Patients with ocular pathology known to affect VA, significant irregular astigmatism, or uncontrollable illness or disease were excluded.

Visual acuity was measured binocularly by Combining two different power aspheric diffractive multifocal IOLs in fellow eyes provides better visual performance than implanting the same power lens bilaterally, and outcomes with the mixed approach are better using a lower add IOL in the non-dominant eye, said Steven J. Dell, MD.
EDOF IOL overcomes limitations of bifocal optic design

IOL is a biconvex multifocal aspherical IOL with a progressive optic featuring three zones

By Cheryl Guttman Krader; Reviewed by Ramin Khoramnia, MD

A NOVEL EXTENDED DEPTH of focus (EDOF) IOL (Mini WELL IOL, SIFI Medtech) is providing very favorable functional and safety outcomes that correspond with a high degree of patient satisfaction, according to data collected by ophthalmologists at the University Eye Clinic Heidelberg.

“We are finding that patients implanted with the Mini WELL IOL have excellent uncorrected visual acuity at far and intermediate distances along with very good uncorrected near visual acuity and a very low incidence of photic phenomenon,” reported Ramin Khoramnia, MD, Assistant Professor of Ophthalmology, University of Heidelberg, and Head, Refractive Surgery Department, University Eye Clinic, Heidelberg, Germany.

The Mini WELL IOL is a biconvex multifocal aspherical IOL with a progressive optic featuring three zones. The central zone and a surrounding annular zone have spherical aberrations of opposite signs that create a continuous number of foci, and the external zone is a basic monofocal zone.

“The Mini WELL IOL provides quite sharp images at far and intermediate distances and near image quality is also quite good. In contrast, standard bifocal IOLs provide sharp images at far and near distances, but variable quality images at intermediate distance,” said Dr. Khoramnia.

Take-home

★ The Mini WELL IOL provides quite sharp images at far and intermediate distances and near image quality is also quite good. In contrast, standard bifocal IOLs provide sharp images at far and near distances, but variable quality images at intermediate distance.

REAL-WORLD EXPERIENCE

Dr. Khoramnia reviewed outcomes achieved at 3 months postsurgery by patients enrolled in a prospective non-randomized study conducted at the University Eye Clinic Heidelberg. Gerd U. Auffarth, MD, PhD, Professor and Chairman, Department of Ophthalmology, University of Heidelberg, is the Principal Investigator of the Study.

The analysis included data from 40 eyes of 24 patients. Their preoperative median SE was 0.50 D (range -7.75 to 4.88 D).

At 3 months, mean corrected distance visual acuity (CDVA) was 0.00 logMAR, mean distance-corrected intermediate VA measured at 80 cm was 0.04 logMAR, and mean distance corrected near VA was 0.22 logMAR.

“Defocus curves for the Mini WELL IOL also show that it provides good visual acuity over quite a large range,” Dr. Khoramnia said.

Functional near vision was also assessed through evaluation of reading performance using the Salzburg reading desk.

“We think it is very important to objectively evaluate the reading performance with presbyopia-correcting IOLs because many patients do not read at the distance that is used in clinical studies to test near visual acuity,” Dr. Khoramnia explained.

“The Salzburg reading desk calculates reading acuity while continuously measuring reading distance and speed as patients do the reading task at their preferred distance.”

The results showed the Mini WELL IOL provided excellent intermediate vision and also performed well at near. Median binocular uncorrected intermediate VA was 0.11 logMAR and median binocular uncorrected near VA was 0.13 logMAR.

Reading performance in patients implanted with the Mini WELL IOL was also investigated in the FOCUS multicenter trial in which the Heidelberg center participated. Radner reading charts were used in the FOCUS trial, and the data collected showed that about 92% of patients were able to read 0.5 logRAD print (book letter size) at a rate of at least 80 words per minute.

MINIMIZING PHOTIC PHENOMENA

Photic phenomena in patients implanted with the Mini WELL IOL were assessed using a proprietary halo and glare simulator. With this device, patients view a night driving scene and indicate whether they see any halo or glare around lights, the type of these phenomena as well as their size and intensity. The data can then be converted to numerical values for statistical analysis.

Preliminary results showed that about 50% of patients implanted with the Mini WELL IOL experienced no glare or halos at all while affected patients had only minimal problems with the photic phenomena.

“Looking at the data for the patients who reported the maximum values indicates that they did not experience much bother from glare and halos,” Dr. Khoramnia said.

RAMIN KHORAMNIA, MD
E: ramin.hhoramnia@med.uni-heidelberg.de
The International Vision Correction Research Centre at the University Eye Clinic Heidelberg receives funding support from SIFI.
Thanks to you, AcrySof® IOLs have created more memories than any other lens.

Over the last 25 years, the AcrySof® portfolio of monofocal, toric and multifocal IOLs has been chosen with confidence. Ask your Alcon representative what makes AcrySof® the most implanted lens in the world*. 

* Alcon data on file.
A MULTICOMPONENT IOL system featuring an exchangeable front optic (PreciSight Lens, InfiniteVision Optics, Strasbourg, France) is showing promise for providing a reliable, reproducible, safe, simple, and time-independent solution for achieving desired refractive outcomes after cataract surgery, said Harvey S. Uy, MD.

