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Indications and Usage
BromSite® (bromfenac ophthalmic solution) 0.075% is a nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) indicated for the treatment of postoperative inflammation and prevention of ocular pain in patients undergoing cataract surgery.

Recommended Dosing
One drop of BromSite® should be applied to the affected eye twice daily (morning and evening) 1 day prior to surgery, the day of surgery, and 14 days postsurgery.

Important Safety Information
- **Slow or Delayed Healing:** All topical nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), including BromSite®, may slow or delay healing. Topical corticosteroids are also known to slow or delay healing. Concomitant use of topical NSAIDs and topical steroids may increase the potential for healing problems.
- **Potential for Cross-Sensitivity:** There is the potential for cross-sensitivity to acetylsalicylic acid, phenylacetic acid derivatives, and other NSAIDs, including BromSite®.

Therefore, caution should be used when treating individuals who have previously exhibited sensitivities to these drugs.

- **Increased Bleeding Time of Ocular Tissue:** With some NSAIDs, including BromSite®, there exists the potential for increased bleeding time due to interference with platelet aggregation. There have been reports that ocularly applied NSAIDs may cause increased bleeding of ocular tissues (including hyphemas) in conjunction with ocular surgery. It is recommended that BromSite® be used with caution in patients with known bleeding tendencies or who are receiving other medications which may prolong bleeding time.
- **Keratitis and Corneal Effects:** Use of topical NSAIDs may result in keratitis. In some susceptible patients, continued use of topical NSAIDs may result in epithelial breakdown, corneal thinning, corneal erosion, corneal ulceration or corneal perforation. Patients with evidence...
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Defend against ocular pain and combat postoperative inflammation with the penetrating power of BromSite® formulated with DuraSite®

- DuraSite® increases ocular surface retention time, resulting in increased bromfenac absorption
- Provides 24-hour coverage with BID dosing
- Available in 5 mL bottle

Visit bromsite.com to find out more.

The FIRST and ONLY NSAID indicated to prevent ocular pain in cataract surgery patients

of corneal epithelial breakdown should immediately discontinue use of topical NSAIDs, including BromSite®, and should be closely monitored for corneal health. Patients with complicated ocular surgeries, corneal denervation, corneal epithelial defects, diabetes mellitus, ocular surface diseases (e.g., dry eye syndrome), rheumatoid arthritis, or repeat ocular surgeries within a short period of time may be at increased risk for corneal adverse events which may become sight threatening. Topical NSAIDs should be used with caution in these patients. Post-marketing experience with topical NSAIDs also suggests that use more than 24 hours prior to surgery or use beyond 14 days postsurgery may increase patient risk for the occurrence and severity of corneal adverse events.

- Contact Lens Wear: BromSite® should not be administered while wearing contact lenses. The preservative in BromSite®, benzalkonium chloride, may be absorbed by soft contact lenses.

- Adverse Reactions: The most commonly reported adverse reactions in 1% to 8% of patients were anterior chamber inflammation, headache, vitreous floaters, iritis, eye pain, and ocular hypertension.

Please see brief summary of Full Prescribing Information on the adjacent page.


Sun Ophthalmics is a division of Sun Pharmaceutical Industries, Inc. © 2017 Sun Pharmaceutical Industries, Inc. All rights reserved. BromSite and DuraSite are registered trademarks of Sun Pharma Global FZE.

© 2017 Sun Pharmaceutical Industries, Inc. All rights reserved.
BromSite® (bromfenac ophthalmic solution) 0.075%

Brief Summary

INDICATIONS AND USAGE
BromSite® (bromfenac ophthalmic solution) 0.075% is indicated for the treatment of postoperative inflammation and prevention of ocular pain in patients undergoing cataract surgery.

CONTRAINDICATIONS
None

WARNINGS AND PRECAUTIONS
Slow or Delayed Healing
All topical nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), including BromSite® (bromfenac ophthalmic solution) 0.075%, may slow or delay healing. Topical corticosteroids are also known to slow or delay healing. Concomitant use of topical NSAIDs and topical steroids may increase the potential for healing problems.

Potential for Cross-Sensitivity
There is the potential for cross-sensitivity to acetylsalicylic acid, phenylacetic acid derivatives, and other NSAIDs, including BromSite® (bromfenac ophthalmic solution) 0.075%. Therefore, caution should be used when treating individuals who have previously exhibited sensitivities to these drugs.

Increased Bleeding Time of Ocular Tissue
With some NSAIDs, including BromSite® (bromfenac ophthalmic solution) 0.075%, there exists the potential for increased bleeding time due to interference with platelet aggregation. There have been reports that ocularly applied NSAIDs may cause increased bleeding of ocular tissues (including hyphemas) in conjunction with ocular surgery. It is recommended that BromSite® be used with caution in patients with known bleeding tendencies or who are receiving other medications which may prolong bleeding time.

Keratitis and Corneal Reactions
Use of topical NSAIDs may result in keratitis. In some susceptible patients, continued use of topical NSAIDs may result in epithelial breakdown, corneal thinning, corneal erosion, corneal ulceration or corneal perforation. These events may be sight threatening. Patients with evidence of corneal epithelial breakdown should immediately discontinue use of topical NSAIDs, including BromSite® (bromfenac ophthalmic solution) 0.075%, and should be closely monitored for corneal health.

Post-marketing experience with topical NSAIDs suggests that patients with complicated ocular surgeries, corneal denervation, corneal epithelial defects, diabetes mellitus, ocular surface diseases (e.g., dry eye syndrome), rheumatoid arthritis, or repeat ocular surgeries within a short period of time may be at increased risk for corneal adverse events which may become sight threatening. Topical NSAIDs should be used with caution in these patients.

Contact Lens Wear
BromSite® should not be administered while wearing contact lenses. The preservative in BromSite®, benzalkonium chloride, may be absorbed by soft contact lenses.

ADVERSE REACTIONS
The following serious adverse reactions are described elsewhere in the Brief Summary:

- Slow or Delayed Healing
- Potential for Cross-Sensitivity
- Increased Bleeding Time of Ocular Tissue
- Keratitis and Corneal Reactions
- Contact Lens Wear

Clinical Trial 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 clinical practice.

The most commonly reported adverse reactions in 1–8% of patients were:
- anterior chamber inflammation, headache, vitreous floaters, iritis, eye pain and ocular hypertension.

