Introduction

These are summary benchmarks for the Academy’s Preferred Practice Pattern® (PPP) guidelines. The Preferred Practice Pattern series of guidelines has been written on the basis of three principles.

- Each Preferred Practice Pattern should be clinically relevant and specific enough to provide useful information to practitioners.
- Each recommendation that is made should be given an explicit rating that shows its importance to the care process.
- Each recommendation should also be given an explicit rating that shows the strength of evidence that supports the recommendation and reflects the best evidence available.

Preferred Practice Patterns provide guidance for the pattern of practice, not for the care of a particular individual. While they should generally meet the needs of most patients, they cannot possibly best meet the needs of all patients. Adherence to these Preferred Practice Patterns will not ensure a successful outcome in every situation. These practice patterns should not be deemed inclusive of all proper methods of care or exclusive of other methods of care reasonably directed at obtaining the best results. It may be necessary to approach different patients’ needs in different ways. The physician must make the ultimate judgment about the propriety of the care of a particular patient in light of all of the circumstances presented by that patient. The American Academy of Ophthalmology is available to assist members in resolving ethical dilemmas that arise in the course of ophthalmic practice.

The Preferred Practice Pattern® guidelines are not medical standards to be adhered to in all individual situations. The Academy specifically disclaims any and all liability for injury or other damages of any kind, from negligence or otherwise, for any and all claims that may arise out of the use of any recommendations or other information contained herein.

For each major disease condition, recommendations for the process of care, including the history, physical exam and ancillary tests, are summarized, along with major recommendations for the care management, follow-up, and education of the patient. For each PPP, a detailed literature search of PubMed and the Cochrane Library for articles in the English language is conducted. The results are reviewed by an expert panel and used to prepare the recommendations, which are then given a rating that shows the strength of evidence when sufficient evidence exists.

To rate individual studies, a scale based on the Scottish Intercollegiate Guideline Network (SIGN) is used. The definitions and levels of evidence to rate individual studies are as follows:

- I++: High-quality meta-analyses, systematic reviews of randomized controlled trials (RCTs), or RCTs with a very low risk of bias
- I+: Well-conducted meta-analyses, systematic reviews of RCTs, or RCTs with a low risk of bias
- I–: Meta-analyses, systematic reviews of RCTs, or RCTs with a high risk of bias
- II++: High-quality systematic reviews of case-control or cohort studies; high-quality case-control or cohort studies with a very low risk of confounding or bias and a high probability that the relationship is causal
- II+: Well-conducted case-control or cohort studies with a low risk of confounding or bias and a moderate probability that the relationship is causal
- II–: Case-control or cohort studies with a high risk of confounding or bias and a significant risk that the relationship is not causal
- III: Nonanalytic studies (e.g., case reports, case series)

Recommendations for care are formed based on the body of the evidence. The body of evidence quality ratings are defined by Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) as follows:

- Good quality (GQ): Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect
- Moderate quality (MQ): Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate
- Insufficient quality (IQ): Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate; any estimate of effect is very uncertain
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Key recommendations for care are defined by GRADE as follows:

• Strong recommendation (SR): Used when the desirable effects of an intervention clearly outweigh the undesirable effects or clearly do not

• Discretionary recommendation (DR): Used when the trade-offs are less certain—either because of low-quality evidence or because evidence suggests that desirable and undesirable effects are closely balanced

In PPPs prior to 2011, the panel rated recommendations according to its importance to the care process. This “importance to the care process” rating represents care that the panel thought would improve the quality of the patient’s care in a meaningful way. The ratings of importance are divided into three levels.

• Level A, defined as most important

• Level B, defined as moderately important

• Level C, defined as relevant but not critical

The panel also rated each recommendation on the strength of evidence in the available literature to support the recommendation made. The “ratings of strength of evidence” also are divided into three levels.

• Level I includes evidence obtained from at least one properly conducted, well-designed randomized controlled trial. It could include meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials.

• Level II includes evidence obtained from the following:
  • Well-designed controlled trials without randomization
  • Well-designed cohort or case-control analytic studies, preferably from more than one center
  • Multiple-time series with or without the intervention

• Level III includes evidence obtained from one of the following:
  • Descriptive studies
  • Case reports
  • Reports of expert committees/organizations (e.g., PPP panel consensus with external peer review)

This former approach, however, will eventually be phased out as the AAO adopted the SIGN and GRADE rating and grading systems.

The PPPs are intended to serve as guides in patient care, with greatest emphasis on technical aspects. In applying this knowledge, it is essential to recognize that true medical excellence is achieved only when skills are applied in such a manner that the patients’ needs are the foremost consideration. The AAO is available to assist members in resolving ethical dilemmas that arise in the course of practice. (AAO Code of Ethics)
Keratorefractive Surgery (Initial and Follow-up Evaluation)

Initial Exam History
- Present status of visual function
- Ocular history
- Systemic history
- Medications

Initial Physical Exam
- Distance visual acuity with and without correction
- Manifest, and when appropriate, cycloplegic refraction
- Computerized corneal topography/tomography
- Central corneal thickness measurement
- Evaluation of tear film and ocular surface
- Evaluation of ocular motility and alignment

Care Management
- Discontinue contact lenses before preoperative exam and procedure
- Inform patient of the potential risks, benefits, and alternatives to and among the different refractive procedures
- Document informed consent process; patient should be given an opportunity to have all questions answered before surgery
- Check and calibrate instrumentation before the procedure
- Surgeon confirms the identity of the patient, the operative eye, and that the parameters are correctly entered into the laser’s computer

Postoperative Care
- Operating surgeon is responsible for postoperative management
- For surface ablation techniques, examination on the day following surgery is advisable and every 2 to 3 days thereafter until the epithelium is healed
- For uncomplicated LASIK, examine within 36 hours following surgery, a second visit 1 to 4 weeks post-operatively, and further visits thereafter as appropriate
- Provide patients with a record or that the ophthalmologist maintains a record that lists the patient’s eye condition, including preoperative keratometry readings and refraction, as well as stable postoperative refractions, so that it will be available if the patient requires cataract surgery or additional eye care

Patient Education
Discuss the risks and benefits of the planned procedure with the patient. Elements of the discussion include the following:
- Range of expected refractive outcomes
- Residual refractive error
- Reading and/or distance correction postoperatively
- The limitations of keratorefractive surgery with respect to presbyopia and the potential loss of uncorrected near visual function that accompanies myopia correction
- Monovision advantages and disadvantages (for patients of presbyopic age)
- Loss of best-corrected visual acuity
- Side effects and complications (e.g., microbial keratitis, sterile keratitis, keratectasia)
- Changes in visual function not necessarily measured by visual acuity testing, including glare and function under low-light conditions
- Night vision symptoms (e.g., glare, haloes) developing or worsening; careful consideration should be given to this issue for patients with high degrees of ametropia or for individuals who require a high level of visual function in low-light conditions
- Effect on ocular alignment
- Development or exacerbation of dry eye symptoms
- Recurrent erosion syndrome
- Advantages and disadvantages of same-day bilateral keratorefractive surgery versus sequential surgery. Because vision might be poor for some time after bilateral same-day photorefractive keratectomy, the patient should be informed that activities such as driving might not be possible for weeks.
- Possibility that it may influence predictive accuracy of IOL calculations for subsequent cataract surgery
- Postoperative care plans (setting of care, providers of care)
- Loss of uncorrected near vision in myopic presbyopes