Outcomes in a series of 30 eyes that underwent exchange of the front optic to correct dioptric power showed the procedure was safe and effective. Prior to enhancement, all patients had MRSE > 1 D (mean 1.06 D) and < -1.0 D cylinder (mean -0.30 D). Mean logMAR uncorrected visual acuity (UDVA) prior to the enhancement was 0.19 (approximately 20/30 Snellen equivalent).

Analyses of data available from 30 eyes seen at 3 months post-enhancement showed statistically significant improvements in both mean MRSE (0.31 D) and mean logMAR UDVA of 0.02 (approximately 20/20 Snellen equivalent). There was no statistically significant change in mean cylinder. Furthermore, at 3 months, 100% of eyes had UDVA of 20/25 or better.

Additional measurements showed that the system exhibited excellent rotational stability; anterior chamber depth was unchanged after the exchange, indicating implant stability; and endothelial cell count was also unchanged. No other safety issues were observed, reported Dr. Uy, clinical associate professor of ophthalmology, University of the Philippines, and medical director, Peregrine Eye and Laser Institute in Makati, Philippines.

“The fact that a significant number of patients are dissatisfied after multifocal IOL surgery is limiting uptake of these premium lenses by cataract surgeons. The reasons for dissatisfaction among these patients include significant residual refractive error and inability to adjust to the visual disturbances caused by multifocal optics,” Dr. Uy said.

“IOL exchange can address these concerns, but surgeons face a dilemma in deciding on the timing of the surgery. If the exchange is done too early, patients may be deprived of the chance to adapt to the primarily implanted lens, but if the exchange is delayed, the procedure becomes more difficult because of capsular fibrosis. This investigational multicomponent IOL system allows IOL exchange without any time limits. It gives surgeons a safety net to provide unhappy patients with a second chance. For that reason, it can build surgeon confidence in using presbyopia-correcting IOLs and their ability to build a premium IOL practice.”

The multicomponent IOL consists of two optics that are implanted simultaneously into
FRONT OPTIC EXCHANGE

(Continued from page 24)

the capsular bag at the time of cataract surgery. The posterior base lens, which is larger than the anterior exchangeable lens, is made of hydrophobic acrylic, contains spherical power and remains fixed in the capsular bag. The exchangeable front portion is a hydrophobic acrylic lens and can feature any type of optic—multifocal, multifocal toric, aspheric, toric, telescopic—thereby allowing surgeons to address a full spectrum of refractive needs and goals through an enhancement procedure.

“... the space is maintained between the two optics after they are implanted. As capsular fibrosis occurs and the base lens becomes more fixed, exchange of the front lens becomes even easier,” Dr. Uy said.

“... If the problem is significant residual refractive error, then the front lens is exchanged for another that will correct the total power. If the front lens was a multifocal optic and the patient is intolerant of the visual symptoms or develops retina or nerve disease, the multifocal portion can be exchanged for a monofocal lens. Or, if a patient initially chose a monofocal lens and later became interested in presbyopia correction, the front optic can be exchanged for a multifocal optic.”

The system is easy to implant. The two refractive components are assembled outside the eye by affixing tabs on the front lens into bridges on the base lens. Then, the implant is injected into the eye through a 2.2 to 2.4 mm incision.

“... Eventually, a preloaded injector will be available. Thus, the primary surgery is no more complex or time-consuming than conventional cataract surgery,” Dr. Uy said.

He noted that the exchange procedure is also easy. Ophthalmic viscoelastic is injected through a hole in the front optic, causing it to lift up and helping to detach it from the base. Without any need for cutting, the front optic is removed from the eye through the original clear corneal incision using commercially available IOL forceps.

The replacement optic is injected into the eye, and its tabs are guided into the bridges on the base using modified Sinskey hooks.

“The exchange generally takes less than 5 minutes to complete,” Dr. Uy said.

“The base lens protects the posterior capsule during the procedure and remains stable, without any change in axis, which establishes the feasibility of a toric IOL platform.”

MIXED POWERS

(Continued from page 21)

a masked observer and under photopic conditions at far and intermediate distances and mesopic conditions for near. At 3 months, distance UCVA of 20/25 or better was achieved by 95% of patients in the +2.75/+3.25 D group and 83% of patients in the +2.75/+4.0 D group, while 20% of patients in the +2.75/+3.25 D group achieved 20/16 UCVA compared with only 8% of the +2.75/+4.0 D patients. The proportion of patients achieving distance UCVA of 20/20 or better in the +2.75/+3.25 D group was also comparable to that recorded in the FDA studies of the +2.75 D and +3.25 D add models and higher than that achieved in the FDA study of the +4.0 D add version.

Intermediate UCVA of 20/40 or better, 20/20 or better, and 20/16 or better was achieved by 93%, 22%, and 7% of patients, respectively, in the +2.75/+3.25 D group, and by 81%, 16%, and 0%, of patients, respectively, in the +2.75/+4.0 D group.