USE IN SPECIFIC POPULATIONS

Pregnancy

Risk Summary
There are no adequate and well-controlled studies in pregnant women to inform any drug associated risks. Treatment of pregnant rats and rabbits with oral bromfenac did not produce teratogenic effects at clinically relevant doses.

Clinical Considerations
Because of the known effects of prostaglandin biosynthesis-inhibiting drugs on the fetal cardiovascular system (closure of ductus arteriosus), the use of BromSite® during late pregnancy should be avoided.

Data

Animal Data
Treatment of rats with bromfenac at oral doses up to 0.9 mg/kg/day (195 times a unilateral daily human ophthalmic dose on a mg/m² basis, assuming 100% absorbed) and rabbits at oral doses up to 7.5 mg/kg/day (3243 times a unilateral daily dose on a mg/m² basis) produced no structural teratogenicity in reproduction studies. However, embryo-fetal lethality, neonatal mortality and reduced postnatal growth were produced in rats at 0.9 mg/kg/day, and embryo-fetal lethality was produced in rabbits at 7.5 mg/kg/day. Because animal reproduction studies are not always predictive of human response, this drug should be used during pregnancy only if the potential benefit justifies the potential risk to the fetus.

Lactation

There are no data on the presence of bromfenac in human milk, the effects on the breastfed infant, or the effects on milk production; however, systemic exposure to bromfenac from ocular administration is low. The developmental and health benefits of breastfeeding should be considered along with the mother’s clinical need for bromfenac and any potential adverse effects on the breast-fed child from bromfenac or from the underlying maternal condition.

Pediatric Use

Safety and efficacy in pediatric patients below the age of 18 years have not been established.

Geriatric Use

There is no evidence that the efficacy or safety profiles for BromSite® differ in patients 65 years of age and older compared to younger adult patients.

NONCLINICAL TOXICOLOGY

Carcinogenesis, Mutagenesis and Impairment of Fertility

Long-term carcinogenicity studies in rats and mice given oral doses of bromfenac up to 0.6 mg/kg/day (129 times a unilateral daily dose assuming 100% absorbed on a mg/m² basis) and 5 mg/kg/day (540 times a unilateral daily dose on a mg/m² basis), respectively revealed no significant increases in tumor incidence. Bromfenac did not show mutagenic potential in various mutagenicity studies, including the bacterial reverse mutation, chromosomal aberration, and micronucleus tests. Bromfenac did not impair fertility when administered orally to male and female rats at doses up to 0.9 mg/kg/day and 0.3 mg/kg/day, respectively (195 and 65 times a unilateral daily dose, respectively, on a mg/m² basis).
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SMILE Begins to Make Inroads

Small incision lenticule extraction, or SMILE, became clinically available as an alternative to LASIK in Europe and Asia in 2012. In September 2016, it was approved for the treatment of spherical myopia by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). To date, more than 1 million SMILE procedures have been performed worldwide.1

During SMILE, the refractive surgeon uses a femtosecond (FS) laser to create a corneal lenticule, which is removed through a small incision—thus eliminating the need for one of the most iconic features of LASIK: the corneal flap.

**Slow Adoption?**

“In describing the advent of minimally invasive SMILE relative to LASIK, ophthalmologists have used the comparison of arthroscopic surgery versus open surgery,” said Jon G. Dishler, MD, who practices in the Denver area. He noted that, as in other areas of medicine, this represents a significant step forward.

Despite this apparent advantage, SMILE has experienced a slow start in the United States, Dr. Dishler acknowledged. He attributed this to the fact that U.S. approval officially covers the correction of spherical myopia only between –1 D and –8 D in eyes with –0.5 D or less of astigmatism. Elsewhere, those parameters are broader, encompassing up to –10 D of myopia and up to –6 D of astigmatism. (Dr. Dishler noted that in the United States can take place up to –10 D, though a pop-up warning will occur.) In addition, at present, only the VisuMax (Carl Zeiss Meditec) is used for SMILE.

Moreover, “as with any new technology, there is usually a period of time during which adoption takes place, and there are new skills that surgeons must learn,” Dr. Dishler said (see “Challenges and Pearls,” below). “This is probably one of the most important factors” with regard to acceptance, he said.

**Benefits**

FDA approval for compound myopic astigmatism is anticipated to take place this year, and other FS laser platforms are reportedly being adapted for SMILE.2 As the field begins to open up, U.S. surgeons who opt to consider SMILE for their practices may be interested in the perspective of early adopters.

Advantages over predecessors. Overall, “SMILE has advantages over LASIK in that there is no flap—and advantages over PRK in terms of quicker recovery time,” said Jason E. Stahl, MD, who practices in Overland Park, Kansas.

In addition to doing away with the risk for traumatic flap displacement, SMILE is thought to offer better biomechanical corneal stability than LASIK and appears to place patients at lower risk for postoperative dry eye symptoms. From a workflow standpoint, patients don’t need to be moved from 1 laser platform to another.3

SMILE also offers advantages over

---

*Originally published in April 2018.*

**LEARNING CURVE.** In an early study of outcomes, retreatment was needed in 7 cases, 6 of which were successful. However, the seventh retreatment produced irregular corneal topography (A, B) and a highly irregular corneal profile in the anterior stroma and a poorly defined SMILE interface (C).5
its immediate predecessor, FLEs (femtosecond lenticule extraction), said John F. Doane, MD, who practices in Kansas and Missouri. “Instead of a small incision, the FLEs procedure requires a large incision, creating a LASIK-type flap that has to be lifted and peeled back to reach the lenticule—and then repositioned after the lenticule is removed,” said Dr. Doane. The result: a longer recovery time than that experienced by SMILE patients.

Visual outcomes. Clinical safety and effectiveness data for SMILE submitted to the FDA demonstrated stable vision correction at 6 months, with all but 1 of the 328 participants experiencing uncorrected visual acuity (VA) of 20/40 or better, and 88% experiencing uncorrected VA of 20/20 or better.6

Patients enrolled in this study had spherical myopia in the range of −1 D to −10 D and up to −0.50 D cylinder. SMILE was performed in 1 eye, and the nonstudy eye was treated with LASIK outside the clinical study.

