

Jorge L. Alió · Dimitri T. Azar
Editors

Management of Complications in Refractive Surgery



Jorge L. Alió · Dimitri T. Azar (Eds.)

Management of Complications in Refractive Surgery

Jorge L. Alió · Dimitri T. Azar (Eds.)

Management of Complications in Refractive Surgery

With 250 Figures and 44 Tables

 Springer

Jorge L. Alió, M.D., Ph.D.

Professor and Chairman of Ophthalmology
Medical Director
Vissum Corporation
Avda de Denia s/n
Edificio Vissum
03016 Alicante, Spain
E-mail: jlalio@vissum.com

Dimitri T. Azar, M.D.

Professor and Head
Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences
Illinois Eye and Ear Infirmary
University of Illinois at Chicago
3.138 EEI MC 648
1855 W. Taylor Street
Chicago, IL 60612, USA
E-mail: dazar@uic.edu

ISBN 978-3-540-37583-8 e-ISBN 978-3-540-37584-5
DOI 10.1007/978-3-540-37584-5

Library of Congress Control Number: 2007939906

© 2008 Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broad-casting, reproduction on microfilm or any other way, and storage in data banks. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the German Copyright Law of September 9, 1965, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Violations are liable to prosecution under the German Copyright Law.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

Product liability: the publishers cannot guarantee the accuracy of any information about dosage and application contained in this book. In every individual case the user must check such information by consulting the relevant literature.

Cover design: Frido Steinen-Broo, eStudio Calamar, Spain

Printed on acid-free paper

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

springer.com

Foreword

My interest in corneal lamellar surgery began in 1985 when I observed Lee Nordan perform a freeze keratomileusis in Houston with José Ignacio Barraquer's freeze technique. At that time, however, I realized that this type of surgery was subject to too many variables, and that for the most part these were independent of the ability and the competence of the surgeon. A more controllable technique was necessary.

Luck would have it that just a few months later I was invited by Philippe Sourdille to Nantes to perform live cataract surgery. In the adjoining room, Jorg Krumeich performed a no-freeze keratomileusis. My interest for corneal lamellar surgery was stimulated further, where a few weeks later in Germany, I observed this new technique, and started to use it myself just a few months after.

But times were hard, particularly when I look back on them now.

The microkeratomes were precise instruments, but they were rudimentary, they were difficult to use and were also potentially risky. The lamellar cut had to have a thickness of at least 300 μm , the lamella had to be fixed to a workbench, and the refractive cut had to be performed on the stromal face with the microkeratome. The optic zones were extremely small particularly in consideration that the target corrections were in excess of 10 D.

Thinking about all that today makes me cringe...

However, Barraquer's idea was brilliant, and what followed on later proved that it was a winner.

The technique with the surgical correction of refraction, with the variant by Antonio Ruiz and others, stayed alive until the excimer laser appeared on the scene. At that point, everything changed—luckily for surgeons over the world and to the enormous satisfaction of the patients!

When Theo Seiler in Berlin demonstrated the use of this machine and despite the fact that everyone had their attention fixed on its use on the surface tissue, I had an idea...finally, I would be able to perform the refractive step of keratomileusis with a repetitive instrument of micrometric precision. Then in 1989, I performed the first operation (the first case anywhere in the world) of intrastromal ablation, using the excimer laser.

At that time, we were all still tied to the concept of performing the refractive step on the stroma of the cut lamella and that is what I did. However, this was not the road to

the future, and it was Joannis Pallikaris who had the brilliant idea of performing the step on the in situ stroma. The idea was to cut a thinner lamella and ingeniously preserve a hinge to avoid losing continuity with the cornea.

However, the hinge was in a nasal position because the cut progressed from the temporal side to the internal canthus. Unquestionably, it would have been preferable to have the uncut zone at the top to avoid dislocation of the flap during blinking. I decided to perform the operation with a "traditional" microkeratome—again the first ever worldwide in 1989—proceeding with the microkeratome, in an extremely well-exposed eye, from downward up.