Near UCVA was 20/20 or better in 49% of patients in the +2.75/+3.25 D group, but in only 22% of patients implanted with the +2.75/+4.0 D combination. In the FDA trials where data were recorded at 6 months, only 25% of patients with bilateral implantation of the +2.75 D add multifocal IOL and only 35% of those receiving the +3.25 D add multifocal IOL bi-laterally achieved 20/20 or better near UCVA.

If the problem is significant residual refractive error, then the front lens is exchanged for another that will correct the total power. If the front lens was a multifocal optic and the patient is intolerant of the visual symptoms or develops retina or nerve disease, the multifocal portion can be exchanged for a monofocal lens. Or, if a patient initially chose a monofocal lens and later became interested in presbyopia correction, the front optic can be exchanged for a multifocal optic.”

The system is easy to implant. The two refractive components are assembled outside the eye by affixing tabs on the front lens into bridges on the base lens. Then, the implant is injected into the eye through a 2.2 to 2.4 mm incision.

“... Eventually, a preloaded injector will be available. Thus, the primary surgery is no more complex or time-consuming than conventional cataract surgery,” Dr. Uy said.

He noted that the exchange procedure is also easy. Ophthalmic viscoelastic is injected through a hole in the front optic, causing it to lift up and helping to detach it from the base. Without any need for cutting, the front optic is removed from the eye through the original clear corneal incision using commercially available IOL forceps.

The replacement optic is injected into the eye, and its tabs are guided into the bridges on the base using modified Sinskey hooks.

“The exchange generally takes less than 5 minutes to complete,” Dr. Uy said.

“The base lens protects the posterior capsule during the procedure and remains stable, without any change in axis, which establishes the feasibility of a toric IOL platform.”

We were also surprised to see very few reports of halos at 3 months with any of the IOLs. The rates were higher at 1 month, but halos were often resolved by 3 months and in no case did a patient describe the halos as severe,” Dr. Dell said.

Response to a question asking whether the patient would recommend implantation of the IOLs received also favored the +2.75/+3.25 D combination—100% of patients in that group said they would make the recommendation compared with just 91% of patients implanted with the +2.75/+4.0 D add IOLs.

“We were also surprised to see very few reports of halos at 3 months with any of the IOLs. The rates were higher at 1 month, but halos were often resolved by 3 months and in no case did a patient describe the halos as severe,” Dr. Dell said.

Response to a question asking whether the patient would recommend implantation of the IOLs received also favored the +2.75/+3.25 D combination—100% of patients in that group said they would make the recommendation compared with just 91% of patients implanted with the +2.75/+4.0 D add IOLs.
Presbyopia-correcting IOLs vary in performance profiles

In one study, small aperture IOLs stand out for intermediate vergence and patient satisfaction

By Cheryl Guttman Krader

FINDINGS from a retrospective comparison of data from prospective studies of presbyopia-correcting IOLs highlight the performance similarities and differences of different technologies.

Undertaken by Jay S. Pepose, MD, PhD, the review included evaluations of defocus curves, visual acuity (VA) outcomes, contrast sensitivity tests, and patient-reported symptoms for an accommodating IOL (Crystallens AO, Bausch + Lomb), a diffractive bifocal IOL with a +3.0 D near add (AcrySof ReSTOR +3.0 D, Alcon), a +4.0 D near add diffractive bifocal IOL (Tecnis +4.0 D Multifocal IOL; J&J Vision), and a small aperture IOL had a continuous range of functional vision and the accommodating IOL in the fellow eye. The other three IOLs had been studied in a trial that included 22 to 26 patients who underwent binocular implantation with the same IOL in both eyes.

“The results show that all four IOLs perform well for providing good uncorrected distance vision, and they have comparable binocular mesopic contrast sensitivity results,” said Dr. Pepose, Director, Pepose Vision Institute, and Professor of Clinical Ophthalmology, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, MO.

“The bifocal IOLs perform best at near, while the small aperture IOL stands out for having a wide range of continuous functional vision and the best performance at intermediate.”

The defocus curves showed that the small aperture IOL had a continuous range of functional vision (20/40 or better) of approximately 4.5 D in binocular testing and approximately 4.0 D in monocular testing of the implanted eye. The functional range of vision was approximately 2.5 D for the accommodating IOL and was non-continuous for the bifocal IOLs: 4.5 D for the +3.0 D add IOL, and 4.0 D for the +4.0 D add IOL.

“The accommodating and small aperture IOLs do best at the intermediate vergence whereas the bifocals provide better near vision,” Dr. Pepose said.

Uncorrected distance VA was measured at 4 m for the small aperture IOL and at 6 m for the other implants using ETDRS charts. Across the four IOLs, mean uncorrected distance VA (Snellen equivalent) was between 20/21 and 20/26.

Uncorrected intermediate VA was measured at 67 cm for the small aperture IOL and at 80 cm for the other implants. In monocular testing, mean uncorrected intermediate VA for the small aperture and accommodating IOLs was 20/24 and 20/23, respectively, and about 2 lines better than that of the bifocal IOLs; the differences between groups were statistically significant.