Postoperative complications. In a study of more than 1,500 SMILE procedures, postoperative complications included trace haze (8%), epithelial dryness on postday 1 (5%), interface inflammation secondary to central abrasion (0.3%), and minor interface infiltrates (0.3%).5 Only 1 patient experienced corrected distance VA (CDVA) difficulties at 3 months.

Long-term results. Given SMILE’s status as a relative newcomer, long-term results are somewhat limited. But in a study of patients with high myopia (45 eyes of 35 patients with mean spherical equivalent of −7.10 ± 0.95 D), 86% of eyes with plano target had an uncorrected distance VA of 20/20 or better at 2 years after SMILE. All told, 2% of eyes lost 1 line of CDVA, while 32% gained 1 line.6

And 5-year results of the first cohort of international patients to undergo the procedure found that initial outcomes proved stable, and no late complications were observed.7 CDVA improved from 0.02 (in logMAR) at 1 month postoperatively to −0.12 at 5 years, and 32 of the 56 eyes evaluated (58%) experienced a gain of 1 or 2 lines in vision. All patients were routinely treated for dry eye symptoms within the first 3 months postoperatively; after this point, none of them needed further dry eye treatment.

Challenges and Pearls

Refractive surgeons who are considering introducing SMILE into their refractive practice—described as “the leap from flap to cap”—have several challenges to consider.

Learning curve. The initial learning curve can be steep, a fact that Dr. Doane attributes to the 3-dimensional nature of the procedure.

“For example, in LASIK, you peel back a flap and have direct visualization when ablating the corneal tissue with the excimer laser,” he said. In contrast, “SMILE requires surgeons to see in 3-dimensional space, and it can get confusing if you don’t have the experience. You have to trust [that] the laser has done what you programmed it to do. After 5 to 10 cases, you start feeling comfortable.” Dr. Stahl agreed. “It is a new technique—freeing the lenticule and then extracting it.”

One practice’s experience. Dr. Stahl and his colleagues purchased the VisuMax laser in December 2016, 3 months after FDA approval. They spent the next 3 months becoming comfortable with the laser.

Initially, they made flaps to “understand the device’s unique features,” Dr. Stahl said. They also took wet lab courses to learn the procedure and viewed videos from experienced surgeons. Their first day of SMILE surgery occurred in March 2017, and their hands-on learning curve went smoothly, as the procedure became “quite easy” after a few cases, he said.

Patient selection. “Patients who are LASIK candidates are also SMILE candidates, and from a biomechanical standpoint, SMILE appears stronger. We are interrupting fewer corneal nerve fibers, which in turn may minimize dry eye,” said Dr. Doane. He added, “I have patients who had SMILE in 1 eye and LASIK in the other, and their vision on postday 1 was identical.”

“SMILE is not suitable for patients who are extremely anxious about undergoing refractive surgery or exhibit difficulty keeping their eyes open,” Dr. Dishler said, as this can contribute to loss of suction (see below). And as with
LASIK, patients with keratoconus are not good candidates for SMILE.

Potential surgical complications. These include anterior cap and side cut tears, difficult lenticule dissection, and retained lenticule fragments.4

Potential loss of suction. The FS laser uses very low suction pressure to hold the eye, Dr. Stahl said. “If the patient moves or squeezes [the eyelids to blink], you can lose suction more easily than with other FS lasers. If you lose suction, you may need to convert to LASIK or PRK.” To minimize this risk, he suggested providing “verbal anesthesia,” talking the patient through the procedure with a calm, reassuring voice as the laser cuts the lenticule.

Incomplete lenticule removal. This potential complication is unique to SMILE, Dr. Stahl noted. He added that it is imperative for the surgeon to thoroughly inspect the lenticule upon completion of the dissection and removal—and that “if the surgeon finds that the lenticule is not complete, he or she must find the residual piece of lenticule and remove it.”

Need for touch-ups. Enhancements may be needed in cases of under- or overcorrection as well as in those of irregular astigmatism occurring as a result of decentralized treatment, difficult lenticule dissection, or partially retained lenticule fragments.

Rates and risks. A study conducted in Singapore and published last year found that the incidence of enhancement after SMILE was 2.1% and 2.9% at 1 and 2 years, respectively.5 Patients with greater initial refractive error (preoperative myopia > 6 D and preoperative astigmatism > 3 D) had higher enhancement rates. Intraoperative suction loss also was found to be a contributing factor.

At present, if an enhancement is necessary, PRK is recommended, Dr. Stahl said. However, if future software approvals increase the current laser parameters, this may allow LASIK enhancements to be performed after SMILE in certain eyes.

Patient Feedback
With regard to patient acceptance, “I offer both LASIK and SMILE to qualifying spherical myopia candidates. What I have found is that patients are excited about fast visual recovery, less dryness, and no flap,” Dr. Stahl said. He cited the admittedly unusual example of a patient who is a professional wrestler. The man chose SMILE because he did not want to worry about a flap being dislodged in the ring.

And Dr. Dishler reported that SMILE resonates with his active, millennial patients who want to return to their normal activities without a lot of “fussing” over their postoperative care. “The reality is that, beyond [my need to] see them 1 day postop and check them a month later, they tend to do well and do not need any subsequent appointments, although they are seen at 6 and 12 months postop for completeness.”


Dr. Dishler is in practice with the Dishler Laser Institute in Englewood and Aurora, Colo. Relevant financial disclosures: Carl Zeiss Meditec: C. Dr. Duane is in practice with Discover Vision in Leawood, Kansas, and Independence, Mo. Relevant financial disclosures: Carl Zeiss Meditec: C. Dr. Stahl is in practice with Durrie Vision in Overland Park, Kansas. Relevant financial disclosures: None. See the disclosure key, page 5. For full disclosures, view this article at aao.org/eyenet.

MORE ONLINE. View the SMILE procedure at aao.org/clinical-video/real-time-relex-smile-procedure.
The Academy’s Global Directory of Training Opportunities (aao.org/training-opportunities) is an online resource for ophthalmologists seeking training opportunities. It is the best way to reach the broadest pool of candidates. If your academic medical center or private practice have fellowships or observerships available to ophthalmologists outside your country, list your opportunities in the Directory. It is free and only takes 2 to 3 minutes to post:

1. Go to aao.org/gdto-submission.
2. Click “Submit a Training Opportunity.”
3. Log in. (This will save you time.)
4. Enter opportunity information.

