**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Efficacy and side effects of individualized panretinal photocoagulation

Vergmann, A. S., Nguyen, T. T., Torp, T. L., Kawasaki, R., Wong, T. Y., Peto, T., & Grauslund, J. (2020). Efficacy and side effects of individualized panretinal photocoagulation. *Ophthalmology Retina*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oret.2020.02.006>

Published in:
Ophthalmology Retina

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights

Copyright 2020 Elsevier.

This manuscript is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits distribution and reproduction for non-commercial purposes, provided the author and source are cited.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

1 Title page

2

3 Title: Efficacy and side effects of individualized panretinal photocoagulation

4

5 Authors:

6 Anna Stage Vergmann^{1,2,4}, Thao Thi Nguyen¹, Thomas Lee Torp^{1,2}, Ryo Kawasaki^{2,5}, Tien Yin Wong^{6,7}, Tunde
7 Peto^{2,8} and Jakob Grauslund^{1,2,3}

8

9 ¹ Department of Ophthalmology, Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark

10 ² Research Unit of Ophthalmology, Department of Clinical Research, Faculty of Health Science, University of
11 Southern Denmark, Denmark

12 ³ Steno Diabetes Center Odense, Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark

13 ⁴ OPEN, Open Patient data Explorative Network, Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark

14 ⁵ Department of Vision Informatics, Osaka University School of Medicine, Osaka, Japan

15 ⁶ Singapore Eye Research Institute, Singapore National Eye Centre, Singapore

16 ⁷ Duke-NUS Medical School, National University of Singapore, Singapore

17 ⁸ School of Medicine, Dentistry and Biomedical Sciences, Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland,
18 United Kingdom

19

20 Corresponding author:

21 Anna Stage Vergmann

22 Department of Ophthalmology, Odense University Hospital

23 Klovevænget 5, entrance 132

24 DK-5000 Odense C, Denmark

25 Phone: +45 65 41 16 82

26 E-mail: anna.stage.vergmann@rsyd.dk

27

28 Meeting presentations:

29 The material is under consideration for presentation at The Association for Research in Vision and
30 Ophthalmology (ARVO) 2020, Baltimore, United States.

31

32 Financial support:

33 VELUX FONDEN, Søborg, Denmark. Grant number: VELUX33389

34 Odense University Hospital PhD foundation, Odense, Denmark. Grant number: 2079.

35

36 Conflict of interest:

37 No conflicting relationship exists for any authors.

38

39 Running head:

40 Same efficacy for less retinal laser in PDR

41

42 Abbreviations:

43 Dark adaptation (DA)

44 Diabetic retinopathy (DR)

45 Panretinal photocoagulation (PRP)

46 Proliferative diabetic retinopathy (PDR)

47 Retinal quality of life (RQOL)

48 Vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF)

49 Visual fields (VF)

50 Visual function questionnaire-25 (VFQ-25)

51

52 **Abstract**

53 This was a pilot study, where we demonstrated comparable efficacy and side effects of less extensive
54 versus standard panretinal photocoagulation in patients with treatment-naïve proliferative diabetic
55 retinopathy.

56 Panretinal laser photocoagulation (PRP) is considered the standard treatment of PDR¹, but given the
57 invasive nature of the treatment, side-effects like loss of visual fields (VF)² and night vision³ as well as
58 diabetic macular edema (DME)⁴ can be expected.

59 To address this, we conducted a prospective, single-blinded randomized clinical trial (RCT) of patients with
60 treatment-naïve PDR, where we investigated efficacy, side effects and retinal quality of life (RQOL) of
61 patients treated with individualized PRP (targeting only affected retinal quadrants) as compared to
62 standard (all quadrants) PRP.