Uncorrected near VA was measured at 40 cm for all IOLs. The mean value was best for the +3.0 D add bifocal IOL (20/20), similar for the small aperture and +4.0 D add bifocal IOLs (20/30 and 20/31, respectively), and worst for the accommodating IOL (20/36). The differences comparing the small aperture and +4.0 D bifocal IOL with the +3.0 D bifocal IOL and the accommodating IOL were statistically significant.

In binocular mesopic contrast sensitivity testing with and without glare, the four IOL groups had similar results with a few exceptions noted in a few comparisons at lower spatial frequencies.

severity scores for blurry vision, fluctuating vision, and ghosting were low in all IOL groups. When comparing the various groups, the most remarkable differences were a very low score for ghosting in the small aperture IOL group, higher scores for halo in the bifocal IOL groups compared with the other two IOLs, and a higher score for glare with the +4.0 D add bifocal IOL. Patients in the small aperture IOL study were also asked if they would have the same procedure again. The data showed a very high satisfaction rate with 95% of patients responding “yes”. “Pairing the small aperture inlay with a low myopic refractive target (-0.75D) further enhances uncorrected near vision with minimal impact on distance, given the nature of small aperture optics,” said Dr. Pepose.

Dr. Pepose stated that the review was done to establish baseline metrics and that comparisons between IOLs must be done carefully recognizing that the data came from different studies.

“This is not a true prospective head-to-head comparison of the four lenses. The studies varied in their methods, including distances for VA testing and choice of patient-reported outcome tools and rating scales. In addition, the monocular and binocular defocus curve data for the small aperture IOL are from different study cohorts,” he said.

JAY S. PEPOSE, MD, PHD
jpepose@peposevision.com
This article is based on a paper presented by Dr. Pepose at the 2018 ASCRS Symposium. Dr. Pepose is an advisor to AcuFocus, Bausch + Lomb, and AllVision.
Comprehending pseudophakic visual quality complaints

Understand what patients mean when they are 20/20 but also unhappy with their vision

By Daniel H. Chang, MD

WITH MODERN presbyopia-correcting IOLs, patients are generally quite happy with their quality of vision after surgery. Nevertheless, some patients are unhappy even with Snellen visual acuity of 20/20 or better. While it may sometimes be tempting to dismiss these patients as unreasonable or “crazy,” understanding what makes these patients dissatisfied even with good Snellen visual is important for their proper management.

When using presbyopia-correcting IOLs, I always evaluate patients after the first eye is done before proceeding to the second eye. This way, I can address any potential visual quality and function issues prior to committing to the second eye. If a patient says things are “blurry,” I first make sure that they are describing their best-corrected visual acuity in the pseudophakic eye. If they are still wearing old glasses or if they are being distracted by their cataractous eye, then proceeding with the second eye surgery makes sense. However, if they are indeed unhappy about the vision in the operative eye, I have them describe their symptoms in more detail.

Dissatisfaction with vision in spite of good Snellen acuity can be grouped into two primary causes: issues of edge-contrast (visual quality) and night vision symptoms (dysphotopsias). I distinguish these two categories by having patients describe the situation(s) in which they are unhappy with their vision. If their complaints are related to the sharpness of letters when looking at an eye chart, the issue is visual quality. If their complaints are primarily related to what they see around lights at night, the issue is dysphotopsia. In both cases, I try to correlate their descriptions with what I know is going on optically with the lens implant and eye.

**VISUAL QUALITY: WHAT HAPPENS AT THE EDGE**

Visual acuity is dependent on the ability to distinguish the edges of an optotype (such as an E on the eye chart). Both contrast (the difference in intensity between the background and the foreground) and brightness (light) help us to discern the edges. In an ideal situation, contrast and brightness are both at 100%, and there is no blur, providing a nice, sharp optotype and a high-quality visual experience (Fig 1).

Contrast and lighting are related. In the example above, when the light is dimmed, the optotype remains black while the background becomes white, so there is a corresponding reduction of intensity difference between foreground and background (Fig 2b). If lighting is dimmed in a low contrast state, the effect is compounded, and the optotype becomes even more difficult to see (Fig 2c). In general, if a patient is having trouble with contrast, the simplest thing to do is to turn up the light.

Blur can be thought of as a spreading of the transition between foreground and background (Fig 3). Instead of a sharp transition from black to white, the edge transition of the optotype becomes more gradual (Fig 3a, b, and c). Increasing illumination can help to some degree, but magnifying the object (e.g., by moving it closer) makes it easier to see (Fig 4a, b, and c).

Other times a patient might say the letter it-

**take-home**

Dissatisfaction with vision in spite of good Snellen acuity can be grouped into two primary causes: issues of edge-contrast (visual quality) and night vision symptoms (dysphotopsias).

*Continues on page 30: 20/20 complaints*
self is sharp but there’s a “glow” or a “shadow” or “fuzziness” around it (Fig 5). This can occur in patients with multifocal IOLs or even extended-depth-of-focus (EDOF) IOLs. Since there is a sharp edge present, patients with these symptoms typically have good visual acuity and function and basically need reassurance and time for neuroadaptation. Even in a discerner, Type A patient, the process of neuroadaptation can take several months, rarely needing an IOL exchange for improvement.