Questions? Email gdto@aao.org
Intrascleral Haptic Fixation as an Alternative to Sutures

When lack of capsular and zonular support prevents placement of an intraocular lens (IOL) in the posterior chamber, some surgeons turn to sutureless intrascleral fixation of a 3-piece, posterior chamber IOL (PCIOL) as the solution.

Small Incision

Many ophthalmic surgeons who perform sutureless intrascleral fixation (also known as extracapsular fixation) say that this method of stabilizing IOLs, which uses a small-incision approach, represents an improvement over large-incision scleral suturing.

Indications. Intrascleral fixation is indicated in patients who have undergone traumatic injury or who have posterior capsular rupture, pseudoexfoliation, or other factors that have damaged the posterior capsule or weakened the zonules. These patients may have subluxations, crystalline lens fragments (or a dislocated IOL) in the vitreous, or visual problems from decentration, and they sometimes need a secondary implant.

Improvement. Before the development of intrascleral fixation methods, surgeons typically stabilized IOLs in problem eyes by suturing them to the sclera or the iris with polypropylene or, more recently, Gore-Tex (an off-label use), said George H.H. Beiko, BM, BCH, FRCSC, who practices in St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada. But iris- and scleral-sutured IOLs are not ideal, because of associated complications such as cystoid macular edema, postoperative inflammation, induced astigmatism, and late suture breakage, Dr. Beiko said.

Two Techniques

Surgeons considering intrascleral fixation have 2 methods to consider.

Glue. Building on earlier work by Gabor B. Sharioth, MD, PhD, Amar Agarwal, MD, first published the glued IOL technique in 2008. For this technique, the surgeon uses forceps to place the lens haptics inside scleral tunnels, which are located underneath scleral flaps. The flaps are then repositioned over the haptics, and fibrin glue is applied to keep the flaps secure during the eye’s early healing.

Yamane. This newer intrascleral fixation method was developed by Shin Yamane, MD, and colleagues, and it is also known as the double-needle flanged haptic technique.

Choosing One Over the Other

Both methods are “wonderful techniques, because you can stay [with the] small incision, and this can potentially lead to faster visual recovery and possibly better refractive outcomes,” said Nicole R. Fram, MD, who practices in Los Angeles. That said, surgeons differ as to which technique they prefer to use (see also “Pros and Cons”).

Preference for glue. “I prefer the glued fixation method,” Dr. Beiko said. “I’ve been doing it for 7 or 8 years, and I use it about a dozen times a year. Dr. Agarwal’s technique is generally thought to be the first-line method for intrascleral fixation.”

Dr. Beiko said that after trying the
Yamane technique in a few eyes and listening to presentations about it at international meetings, he concluded that the technique has problems that make it unsuitable for him to use.

“What they found in Japan, in a prospective study, was more IOL tilt with the Yamane than with the glued technique,” Dr. Beiko said. Specifically, the study found that IOLs fixated with the Yamane method were tilted, on average, 13.2 degrees, compared to 4.8 degrees with the glued IOLs.5

“The other thing I’ve never been quite happy with is just blindly leaving the first haptic that’s been placed within the needle floating in the back of the eye while I’m fixing on the other haptic,” Dr. Beiko said. “I’m worried that this loose haptic, which is hidden behind the iris, might be touching the retina. It’s a perfect place to create a break in the retina if you touch it.”

Using both. Sadeer B. Hannush, MD, at Wills Eye Hospital in Philadelphia, said he began using the glue-assisted fixation technique 5 years ago, after Dr. Agarwal’s group reported that their IOLs had remained stable for several years after implantation. “In 2013, it became my preferred fixation method in eyes with inadequate capsular support, and it remains the gold standard in sutureless intrascleral haptic fixation,” Dr. Hannush said.

Dr. Hannush started exploring the Yamane technique in late 2016, after stumbling on an early paper describing the procedure. Today, he uses both approaches. He cautioned that the eye should remain pressurized at all times either with a chamber maintainer or with perfusion through a sclerotomy.

“I believe both techniques are here to stay, each offering advantages in certain settings and in the hands of the particular surgeon,” he said. “The glued IOL technique is very effective, and it may be a little bit easier to perform for surgeons who don’t do a lot of intrascleral fixation.”

Cautious about both. Dr. Fram said she has primarily been using scleral suture fixation and some glued IOL techniques over the past 10 years. In the last year, she said she has been evaluating the Yamane technique, because she views it as a clever small-incision technique with much promise. Another intriguing characteristic of the Yamane technique is that there is less hypotony associated with it in the early postoperative period, in comparison to larger-incision scleral suture fixation or even the glued IOL, she said.

But Dr. Fram is quick to point out that both intrascleral fixation methods are 2-point fixation and require symmetrical scleral tunneling and sclerotomy entries. Better standardization of these steps may improve outcomes, she said. “My experience with both the glued IOL and the Yamane technique is that critical steps of tunneling in the sclera and sclerotomy entry can be challenging in terms of reproducibility and standardization. Because this is 2-point fixation, IOL tilt is an issue.”

Out of the approximately 42 Yamane procedures Dr. Fram has performed, 4 IOLs had significant tilt, and 2 of them required refixation. “Interestingly, I had a patient who was 20/20 uncorrected—and as he healed over a 2-week period he developed 2.5 D of astigmatism,” she said. While corneal topography and wavefront analysis (OPD-Scan; Marco) revealed little corneal astigmatism, internal astigmatism > 2 D was detected. Ultrasound biomicroscopy confirmed the IOL was tilted, she said.

“So although there can be very rapid visual recovery, which makes for a won-

---

Pros and Cons

Dr. Hannush provided a concise overview of the 2 methods.

Glue: advantages.
- It compartmentalizes the eye nicely into anterior and posterior segments.
- It allows the use of foldable IOLs and thus a small corneal incision.
- All maneuvers are performed under direct visualization.
- The desired length of the haptic may be embedded in a scleral tunnel. This may be adjusted to optimize IOL centration and minimize rotation.
- It has a decade-long track record.

Glue: limitations.
- It requires familiarity with transscleral work, transferring the haptic from 1 forceps to the next (termed the “handshake technique” by Dr. Agarwal), as well as help from a third hand at certain points in surgery.
- It requires takedown of the conjunctiva and the creation of scleral flaps.
- It requires familiarity with the use of fibrin sealant.
- It requires familiarity with anterior vitrectomy techniques, ideally through the pars plana.