Immediately afterwards, we saw the appearance of the first microkeratome with a fixed plate. What a relief! Finally, the anxiety and worry of creating a perforating lamellar cut had disappeared; we had the option of creating a superior hinge. The laser-assisted in situ keratomileusis (LASIK) down-up technique was born.

We then reached the modern era where improvements to the excimer laser appeared every couple of months; there was the transition from the mono-zone to the multi-zone, from a flying-spot treatment to a wave front, with the subsequent addition of the eye tracker and the recognition of the iris, as well as a whole series of minor innovative changes all geared to improving the end result.

We have reached the state of surgical fiction. However, unfortunately, patients do not participate correspondingly. In fact, laser refractive surgery went extremely well for a number of years and then unexpectedly hit a period of calm or stagnation.

Had we possibly created excessively high expectations?

Had we possibly operated on patients who were not suitable?

Had we possibly induced too many complications?

There is no doubt that on reading this book we can find the solution to many of the mistakes that all of us, to a greater or lesser degree, had made in the past, and we can find many useful and positive suggestions. However, more importantly, we find the necessary information for preventing or reducing the complications, both intraoperative and postoperative, even through the more attentive selection of the patients to be subjected to surgery.

In today's world, refractive surgery commands an extremely important place in eye-surgery practice.

Some techniques are still in their infancy, others have been used for more than 10 years, some have almost disappeared totally from the operating rooms, and more will be developed in the future.

The results of any surgical procedure, even those not related to ophthalmology, were evaluated exclusively from a quantitative point of view; in our specific case, the measurement was how many decimals were recovered by the eye after surgery.

Then surgeons realized that the quality of vision is also extremely important and only an evaluation of this could explain some of the often-incomprehensible complaints the patients would make.

Having a clear picture of how a person's quality of life can be changed by the onset of complications becomes of utmost importance, even in consideration of the person's job or leisure activities, as these can be contraindications to certain types of surgery.

The most popular operation is LASIK: The surgical step that, more than any other, causes problems is the cut with the microkeratome.

Are there still problems with the flap?

Yes! Thin flap, non-uniform flap, perforated flap, incomplete flap, etc. This is due to the fact that this step is mechanical, and by definition not precise, and also because it depends on the surgeon skills.

So who makes more mistakes, the surgeon or the machine?

One essential ingredient of refractive surgery is that the treatment is efficacious and achieves the preset objectives. However, even more important is that it is associated with very few complications, and that these will be acceptable to both the patient and the surgeon. This is particularly true if we consider that these operations are not essential but a question of choice; they are not strictly necessary from a medical point of view.

It is therefore important to publish a book that deals specifically with the complications of refractive surgery, their treatment, and how to prevent them.

The first chapter is essential; it presents the refractive results and the complications from surgery. It describes the risk-benefit ratio that allowed refractive surgery to be accepted and listed among the most popular surgical techniques being used at present.

The second of the introductory chapters is original and specific; it takes a separate look at the effect the complications may have on the quality of life.

A number of chapters on the complications of LASIK follow. It makes sense that these form the main bulk of the book, given that this is the most widespread technique on the international scenario.

First, we have an encyclopedic review of the intraoperative problems of the flap, and then the precocious and late-onset postoperative problems.

All the well-known complications are described.

The problems of complications associated with the flap have been greatly reduced since the currently available microkeratomes have been used. These are more reliable and safer; however, possibly a cut that was independent of mechanical instruments would be a better solution. This led to the development and launch of the femtosecond laser that could perform the work of the microkeratome but with greater precision and fewer risks.

In addition to the anatomical complications, specific chapters examine the calculation errors in refractive correction; again, in the past these topics were not dealt with in sufficient detail.

Finally, there are chapters on the complications of the eye, which actually create the subjective problems for the patients and leave them dissatisfied with the results of the operation.