With any of these manifestations of “blurry” vision, one should always look for possible secondary causes such as residual refractive error, dry eye, posterior capsular opacification (PCO), and cystoid macular edema.

**DYSPHOTOPSIAS:**
**VISION IN THE DARK**

Another reason that patients might be unhappy with objectively 20/20 vision is dissatisfaction with the quality of vision at night. Dysphotopsias are the result of out-of-focus light hitting the retina. Whether from ocular aberrations, lenticular light scatter, or pseudoaccommodating IOLs, dysphotopsias vary greater in brightness and appearance. For clinical trials, the FDA classifies dysphotopsias into three distinct categories: glare/flare; halo; and starburst. Each of these has a different appearance to the patient and occurs for different optical reasons (Fig 6).

Glares or flares, which may also be described as smearing or blur around the point source of light, can be due to refractive error, ocular surface problems, PCO, and nuclear cataracts;
and it is less likely to be directly associated with any particular IOL optics.

Halo, or a ring around the point source of light, is common with multifocal IOLs. These lenses have two focal points, which can be seen on a defocus curve as two peaks. Between the two peaks, there is a drop-off in energy distribution in the intermediate range. That dip in the defocus curve correlates with a dip in off-axis light, or the gap between the center and the ring in the halo. The size of the halo is related to add power, with larger halos associated with higher add powers.

Starbursts may be described by patients as streaks or rays of light emanating from the point source. These can occur with refractive error, ocular surface problems, posterior capsular folds/PCO, or diffractive IOLs.

Dysphotopsias can also occur in different forms and/or combinations (Fig 7). When looking at illustrations of dysphotopsias, it is important to recognize that the ability to represent dysphotopsias in a picture is limited by the contrast of the paper or display on which we view at the illustration. With only 256 levels of gray, our digital images are a far cry from the contrast ratios relevant to night vision, which can be greater than 1:1,000,000.

As new presbyopia-correcting IOLs become available, the differences in optics and design mean new trade-offs between depth of focus and dysphotopsias. For example, while diffractive multifocal IOLs can produce a single bright halo, diffractive EDOF IOL patients tend to describe starbursts and multiple fine concentric halos that produce a “spiderweb” effect. Overall, I have seen greatly reduced night vision complaints with EDOF IOLs as compared to multifocal IOLs, but I foster this with appropriate preoperative counseling.

**CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, whether it’s visual quality or dysphotopsias, we have much more to learn about how our presbyopia-correcting IOL patients’ visual experiences correlate to our traditional clinical testing results. Instead of shunning patients with visual quality complaints following implantation of these lenses, we should embrace the opportunity to learn from their symptoms not only for how best to manage them, but also better to counsel future patients—and to create our next generation of IOLs to correct presbyopia.

---

**Special Report » UPDATE IN IOL INNOVATION**

**FIGURE 7** While diffractive multifocal IOLs can produce a single bright halo, diffractive EDOF IOL patients tend to describe starbursts and multiple fine concentric halos that produce a “spiderweb” effect. (Photos courtesy of Daniel H. Chang, MD)

---

We have much more to learn about how our presbyopia-correcting IOL patients’ visual experiences correlate to our traditional clinical testing results.

---

**Daniel H. Chang, MD**

ph: 661/325-397
e: dchang@empireeyeandlaser.com

Dr. Chang is in private practice at Empire Eye and Laser Center in Bakersfield, CA. He is a consultant to Johnson & Johnson Vision.
Clinical vs patient-reported outcomes in premium multifocal IOL patients

Study examined residual astigmatism, quality of life

By Steve Lenier; Reviewed by Stephen J. Hannan, OD

A STUDY BY Drs. Stephen Hannan and David Teenan of Optical Express compared the effect of postoperative residual astigmatism on clinical and patient reported outcomes in patients implanted with an extended depth of focus lens (Symfony, Tecnis, Johnson & Johnson Vision), and a segmental add multifocal intraocular lens (MF20, Oculentis). The preoperative and demographic characteristics of the two groups were similar, there were no statistically significant differences (Fig. 1).

The researchers found that at three months the lenses had similar postoperative clinical and patient reported performance. However, in the group of patients who had higher levels of postoperative residual astigmatism, those in the group receiving the Symfony lens reported greater satisfaction with their quality of life and willingness to undergo the procedure again than those receiving the MF20 lens.

At three months, residual astigmatism was not different between the IOL types, and there was no significant difference in the mean change in astigmatism (Fig. 2). There was also no statistically significant difference for the overall distribution of postoperative uncorrected distance visual acuities. It’s possible some disparity or breakout may be present between the two lenses at the higher level of visual acuity, i.e. 20/16. (Fig. 3). Similarly, there was no statistically significant difference for the overall distribution of postoperative uncorrected near visual acuities, with some disparity or breakout possibly present between the two lenses at the higher level, i.e. N6.

Overall, there was almost no difference when patients were asked if the surgery improved their quality of life. For the Symfony lens 90% responded yes, and for the MF20 lens 89% said yes. However, in patients who had higher levels of postoperative astigmatism, those who had a Symfony lens reported a greater rate of their life being improved (86%) than those with the MF20 lens (68%) (Fig 5).