Yamane: advantages.
- The technique is conceptually simple.
- The need for conjunctival takedown and scleral flaps is obviated.
- It allows implantation of a foldable IOL through a small incision.
- It is currently the fastest method of sutureless PCIOL intrascleral haptic fixation.
- Eyes tend to be very quiet postoperatively with rapid visual rehabilitation.

Yamane: limitations.
- Despite its conceptual simplicity, it is surgically challenging even for a surgeon who is experienced in methods of scleral fixation.
- It requires familiarity with anterior vitrectomy techniques, ideally through the pars plana.
- As with the glued technique, and possibly more importantly, haptic placement is critical (180 degrees apart and 2 mm posterior to the limbus).
- The surgeon’s view is obstructed during the intrascleral passes.
- To decrease the chance of optic rotation, it is important to achieve at least a 2-mm tunnel during the intrascleral pass that is circumlinear with the limbus.
- Limited international experience.
derful procedure that you want to try, you have to be prepared and know how to re-fixate the IOL in the event that you get significant tilt," she said. In addition, it is imperative that the surgeon examine the patient every 6 months for potential extrusion of the haptics subconjunctivally through potentially thin-walled scleral tunnels.

Surgical Tips and Pearls

Two essentials. In order to do these procedures, "a surgeon should feel comfortable with a thorough trimcinolone-assisted anterior vitrectomy prior to the fixation portion of the procedure," Dr. Fram said. "This is a must-have [technique] in your skill set, or else you shouldn’t be attaching anything to the wall of the eye."

It also is essential to use an anterior chamber maintainer during these procedures, Dr. Beiko noted.

IOL selection. Dr. Beiko implants a 3-piece silicone IOL (LI61SE, Bausch + Lomb) for his glued intrascleral fixation cases. "But I think that virtually any 3-piece IOL can be used," he said, with 1 exception: IOLs with PMMA haptics, because these are very friable.

Dr. Hannush said that specific IOL selection is crucial in Yamane cases, because conventional PMMA haptics are prone to kinking, breaking, or even disinserting from the optic during the potentially significant manipulation that the method involves. He recommends the EC-3 PAL lens (originally available from Aaren Scientific, now renamed Lucia 602 and available from Carl Zeiss), because its haptics are made from polyvinylidene fluoride, which is very resilient.

Special equipment. With the glued technique, conventional intraocular forceps should not be used, because they might damage the haptics, Dr. Beiko said. The 23-gauge forceps he uses to externalize and manipulate the haptics have blunt ends; some surgeons use forceps with ridges on the ends, he said.

The Yamane technique requires a special type of 30-gauge needle with thin walls and a wide lumen, Dr. Hannush said. (The TSK Ultra Thin Wall Needle is manufactured in Japan and distributed by Delasco.)

Geometry matters. The surgeon performing a Yamane fixation lacks tools to assure that the intrascleral tunnels are precisely equal in length (with 20-degree angulation and 5-degree tilt) and that sclerotomy entry occurs in the right places, 180 degrees apart, Dr. Fram said.

"These are hard things to standardize," and this might help explain the IOL tilt problem in Yamane eyes, she said.

Visualization. "With the glued IOL technique, you are able to directly visualize everything, at every step," Dr. Fram said. In contrast, "with the Yamane [technique], you are marking, and then you’re going through the conjunctiva, through Tenon’s, and through the sclera—and you’re doing it blind."

Consequently, although the Yamane technique does not call for taking down the conjunctiva, sometimes it will be helpful to do a small peritomy, about 2 clock hours, for better visualization of the sclera, she said.

Shorten the haptics. In Yamane eyes, Dr. Hannush said he has learned from experience to clip off the haptic tips before making the flanges. "Sometimes the lens will rotate in the eye if I keep them long." Instead, he recommended, "After the IOL is centered, an asymmetric amount of haptic is clipped off, as is deemed necessary by the surgeon, thus allowing continued good centration of the lens when the 2 haptics are tucked back into the sclera."

Glue or sutures? Some surgeons modify Dr. Agarwal’s original technique by holding the scleral flap in place with a suture instead of fibrin glue, but Dr. Beiko recommends using the glue. “The main advantage of the glue is that it decreases the postoperative inflammation. It’s not so much for stabilization of the haptic. The eyes seem to be much quieter when you don’t use sutures.”

Avoiding haptic loss. After externalizing the leading haptic during a glued procedure, the surgeon must begin externalizing the second haptic. To keep the first haptic from moving, Dr. Beiko has a simple solution: He takes a tiny silicone ring (a “tire”) from an iris hook and threads the ring onto the haptic.

“I’ve found this makes the fixation procedure easier for me, because it stops the haptic from slipping back into the eye.”

**POSTOP.** Flanged haptic end seen in the inferior subconjunctival space 2 mm from the limbus. (Arrow = haptic end.)

Final note. "With either technique, it may be a good idea to place 1 or 2 peripheral iridectomies to prevent reverse pupillary block," Dr. Hannush said.


Dr. Beiko is in practice in St. Catharines, Ontario; a lecturer in the Department of Ophthalmology & Vision Sciences at the University of Toronto; and an associate clinical professor at McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, all in Canada. Relevant financial disclosures: Alcon: Nondisclosure Agreement; Bausch + Lomb; Carl Zeiss; C; Eyekon: Nondisclosure Agreement; Glaukos: C; Infiny Vision: C; Johnson & Johnson Vision: C;LS; Luitician: S; Optic: L.

Dr. Fram is in practice with Advanced Vision Care in Los Angeles, and a clinical instructor at the Jules Stein Eye Institute at the University of California, Los Angeles. Relevant financial disclosures: None.