63 The current study was a six-month 1:1 single-blinded RCT (<https://clinicaltrials.gov>, identifier:
64 NCT03113006) including 53 eyes of 47 patients with treatment-naïve PDR. Patients were randomized to
65 navigated retinal photocoagulation (Navilas®, OD-OS GmbH, Teltow, Germany) performed as standard
66 treatment for all retinal quadrants (n=27) or individualized PRP addressing only quadrant(s) with retinal
67 neovascularization (n = 26) (Fig. S1 available at www.opthalmologyretina.org). The treatment was
68 performed in two sessions, with one week in between treatments, at baseline (BL) in both groups.
69 Participants were included at Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark between June 1st, 2017 and
70 February 1st, 2019. Exclusion criteria were DME in the affected eye (central subfields thickness >300 µm),
71 age <18 years, pregnancy and/or hazy optic media that could prevent PRP. Randomization was performed
72 by Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap) database under Open Patient data Explorative Network
73 (OPEN). The study was conducted in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration II and in accordance with
74 good clinical practice. Patients provided both written and oral consent to participation. The project was
75 approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Southern Denmark (Project-ID: S-20160168) and The Danish
76 Data Protection Agency.

77 Principal endpoint was defined as progression of PDR as given by disease progression, vitreous
78 hemorrhage, need for additional retinal photocoagulation, or need for vitrectomy. Disease progression was
79 evaluated at month (M) 3 and 6 by lesion growth (assessed by ophthalmoscopy and wide-field fundus
80 photo) or increasing leakage by ultra-wide-field fundus fluorescein angiography (UW-FFA, Optos,
81 Dunfermline, United Kingdom).

82 To evaluate side-effects at M6, we measured development in visual fields (VF, 30-2 perimetry, ZEISS
83 Humphrey® Field Analyzer 3, Carl Zeiss, Oberkochen, Germany) and in dark adaptation (DA, Goldmann-
84 Weekers dark adaptometer, Haag-Streit Holding, Köniz, Schweiz), while covering the fellow-eye. Mean
85 Deviation (MD) and Visual Field Index (VFI) were recorded for VF. A validated Danish version of Visual
86 Function Questionnaire-25 (VFQ-25) including the appendix VFQ-39⁵ was filled out by the patients at BL
87 and M6.

88 Mann-Whitney U test and Wilcoxon signed-rank test were used as appropriate to analyze differences
89 between groups and time points. Chi2 test was used to evaluate if there were any differences in number of
90 patients who progressed in the two groups.

91 A total of 53 eyes of 42 patients were included. Patients did not differ according to age (years), distribution
92 of sex, ethnicity, body mass index (kg/m²), diabetes type, diabetes duration (years), smoking status, central
93 retinal thickness (µm), blood pressure (mmHg), HbA1c (mmol/mol), or blood lipids (mmol/L) (Table S1,
94 available at www.opthalmologyretina.org).

95 Progression of PDR did not differ between patients treated by individualized and standard PRP (48.0% vs.
96 59.3%, $p=0.27$, Table 1), even though the former by protocol received fewer photocoagulation spots
97 (1524 ± 1096 vs. 2165 ± 915 , $p=0.006$).

98 Visual fields and dark adaptation were obtained in 44 (individualized: 24, standard: 20) and 42
99 (individualized: 23, standard: 19) eyes, respectively. VF did not differ between the individualized and
100 standard group at M6 in either VFI (92.5 ± 7 vs. 95.5 ± 8 , $p=0.13$) or MD (-4.70 ± 4.23 vs. -3.47 ± 4.22 , $p=0.25$).
101 Dark adaptation analysis (log unit) showed no differences between the individualized and standard group
102 at M6 (0.41666 ± 0.051 vs. 0.41340 ± 0.059 , $p=0.76$).