The same results were seen when patients were asked if they would have the operation again, if they had it to do over. For both groups, 90% of patients said yes. But again, patients with higher levels of residual astigmatism reported a greater rate of willingness to have the procedure again if they had the Symfony lens (90%) over the MF20 lens (79%) (Fig. 6).

take-home

In a well-matched sample group, patients with higher levels of postoperative astigmatism reported a greater improvement in quality of life and a greater rate of willingness to have the procedure again if they received an extended depth of focus (Symfony, Johnson & Johnson Vision) IOL compared to patients receiving a low add multifocal (MF20, Oculentis) IOL, despite similar postoperative clinical and patient reported performance.
Patients in these two well-matched groups had similar clinical and patient reported results after three months, whether they received a Symfony IOL or an MF20 IOL. However in the group receiving the Symfony IOL, those with higher levels of residual astigmatism (> 1D), had an increased likelihood of reporting that the procedure had improved their quality of life, and would also be more willing than others to have the procedure again.

The authors pointed out that a limitation of this study is that the proportion of patients with residual astigmatism for both groups is relatively small in this dataset, approximately 5%. They said their next step is to examine a larger sample of treatment data so the subgroup with higher levels of astigmatism can be examined further.

Stephen Hannan added that with increasing patient expectation being found today, factors such as an understanding of the tolerance to low levels of residual astigmatism will play a greater role in the lens selection decisions made by clinicians.

Stephen Hannan, OD
E: stephenhannan@opticalexpress.com
This article was adapted from a presentation that Dr. Hannan presented at 2017 American Society of Cataract and Refractive Surgery meeting. Drs. Teenan and Hannan reported no financial disclosures regarding this study.
THE LATEST MEMBER of the Bausch+Lomb enVista intraocular lens family is getting rave reviews from early users. The MX60E opens in about 20 seconds compared to 2.5 minutes for previous versions as well as providing superior intermediate vision results.

“Of my first 45 patients, 97.7 percent were 20/30 uncorrected intermediate and 62 percent were 20/25,” said Dee Stephenson, MD, the first surgeon to use the enVista MX60E. “Thirty-five percent were 20/20 and 100 percent were 20/40 or better. This was in all takers, no astigmatism correction, just a monofocal IOL. It’s not a premium lens, but you could almost use it as a premium lens because it gives you such great intermediate vision. Eighty-six percent of all of my patients can read their hand-held devices without glasses.”

Dr. Stephenson reported more detailed results on a large cohort of patients at the American Society for Cataract and Refractive Surgery annual meeting in April, 2018.

The newest enVista is glistening-free, Dr. Stephenson continued, and is highly resistant to scratches created while the lens is being loaded in the injector or during insertion into the eye.

“When you see those forceps marks or scratches after the lens unfolds, you know they aren’t going away,” she said. “They can be visually impairing and you can’t do anything short of replacing the lens. This lens just doesn’t seem to scratch.”

The MX60E is the latest member of the enVista IOL family to be approved for use in the United States and to reach the market. A similar toric lens has been approved for use in the European Union. B+L is looking to include a toric offering on the same platform in the United States in the near future.

Advantages like a scratch-resistant surface and faster opening time didn’t happen by accident. B+L has been modifying the enVista platform based on surgeon feedback.

“Surgeons had three key things they wanted to have addressed by the next generation of monofocal IOLs,” explained Chuck Hess, Vice President and General Manager, US Surgical, for Bausch+Lomb. “They wanted lens technology that provided better performance from a centration and stabilization perspective. They wanted an optic that was free of glistens and scratches. And they wanted a lens that went into the eye and opened rapidly to allow them to improve efficiency. The next generation MX60E addresses all three of these shortfalls in current monofocal IOL technologies.”

Design tweaks in the MX60E provide better centration and stabilization than other IOLs, Dr. Stephenson noted. The new haptics are angulated at 56 degrees to provide total coverage of 112 degrees. enVista provides the broadest capsular contact angle of the three IOL platforms available in the US market, Mr. Hess noted. The broader contact surface increases stability within the capsule both during and after healing.

“That 110 degrees is more than half the bag, which makes this lens amazingly stable in the eye,” Dr. Stephenson said. “Even if you have a zonular weakness or a bag that isn’t perfectly centered, this lens will center very nicely, almost like it has its own CTR built into the platform. The Tecnis haptics only cover 84 total degrees and the Acrysof 88 degrees. With 110 degrees, the enVista centers very nicely almost on its own.”

The enVista also has a 360 degree square edge versus the rounded edge used by other manufacturers. The square edge does a better job preventing lens epithelial cell migration compared to other designs, Dr. Stephenson explained. The lens is aspheric and does not introduce any negative or positive dysphotopsia and the power is the same from center to edge, which provides a comfortable margin of error if the lens is less than perfectly centered.

The hydrophobic acrylic material that forms the enVista platform is 16 times harder than comparable lenses, Mr. Hess said. Designers tweaked the molecular structure of the acrylic used to eliminate the tiny voids that create glistens as the lens material absorbs moisture.