Dr. Hannush is attending surgeon in the Cornea Service at Wills Eye Hospital, with the Department of Ophthalmology at the Sidney Kimmel Medical College at Jefferson University, and medical director of the Lions Eye Bank of Delaware Valley, all in Philadelphia. Relevant financial disclosures: None. See the disclosure key, page 5.
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REFRACTIVE SURGERY SUBSPECIALTY DAY 2018: BETTER TOGETHER – LENS AND CORNEA BASED SURGERY*
The ISRS Annual Meeting
Friday, 26 October | 08:00 – 17:30
McCormick Place | E354
ISRS Award Presentation at 10:45

ISRS Member Only Lunch
Friday, 26 October | 12:10 – 13:15
McCormick Place | E450

BREAKFAST WITH EXPERTS*
07:30 – 08:30 | McCormick Place | Hall A

Femtosecond Laser Cataract Surgery in Complex Cases (B104)
Complication Management in SMILE (B124)
Sunday, 28 October

Adjustable IOls (B131)
Collagen Crosslinking (B149)
Monday, 29 October

Transepithelial Surface Ablation (B173)
Tuesday, 30 October

SCIENTIFIC SESSIONS
Introduction to Corneal and Lens-Based Refractive Surgery for Residents (SYM09)
Sunday, 28 October | 08:00 – 11:00
Grand Ballroom | S100C

The Era of Femtosecond Lasers (SYM25)
Sunday, 28 October | 10:15 – 11:45
McCormick Place | E450

For more information on ISRS or to become a member, visit Member Services in the Academy Resource Center (Booth 508) or visit www.isrs.org.

SKILLS TRANSFER LABS*
Laser Refractive Surgery (LAB 119A)
Saturday, 27 October | 15:00 – 17:00
McCormick Place | N227B

Laser Refractive Surgery Course (LEC 119)
Sunday, 28 October | 14:00 – 16:15
McCormick Place | N138

Laser Refractive Surgery (LAB 119B)
Monday, 29 October | 10:30 – 12:30
McCormick Place | N227B

INSTRUCTION COURSES*
CXL: Basic and Advanced Indications (216)
Sunday, 28 October | 11:30 – 12:30
McCormick Place | N135

Advanced Corneal Topographic Analysis (281)
Sunday, 28 October | 16:30 – 17:30
McCormick Place | N137

A Step-by-Step Primer to Starting LASIK in 2018 (644)
Tuesday, 30 October | 10:15 – 12:30
McCormick Place | S102D

*Fee applies
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Brightening the future of eye care
Cataract Innovations

Intracameral antibiotics, refractive indexing, and drops that “dissolve” cataracts: A look at 3 disruptive technologies poised to reshape the field.

By Annie Stuart, Contributing Writer

Although cataract surgery is already one of the safest, most effective surgeries worldwide, its evolution continues. Three technologies—1 now in use and 2 in development—may go a long way toward transforming the field, whether by reducing the need for postoperative drops, revolutionizing the approach to intraocular lens (IOL) adjustment, or allowing the clinician to circumvent cataract surgery altogether.

Moving Toward Drop-Free Surgery

Around the turn of the millennium, the incidence of endophthalmitis in the United States was reported to range from 1 in 300 to 1 in 1,000, said Neal H. Shorstein, MD, at the Kaiser Permanente Medical Center in Walnut Creek, California. “Today, it’s more typical to see rates of 1 in 5,000 to 1 in 10,000,” he said.

What’s behind this decrease? “One reason is that surgeons are more aware of wound construction and management,” Dr. Shorstein said. Another contributing factor may be the increasing adoption of intracameral antibiotics (IA)—that is, direct delivery to the inside of the eye right after cataract surgery.

Making inroads. Although IA is a controversial practice, it is gaining momentum, based in part on the following.

Drug delivery. With IA, you inject directly into the anterior chamber, where you want the drug to stay for some time after surgery, said Dr. Shorstein. "Depending upon the agent and how much you are injecting, the concentrations in the eye are on the order of about 1,000 to 3,000 micrograms per milliliter—high enough to overcome even resistant strains of coagulase-negative Staphylococcus, one of the most common causative organisms,” he said. “With topical drops applied to the surface of the eye, however, the concentration of antibiotic in the anterior chamber is too low to overcome organisms with higher resistance.”

Patient perspective. In general, IA is a financial win for patients because they will need fewer medications, said Michael Greenwood, MD, at Vance Thompson Vision in Fargo, North Dakota.

In addition, IA can circumvent problems with adherence. “Patients often have difficulty instilling eyedrops” and may inadvertently scratch their conjunctiva or cornea with the eyedrop container, Dr. Shorstein said. “Or they may never purchase their drops, fail to instill them in proper intervals, or simply stop using them (prematurely).” A quick, one-time injection by the surgeon circumvents these problems.

Lingering concerns. Those who are uneasy with the widespread adoption of IA cite the need for more level I evidence from randomized clinical trials (see “IA Research Notes”). Other barriers to its use include the following.

No FDA approval. U.S. surgeons do not have an FDA-approved IA agent available. Instead, ophthalmologists may have their hospital compound the antibiotic or use compounding pharmacies such as ImprimisRx, Leiters, and Avella Specialty Pharmacy, which are FDA-registered 503B outsourcing facilities, said Dr. Greenwood.

And because the surgery center generally bears
the cost of procuring the product, this adds another barrier in terms of increased operating costs.

Potential toxicity. Surgeons may also worry about compounding errors, which can lead to insufficient antibiotic strength or toxicity, said Dr. Greenwood. For example, a primary risk of cefuroxime, said Dr. Shorstein, is temporary or permanent macular toxicity. In rabbit studies and in human tissue culture, moxifloxacin has displayed a risk of corneal endothelial toxicity. Another potentially blinding complication is hemorrhagic occlusive retinal vasculitis (HORV), which has been linked to the use of vancomycin (see “Questions about half-life”).

“Any time you’re using a compounding pharmacy, you want to make sure it is following federal regulations,” Dr. Greenwood said. Similarly, if your clinic or local hospital is doing the compounding, the process must be painstakingly accurate and in accordance with all regulations, he said.

Questions about half-life. The research in the literature is slightly divergent on the exact half-life of drugs in the anterior chamber, said Dr. Shorstein. “For cefuroxime and moxifloxacin, the concentration is above typical organisms’ MIC90 for about 4 to 6 hours. For vancomycin, it’s longer.” However, because of the risk of HORV, he noted, the FDA and the American Society of Cataract and Refractive Surgery (ASCRS) strongly advise against the routine injection of vancomycin for the prophylaxis of endophthalmitis.

Intracameral modifications. Many surgeons who use IA also combine it with another medication. In addition, some surgeons use IA without adding topical antibiotic drops, Dr. Shorstein said (see “Going drop free,” below).