103 VFQ-25 were obtained in 26 patients (individualized: 15, standard: 11). There were no differences between
104 groups at M6 (90.9 ± 2.4 vs. 89.6 ± 10.4 , $p=0.41$). Though, a statistically significant worsening between BL and
105 M6 was found in the individualized group (93.5 ± 7.55 vs. 90.9 ± 2.40 , $p=0.04$). However, in post-hoc analysis
106 excluding the VFQ-39 appendix, we found no differences in the groups from BL to M6 (individualized
107 $p=0.71$, standard $p=0.69$), or between the groups at M6 (89.1 ± 9.3 vs. 86.5 ± 10.9 , $p=0.45$).

108 In this prospective RCT of patients with treatment-naïve PDR, we found that individualized PRP, targeting
109 only affected retinal quadrants, had the same efficacy as full PRP. Furthermore, side effects and RQOL did
110 not differ between the two groups.

111 VF and DA ability are determined by the function of the photoreceptor cells. In an earlier study, VF and DA
112 were found to be affected in patients with PDR both before and after PRP². In PRP, the retinal pigment
113 epithelium and photoreceptors are altered and replaced by scar-tissue. A previous study reported that
114 navigated laser leads to more uniform laser burns compared to conventional pattern scan laser⁶, and this
115 might explain our results that were somewhat in opposition to the results of DRCR.net Protocol S that
116 reported of VF-loss secondary to PRP⁷.

117 We conclude a less intensive, individualized retinal photocoagulation, targeting only retinal quadrants with
118 retinal neovascularization, has a similar efficacy as standard PRP in patients who are regularly seen in the
119 clinics. In addition, limited side-effects, balanced between groups, could indicate a gentler approach
120 performed by the navigated laser system used in both treatment arms. This pilot-study adds to the ongoing
121 discussion of individualizing and balancing efficacy and side-effects in PDR. While VA-loss was prevented at
122 M6 in our study, we cannot speculate to the long-term sustainability of results. Hence, upcoming
123 randomized trials, addressing long-term VA and treatment efficacy, and including additional relevant
124 endpoints like electroretinography, would be important to confirm these findings.

125 We would like to acknowledge VELUX FONDEN and the PhD Foundation at Odense University Hospital for
126 the financial support for this study.

127

- 128 1. The Diabetic Retinopathy Study Research Group. Photocoagulation Treatment of Proliferative
129 Diabetic Retinopathy - Clinical Application of Diabetic Retinopathy Study (DRS) Findings. DRS Report
130 Number 8. *American Academy of Ophthalmology*. 1981.
- 131 2. Boynton GE, Stem MS, Kwark L, Jackson GR, Farsiu S, Gardner TW. Multimodal characterization of
132 proliferative diabetic retinopathy reveals alterations in outer retinal function and structure.
133 *Ophthalmology*. 2015;122:957-967.
- 134 3. Pender PM, Benson WE, Compton H, Cox GB. The effects of panretinal photocoagulation on dark
135 adaptation in diabetics with proliferative retinopathy. *Ophthalmology*. 1981;88:635-638.
- 136 4. Ferris FL, 3rd, Podgor MJ, Davis MD. Macular edema in Diabetic Retinopathy Study patients.
137 Diabetic Retinopathy Study Report Number 12. *Ophthalmology*. 1987;94:754-760.
- 138 5. Sørensen MS, Andersen S, Henningsen GØ, Larsen CT, Sørensen TL. Danish version of Visual
139 Function Questionnaire-25 and its use in age-related macular degeneration. *Dan Med Bul*.
140 2011;58:1-5.
- 141 6. Chhablani J, Mathai A, Rani P, Gupta V, Arevalo JF, Kozak I. Comparison of Conventional Pattern
142 and Novel Navigated Panretinal Photocoagulation in Proliferative Diabetic Retinopathy.
143 *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*. 2014;55:3432-3438.
- 144 7. Gross JG, Glassman AR, Liu D, et al. Five-Year Outcomes of Panretinal Photocoagulation vs
145 Intravitreal Ranibizumab for Proliferative Diabetic Retinopathy: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*
146 *Ophthalmol*. 2018;136:1138-1148.