The rapid opening speed has nothing to do with visual results and everything to do with surgical efficiency. Earlier enVista lenses took about 2.5 minutes to fully open. Surgeons could reduce the opening time by warming the viscoelastic used during the insertion process, but it

‘The newest enVista lens was developed with surgeons and patients in mind to address shortcomings of current monofocal IOL platforms.’

Continues on page 35: MX60E
MPOD Measurement Approved for Category III CPT Code

THERE ARE MANY different levels and categories of medical instrumentation. As each new piece of equipment undergoes evaluation and becomes more common, the American Medical Association (AMA) assigns codes depending on where the machinery is in its research and validity journey. EyePromise® is proud to announce that macular pigment optical density (MPOD) measurement by heterochromatic flicker photometry (HFP) has earned the AMA’s Category III CPT code, and it’s listed under code 0506T.

WHAT IS HFP?
Heterochromatic flicker photometry is a noninvasive diagnostic test to measure MPOD. The macular pigment is made up of zeaxanthin and lutein, and these carotenoids protect the retina and shield it from harm caused by damaging light waves known as short-wavelength, high-energy, visible blue light. Damage from blue light has been linked to the development of age-related eye health concerns, and the National Eye Institute (NEI) expects a 50% increase in these concerns in the US by 2020.

WHO SHOULD BE TESTED?
Patients at risk for developing of age-related eye health concerns are candidates for HFP, but it’s recommended to start testing patients over 21 to detect any eye health changes early. MPOD measurements are an objective tool for estimating this risk, and MPOD can improve with nutraceuticals and changes in the diet to include foods rich in lutein and zeaxanthin. Central measurement on one eye is typically the only measurement necessary to get an understanding of macular pigment health.

HOW CAN I MEASURE MPOD?
EyePromise offers HFP MPOD measurement technology with the QuantifEye® MPS II. Proven to have 97% repeatability, the instrument takes about 2-3 minutes per patient and includes intuitive technology with icon-driven menus and enhanced reporting for staff members and patients. Studies continue to show the accuracy and reliability of the QuantifEye MPS II, including:

- The Value of Measurement of Macular Carotenoid Pigment Optical Densities and Distributions in Age-Related Macular Degeneration (Bernstein, et. al.—Vision Research, 2010)
- Desktop Macular Pigment Optical Density Measurement: A New Approach Based on Heterochromatic Flicker Photometry (Berendschot, et. al.—E, volume 25)

The QuantifEye MPS II has a small footprint, taking up little space in the office and little time with the patient. With the emerging science and continued research, MPOD measurement via HFP can be one of the most modern pieces of equipment an eye care professional can have in their practice.
Pneumatic Retinopexy Performed by Vitreoretinal Fellows: A Multicenter Study

An examination of experience and success rates

Parisa Emami-Naeini, MD, MPH; Jordan Deanor, MD; Ferhina Ali, MD, MPH; Priyanka Chopra, MD; Richard Kaplan, MD; Kevin Chen, MD; Eric Nudelman, MD, PhD; Meenakashi Gupta, MD; Jeremy Wolfe, MD; Michael Klufas, MD; Glenn Yiu, MD, PhD; Special to Ophthalmology Times

BACKGROUND/PURPOSE

Pneumatic retinopexy (PR) is a minimally invasive, in-office procedure widely used for treatment of rhegmatogenous retinal detachment (RD). It is the second most common procedure performed for RD repair (after pars plana vitrectomy with or without scleral buckle). The single-procedure success rate (i.e. retinal reattachment after one PR) has been reported to be between 43.7%–93.5% with higher success rates in certain subpopulations (e.g. phakic eyes, single superior retinal break, etc.).

At academic institutions, vitreoretinal fellows commonly perform PR, which requires comparatively less supervision due to the relative simplicity of the procedure. Yet, success of the procedure depends on a myriad of factors including patient selection, examination skills, and manual dexterity that may improve with experience.

This is a multicenter study investigating the outcome of PR performed by vitreoretinal fellows from five different institutions.

METHODS

This is a retrospective, multicenter, consecutive case series of 457 eyes of 457 patients with primary RD who underwent PR by vitreoretinal fellows from 5 different institutions between 2002 and 2016. These institutes included: University of California Davis, Wills Eye Hospital, Associated Retinal Consultants (William Beaumont Hospital), New York Eye and Ear Infirmary and University of California San Diego. We included patients with a follow-up of at least 3 months. Patients with prior history of intraocular surgery (except for uncomplicated cataract extraction) were excluded from the study.

RESULTS

Forty-nine vitreoretinal fellows from five institutions performed the procedures. Number of cases per institution ranged from 14 to 198 (median 71). Each fellow performed between 1–24 procedures (median 6.5 procedures/fellow). More than half of the procedures (65.8%) were performed by the first-year fellows. There was no statistically significant difference in the pre-procedural characteristics of first- and second-year cases (i.e. age, gender, lens status, status of the macula or size of RD in clock hours).