Dr. Greenwood places Dex-Moxi-Ketor (ImprimisRx) into the anterior chamber after surgery. (Dex-Moxi-Ketor is short for dexamethasone, moxifloxacin, and ketorolac, which are steroid, antibiotic, and nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory medications, respectively.) He and his colleagues1 found that “intravitreal injection of an antibiotic and a steroid does not create significant intraocular pressure (IOP) spikes following cataract surgery in patients with glaucoma,” he said.

Dr. Greenwood’s approach is not entirely drop free, however. “For a month, patients take 1 drop once a day of a combination of prednisolone acetate, gatifloxacin, and bromfenac, a combination medication that is also from ImprimisRx,” he said. By doing so, he explained, he’s eliminated about 80 drops from his cataract patients’ postsurgical regimen.

Going drop free. In contrast, before cataract surgery, Dr. Shorstein’s patients receive only a dilating drop. After cataract surgery, he has patients apply no drops, pointing out that large studies have underscored the lower infection rates using IA alone (see “IA Research Notes”).

“Our study2 showed that an injection of triamcinolone, delivered subconjunctivally, is just as effective in preventing postoperative macular edema as topical postop steroid drops,” said Dr. Shorstein, who does prescribe topical steroid drops postoperatively for patients with glaucoma and a compromised optic nerve. “This long-acting steroid injection, along with the intracameral antibiotic injection, make up the drop-free technique.”

Other ways to lower risk. A variety of techniques further lower the risk of endophthalmitis, said Dr. Greenwood. This includes a good Betadine prep prior to surgery, sterile techniques during surgery, and placement of a Betadine solution on the eye at the end of surgery.

In addition, some studies have concluded that, because IOP can dip soon after surgery, it’s advantageous to perform stromal hydration at the end of the surgery. “Leaving the eye adequately pressurized with a slightly increased IOP helps seal the corneal flaps together and ensure wound closure following the procedure,” said Dr. Shorstein.

After surgery, he also instructs his patients to avoid touching or rubbing their eyes for 24 to 48 hours, and to not apply any artificial tears. “Although there’s no hard evidence, it’s my belief that the less patients manipulate their eyes, the lower the risk of endophthalmitis,” he said.
Rethinking Refractive Error Correction

Refractive index shaping—also known as refractive indexing—uses a minimally invasive, ultrafast femtosecond laser to change the refractive index ab interno of an IOL without measurably changing its shape, said Scott M. MacRae, MD, at the University of Rochester in New York. “The laser has about 100 times less pulse energy” than commercial femtosecond lasers now in use, he said.

Procedure basics. Before the laser adjustment, the subject receives topical anesthesia and drops to dilate pupils, said Liliana Werner, MD, PhD, at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City. The subject’s eye is aligned and docked to the femtosecond laser system, and appropriate laser treatment is then applied.

Research. Currently, 2 companies are evaluating the technology: Clerio Vision is working with researchers at the University of Rochester, and Perfect Lens is collaborating with researchers at the University of Utah.

“We are experimenting with different types of IOL materials to observe how they react and to determine the best energy levels to use,” said Dr. MacRae. “Although certain materials do change more than others, the response is very uniform for each type of material.” He added, “We have tested a variety of commercially available lenses and some noncommercial materials, and they have a predictable response to refractive indexing.”

The technology has not been tested with silicone or PMMA lenses, but it works well with commercially available hydrophobic and hydrophilic acrylic lenses, said Dr. Werner.

One option would be to use these types of monofocal lenses with the initial power selected for each eye, according to current standards of care, with the idea that they could be modified later. Another approach would involve developing a material that is very responsive to refractive indexing, which could provide even more control and flexibility, said Dr. MacRae.

Multiple adjustments possible? This technology opens up the possibility of responding to refractive error changes that occur over time, said Dr. MacRae. Many adjustments may be possible, said Dr. Werner, because each treatment is applied to only a very thin layer within the IOL. “Ongoing studies are assessing this, as well as the amount of power change that can be obtained before the quality of the IOL optic decreases,” she said.

Potential benefits. The laser treatment can be done in a noninvasive manner under topical anesthesia, and it is very fast, said Dr. Werner. “In our rabbit studies, the treatment took 23 seconds for a change of +3.6 D.” Other potential advantages include the following:

Precision. The precision obtained with the power adjustment by the femtosecond laser is within 0.1 D of the target and is very consistent, said Dr. Werner.

Address a wide range of refractive errors. “We know we can treat ± 4 diopters, and potentially quite a bit more, depending upon the type of IOL material,” said Dr. MacRae. He added that refractive indexing can be used to treat residual myopia, hyperopia, astigmatism, and higher-order aberrations, as well as to create diffractive bifocals, trifocals, and other patterns.

Flexibility. Analyses of the optical quality through modulation transfer function (MTF) measurements of the lenses’ show that a monofocal lens can be changed into a multifocal lens, with resulting MTF values for far and near foci similar to commercially available multifocal lenses, said Dr. Werner. (The MTF of an IOL is a measurement of its ability to reproduce the image of an object.)

“That same lens can be turned back into a monofocal lens, and the final MTF obtained is very close to the original MTF of the initial monofocal lens. This means that all of those changes can be performed without any significant decrease in the optical quality of the original lens.”

Negligible toxicity. Standard tests have been performed on modified IOLs, and no leachables were found, said Dr. Werner. Also, in vivo studies performed in rabbits showed no inflammatory reaction or signs of toxicity up to 6 months postoperatively. Anti-inflammatory treatment was not applied to the rabbit eyes after laser treatment, she added.

Candidates. Who might eventually benefit from refractive indexing? One example is children with congenital cataracts, whose refractive error changes over time as the eye develops. Other potential recipients include those patients who have residual refractive errors after cataract surgery, who would like to have their monofocal IOL converted to a multifocal IOL, or who cannot adapt to their current multifocal IOL, said Dr. Werner.

Next up: results in humans. Dr. Werner expects results from the first human trial shortly. And more human data on refractive indexing will become available over the next 1-2 years, said Dr. MacRae. “Big issues that need
to be fully worked out are reproducibility, long-term biocompatibility, and optical performance. All the work thus far has been done in animals or on the bench. It's exciting, but we need to make the airplane fly.”

Other uses for refractive index shaping. Refractive index shaping also shows promise in 2 additional areas, Dr. MacRae said.