The femtosecond laser can contribute to reducing these and other problems.

What are the advantages associated with this laser? First of all, the lack of blades! In addition, the possibility of no complications in the event of technical problems, and the option of repeating the operation just a short time later.

Potentially, it can also prevent ectasia; subject to the precise preoperative measurement of the corneal thickness, the cut can be performed uniformly over the entire area and that is not all...

Further improvements to the equipment and the software permit greater improvements to the ablation techniques; aberrometers that are more suitable allow the elimination of the optical aberrations; more advanced pupilometers will reduce the patients' functional problems and improve the end result.

However, additional problems persist: scarring, melting, etc., the etiopathogenesis of which must be examined in depth to enable surgeons to identify the key factors for resolving them.

The book also contains descriptions of topics that were previously not treated specifically: nummular keratitis, fluid in the interface, and ptosis. The latter complication is rightly considered, given the complaints it elicits from patients.

Then, ample space is given to the problem of dry eye, which was underestimated when this surgical technique was initially developed.

Rare complications are also examined such as optic neuropathy and the problems of eye motility.

Can any problems related to infection be resolved with the use of disposable instruments, on the understanding that these must have the same validity and competitive

costs as their repeated-use/sterilizable counterparts? Will that be enough? I do not think so. However, if we improve the preoperative diagnosis and the medical preparation of the patient, there is no doubt that we will be able to reduce the frequency of the problems.

The photorefractive keratectomy (PRK) technique, which is still popular, is examined with its main complications, namely haze and regression.

Improvements in laser-assisted sub-epithelial keratectomy (LASEK) are unquestionably linked to finding a way, probably chemical, to attain, precise detachment of the corneal epithelium while respecting the cell vitality.

Will EpiLASIK be able to distance the doctor and patient from the postoperative difficulties similar to those associated with PRK and bring them closer to LASIK?

What will the future hold for the techniques with phakic intraocular lenses (IOLs)?

Surgery that began more than 20 years ago, and then abandoned because of too many complications, has come back into fashion not merely because elevated defects could not be suitably treated with the laser, but mainly due to the improvements in the materials and the design of the phakic IOLs in addition to the better knowledge in the anatomy and physiology of the eye.

Further improvements in the shape, thickness, and dimensions of the IOL and their foldability can avoid complications such as glaucoma, cataract, and corneal decompensation. However, the reduction in problems is also associated by better pre- and postoperative instrumental analysis of the eye; instruments such as Visante and the like must be constantly used and applied in this type of surgery, taking into consideration that, generally speaking, a phakic IOL is not designed to remain in the eye for the rest of the patient's life.

The manufacturers must also aim to develop an IOL that is easy to remove if necessary.

Possibly the most important step will be to produce a precise definition for contraindications for the phakic IOLs and whether the existence of three types of IOLs is justified. The future will tell whether only one of these should be used. By analyzing the complications associated with each one of them, we should be able to provide answers to these questions.

In addition, the more recent surgical techniques for the correction of severe visual defects and presbyopia will be increasingly oriented to the replacement of a human crystalline with a multifocal artificial lens.

However, is this ethically and deontologically correct? And will it be possible to further reduce the residual problems associated with this surgery, namely, capsular opacity and problems with the retina?

The definition of the etiopathogenesis of macular edema and neovascularization present in the eye will allow us to reduce some of these problems.

Dedicated software will avoid the refractive surprises associated with previous corneal refractive surgery.

Four chapters on lesser-used techniques follow: radial keratotomy, conductive keratoplasty, intracorneal segments, and intracorneal inserts.

Specifically for radial keratotomy, a technique that is no longer being used, the chapter describes the problems the surgeon has to face in the event of a repeat refractive operation and/or cataract surgery.

Last but not of least importance in today's scenario, the final three chapters.

Understanding whether the patient will be happy with the result or not is essential for surgery of this type, and associated with this problem is the informed consent.