Mean age of patients was 63.54 years (SD 10.87y) and 65.2% (298 patients) were female. Most of the patients (328, 71.8%) were phakic. RD was macula-sparing in 60.2% of patients (n=275).

Single-procedure success rate was 66.7% at 3 months. No statistically significant difference was found in outcomes of cases performed by first- or second-year fellows (P=0.21). Pseudophakic status and macular involvement at baseline were not associated with worse outcomes in this series (P>0.05).

We then categorized the cases based on the experience of the fellows performing them (i.e. number of the cases performed by each fellow).

CONCLUSION

Anatomic outcomes of PR in the hands of vitreoretinal fellows in-training compared favorably with the previously reported literature and cases performed by skilled retina specialists. Fellows performing more procedures had higher single-procedure anatomic success rate.

These results have important implications in further development, improvement and standardization of fellowship training curriculum.

**Pneumatic Retinopexy Performed by Vitreoretinal Fellows: A Multicenter Study**

**Parisa Emami-Naeini, MD, MPH; Jordan Deanor, MD; Ferhina Ali, MD, MPH; Priyanka Chopra, MD; Richard Kaplan, MD; Kevin Chen, MD; Eric Nudelman, MD, PhD; Meenakashi Gupta, MD; Jeremy Wolfe, MD; Michael Klufas, MD; Glenn Yiu, MD, PhD; Special to Ophthalmology Times**
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YOUR PARTNERS IN ANTERIOR SURGERY OUTCOMES

AL-SCAN OPTICAL BIOMETER

• 6 measurements in 10 seconds (K, AL, PS, WTW, CCT, ACD)
• Easy to use: 3-D auto tracking and auto shot for all measurements
• Toric Assist function

CEM-530 SPECULAR MICROSCOPE

• Easy to Use: 3-D auto tracking / auto shot / auto analysis
• Paracentral and Peripheral imaging for overall endothelial cell health of the cornea
• Manual Analysis function

NIDEK Inc.
47651 Westinghouse Drive
Fremont, California 94539-7474 USA
Telephone: 1-800-223-9044 • Fax: 1-510-226-5750

LEARN MORE: info@nidek.com or usa.nidek.com
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Caution: U.S. Federal Law restricts this device to sale, distribution, and use by or on the order of a physician or other licensed eye care practitioner. Specifications may vary depending on circumstances in each country. Specifications and design are subject to change without notice.
LEAVE A LEGACY OF SEAMLESS BRILLIANCE.

Start with ME.

TECNIS Symfony® and TECNIS Symfony® Toric IOLs deliver state-of-the-art presbyopia mitigation and astigmatism correction* while providing a full range of high-quality, continuous vision. I’ve never let anything keep me from seeing the big picture. Why would you?

Don’t wait to leave a legacy of seamless brilliance. Start now with TECNIS Symfony® and TECNIS Symfony® Toric Extended Depth of Focus IOLs.

*TECNIS Symfony® Toric IOLs only

INDICATIONS AND IMPORTANT SAFETY INFORMATION FOR THE TECNIS SYMFONY® AND TECNIS SYMFONY® TORIC EXTENDED RANGE OF VISION IOLs

INDICATIONS: The TECNIS Symfony® Extended Range of Vision IOL, model ZXR00, is indicated for primary implantation for the visual correction of aphakia, in adult patients with less than 1 diopter of pre-existing corneal astigmatism, in whom a cataractous lens has been removed. The lens mitigates the effects of presbyopia by providing an extended depth of focus. Compared to an aspheric monofocal IOL, the lens provides improved intermediate and near visual acuity, while maintaining comparable distance visual acuity. The model ZXR00 IOL is intended for capsular bag placement only. The TECNIS Symfony® Toric Extended Range of Vision IOLs, models ZXT150, ZXT225, ZXT300, and ZXT375, are indicated for primary implantation for the visual correction of aphakia and for reduction of residual refractive astigmatism in adult patients with greater than or equal to 1 diopter of preoperative corneal astigmatism, in whom a cataractous lens has been removed. The lens mitigates the effects of presbyopia by providing an extended depth of focus. Compared to an aspheric monofocal IOL, the lens provides improved intermediate and near visual acuity, while maintaining comparable distance visual acuity. The model series ZXT IOLs are intended for capsular bag placement only. WARNINGS: May cause a reduction in contrast sensitivity under certain conditions, compared to an aspheric monofocal IOL. Inform patients to exercise special caution when driving at night or in poor visibility conditions. Some visual effects may be expected due to the lens design, including: perception of halos, glare, or starbursts around lights under nighttime conditions. These will be bothersome or very bothersome in some people, particularly in low-illumination conditions, and on rare occasions, may be significant enough that the patient may request removal of the IOL. Rotation of the TECNIS Symfony® Toric IOLs away from their intended axis can reduce their astigmatic correction, and misalignment greater than 30° may increase postoperative refractive cylinder. If necessary, lens repositioning should occur as early as possible prior to lens encapsulation. ATTENTION: Reference the Directions for Use for a complete listing of Indications and Important Safety Information.

TECNIS and TECNIS SYMFONY are trademarks of Johnson & Johnson Surgical Vision, Inc.