Modifying contacts. “Making diffractive and refractive index changes internally, rather than on the outside of the lens, means that [the clinician] could create a much thinner lens for high myopes or hyperopes, thus improving the oxygen permeability and comfort level,” he said. “You could also create a diffractive multifocal optic internally in the contact lens.” Doing so isn’t possible with the current generation of multifocal contact lenses, which essentially are designed as “refractive” multifocals, he said.

Treating corneas. If it becomes possible to use refractive index shaping on the cornea, that would be a game changer, said Dr. MacRae, as it does not significantly affect corneal nerves or provoke much in the way of a wound healing response. “If refractive indexing can treat higher degrees of refractive error, it has the potential to revolutionize the field,” he said. “And if the technology could be made portable, it could go a long way toward attacking the problem of refractive error.”

In addition, any cornea treatments can be placed in layers so that multiple treatments could be done sequentially, as the refraction changes. “You can put a treatment in and go 20 microns deeper and then repeat the treatment, if needed,” he said. “For example, if you treat a 16-year-old with a diopter of myopia, you can re-treat at age 22 or 23, if she gains another diopter of myopia.”

Dr. MacRae explained that the energy levels used in refractive indexing are so low as to be nondisruptive. “We are micromachining the cornea and causing densification of the collagen fiber spacing, based on our histopathologic studies.” Animal models have demonstrated that this technology does work and is stable and persistent for at least 2 years, he said. With regard to impact upon keratocytes, the animal studies have found minimal, localized keratocyte death only within the laser focal zone.

Reducing Cataracts With an Eyedrop
In 2015, a team of researchers at the University of California, San Diego was reviewing the genetic makeup of 2 families with congenital cataracts. What they found was like so many serendipitous discoveries in medicine: Each family member with cataracts had a mutation in the lanosterol synthase gene (LSS), which had no previously known association with cataracts. This mutation stopped production of lanosterol, a naturally occurring steroid. “That led us to the idea that lanosterol was, in fact, important for keeping lens proteins from aggregating and producing cataracts,” said Kang Zhang, MD, PhD, who heads the research team.

Lanosterol. “We conducted studies using a naturally occurring age-related cataract in rabbits and dogs,” said Dr. Zhang. “We took the rabbits’ cataractous lenses out and incubated them in test tubes with lanosterol, showing that we could reduce cataracts and improve the

IA Research Notes

Intracameral antibiotics entered the spotlight when a study by the European Society of Cataract and Refractive Surgeons (ESCRS) found that the rate of endophthalmitis was 5 times higher in those who did not receive an IA injection.1 “The results also showed that there was no statistical benefit in adding perioperative topical antibiotics along with intracameral antibiotics,” said Dr. Shorstein.

The study has received its fair share of criticism over the years, however, particularly with regard to its design,2 and additional randomized clinical trials are needed.

Kaiser study. Dr. Shorstein and his colleagues3 published the following in a study of 300,000 surgeries:

IA reduced the incidence of endophthalmitis by about half, with no measurable differences between cefuroxime and moxifloxacin.

• Adding topical antibiotics to a regimen of IA did not further reduce the risk of endophthalmitis. In fact, doing so actually increased the risk of endophthalmitis, a finding that was not statistically significant. Dr. Shorstein suspects that any increase could be due to bottle tip contamination, patient error in administration, or trauma to the eye from applying drops.

• Patients on topical fluoroquinolone or polymyxin/tri-methoprim alone experienced a significantly lower incidence of endophthalmitis compared to those who failed to fill their prescription for drops and to those on a topical aminoglycoside.

Up next. An ASCRS study is set to compare topical and intracameral moxifloxacin. The hope is that the investigation will lead to FDA approval of an intracameral indication for this existing antibiotic drug, Dr. Greenwood said.

3 George NK, Stewart MW. Ophthalmol Ther. Published online July 5, 2018.
perform sustained delivery for 2 subconjunctival space in monkeys and found it can that his team “implanted this nanoparticle gel into the eyedrop or by implantation, he said, and he added parts. The lanosterol formula can be delivered as either molecule, which has both hydrophilic and hydrophobic sterol crossing the cornea by creating an amphipathic molecule, which has both hydrophilic and hydrophobic parts. The lanosterol formula can be delivered as either an eyelid or by implantation, he said, and he added that his team “implanted this nanoparticle gel into the subconjunctival space in monkeys and found it can perform sustained delivery for 2-3 months.”

New nanoparticle. Now, Dr. Zhang and his team are turning their attention to developing a lanosterol eyelid for humans. The biggest stumbling block has been the molecule itself, which is large and not easily soluble. “But we have found a nice nanoparticle vehicle and developed a formula that can be used for delivery,” he said, explaining that the nanoparticle facilitates lanosterol crossing the cornea by creating an amphipathic molecule, which has both hydrophilic and hydrophobic parts. The lanosterol formula can be delivered as either an eyelid or by implantation, and he added that his team “implanted this nanoparticle gel into the subconjunctival space in monkeys and found it can perform sustained delivery for 2-3 months.”

VP1-001. Another research team, at ViewPoint Therapeutics in San Francisco, is working on a second eyedrop. In a study published in Science, they reported on a compound that stabilized lens crystallin proteins and prevented them from forming amyloids. The compound, now named VP1-001, improved lens transparency in murine models of hereditary cataract. It also showed promise in aged mouse and human lenses.

Next up: Studies in humans. “In the last quarter of this year, we are going to initiate both human trials and animal studies in the United States and China,” said Dr. Zhang. He plans to enroll between 30 and 50 people in the phase 1 safety study, but expects toxicity to be minimal given the endogenous nature of lanosterol. Looking ahead. Although cataract-dissolving eye drops are unlikely to be used for rock-hard cataracts, Dr. Zhang sees this approach as a promising alternative to surgery in other instances—for example, with patients who are at risk of complications because they have certain eye conditions (such as weak zonules), bleeding disorders, and/or cardiovascular conditions. The drops also might be appropriate for those patients who are bothered by symptoms such as glare or trouble seeing in dim light, but their symptoms are not considered severe enough to justify cataract surgery. Finally, eyedrops could be widely distributed in remote, resource-scarce areas where surgery is difficult to deliver or even unavailable—and where the burden of cataract-related blindness is greatest.
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