The final chapter compares the complications presented in the literature over the past 10 years, permitting a comparison of the various techniques and a visualization of how experience and technological progress has led to a reduction in the complications that resulted from the initial inexperience of the surgeons and the learning curve associated with this new technique.

In other words, this book summarizes in a clear, complete, and updated manner all the information associated with this subject. It provides a practical and not an empirical approach to the various problems examined. It is more comprehensive with respect to previous publications, covering every aspect of refractive surgery.

The high quality of the images only serves to augment the validity of the book.

The various chapters were written impartially by experts on the specific subject.

The updated, complete information contained in this book makes it an important publication for all our colleagues who are specialized in this field of ocular surgery.

Another important stimulus from this book is that we must fuel the desire to continue along this road of improvement for these refractive techniques.

However, this subject is constantly evolving and therefore the various chapters will act as a stimulus for additional research and improvements to the techniques: The book contains all we know to date and highlights the areas that still need to be explored.

On behalf of all refractive surgeons, I would like to thank the Aliò Foundation and its staff for its enormous contribution to the improvements and the developments seen in refractive surgery. I would also like to thank them for the effort and commitment to improving the expertise of our colleagues, which in the final analysis is translated into an advantage for the patients.

Lucio Buratto

Preface

The reader will find in this book a modern perspective on complications in refractive surgery. The environment and the perspective of the topic have been changing continuously in the last 10 years, most notably in the last 5 years. Many traditional complications such as flap complications are now in decline, whereas other new complications are appearing. The overall frequency and epidemiology of the different complications of refractive surgery have dramatically changed with the different technological innovations that have been introduced into the practice of corneal refractive surgery. However, not all complications followed this decrease, but rather have increased in their frequency; traditional problems such as endothelial cell loss and cataract induction in some phakic IOL models remain concerns of refractive surgeons, and new forms of inflammatory complications of refractive surgery have emerged. Refractive complications such as aberrations induced by previous procedures, decentrations, and others are now properly treated due to significant technological improvement and knowledge of the performance of eye physiology and optics. This book is aimed at providing current and future refractive surgeons with up-to-date information on the pathogenesis of potential refractive surgical complications and at offering an approach to their prevention and treatment.

In addition to our own experience in refractive surgery, we have relied on the invaluable experience of many friends and colleagues who have authored several chapters within this book. Our author list represents the best of the best in refractive surgery. This unique panel of unparalleled international experts has clearly contributed to the science and the practice of refractive surgery. We would like to thank them for the service and contributions to refractive surgery, to patients, and through their

respective chapters, to advancing the knowledge of refractive surgery.

It is our hope that the reader will find in this book the requisite links between the science and practice of refractive surgery. The acceptance of refractive surgery as a separate subspecialty in ophthalmology is higher than ever, thanks to the attention being paid to surgical complications and their management. The surgical outcomes and quality of life of patients undergoing refractive surgery has steadily improved.

The promise of refractive surgery rests in our singular focus on our patients' quality of life and quality of vision. Continued improvements in our field are dependent on enhanced technologies and superior training. To this end, we offer this book as a complement in order to assist our field in becoming better educated about the complications that we face, by providing better tools to solve them, and by increasing knowledge of how to prevent them, all to benefit our patients.

We would like to thank Springer for its support to this edition and ongoing support for refractive surgery. We also offer our heartfelt thanks to our families for their support, which has allowed us to devote our attention to the edition of this book.

Jorge L. Alió
Alicante, Spain

Dimitri Azar
Chicago, Illinois

January 2008

Contents

Chapter 1 Refractive Surgery Outcomes and Frequency of Complications 1 Wallace Chamon and Norma Allemann	Chapter 2 Influence of Refractive Surgery Complications on Quality Of Life 9 Konrad Pesudovs
1.1 Common Complications Associated with Refractive Surgery 1	2.1 Introduction 9
1.1.1 Refractive Imprecision and Loss of Spectacle-Corrected Visual Acuity 1	2.2 Measurement Concepts 9
1.1.2 Infection 3	2.3 Instruments 10
1.1.3 Infection and Contact Lenses 3	2.3.1 Quality of Life Impact of Refractive Correction Questionnaire 10
1.1.4 Subjective Complaints 3	2.3.2 Refractive Status Vision Profile 11
1.1.5 Retinal Detachment 4	2.3.3 National Eye Institute Refractive Quality of Life Instrument 11
1.2 Keratorefractive Procedures 4	2.3.4 Others 11
1.2.1 Photorefractive Keratectomy 4	2.4 Complications and QOL 12
1.2.1.1 Haze 4	2.4.1 QIRC 12
1.2.1.2 Mitomycin C 4	2.4.2 RSVP 12
1.2.1.3 Keratectasia 4	2.4.3 NEI-RQL 12
1.2.2 LASIK 4	2.4.4 Outcomes Reported with Other Instruments 12
1.2.2.1 Microkeratome-Related Complications 4	2.5 Implications 12
1.2.2.2 Femtosecond Laser 4	Acknowledgment 13
1.2.2.3 Dislocated Flap 4	References 13
1.2.2.4 Diffuse Lamellar Keratitis 4	
1.2.2.5 Keratectasia 4	
1.3 Phakic Intraocular Lenses 4	Chapter 3 LASIK: Intraoperative (Flap) Complications 15
1.3.1 Endothelial Cell Loss 4	Chapter 3.1 Thin, Irregular, Buttonhole Flaps 15 Stephen G. Slade
1.3.2 Pupillary Block Glaucoma 5	3.1.2 Causes 16
1.3.3 Iris Atrophy and Pupil Ovalization 5	3.1.3 Diagnosis 16
1.3.4 Chronic Inflammation 5	3.1.4 Prevention 16
1.3.5 Intraocular Lens Dislocation 5	3.1.5 Treatment 17
1.3.6 Cataract 5	References 18
1.3.7 Pigment Dispersion 5	
1.3.8 Posterior Luxation (in Phakic Refractive Lens™) 5	
References 5	

Chapter 3.2		Chapter 4.2	
Incomplete LASIK Flap	19	Diffuse Lamellar Keratitis	40
Helen K. Wu and Waleed A. Allam		Marlane J. Brown, David R. Hardten, Elizabeth A. Davis, and Richard L. Lindstrom	
3.2.1 Introduction	19	4.2.1 Diffuse Lamellar Keratitis	40
3.2.2 Incidence	19	4.2.2 Etiology and Prevalence	41
3.2.3 Etiology	19	4.2.3 Identification and Appearance	42
3.2.4 Management	19	4.2.4 Staging	42
3.2.4.1 Immediate Measures	19	4.2.5 Intervention and Treatment	44
3.2.4.2 Delayed Management	20	4.2.6 GAPP Syndrome	45
3.2.5 Prevention	20	4.2.7 Steroid-Induced Glaucoma after LASIK	45
References	21	4.2.8 Infectious Keratitis versus Noninfectious Keratitis	45
Chapter 3.3		4.2.9 Conclusion	45
Dislocated Flaps: How to Solve Free Flaps with No Marks or Flap Malposition	21	References	46
Julio Baviera		Chapter 4.3	
3.3.1 Introduction	21	Pressure-Induced Interlamellar Stromal Keratitis	47
3.3.2 Prevention	23	Sadeer B. Hannush and Michael W. Belin	
3.3.3 Experience	24	4.3.1 Introduction	47
3.3.4 Free-Flap Rotation Study	24	4.3.2 Conclusion	48
References	27	References	49
Chapter 3.4		Chapter 4.4	
Management of the Distorted Flap	27	Prevention and Management of Flap Striae after LASIK	49
David R. Hardten		Roger F. Steinert	
3.4.1 Introduction	27	4.4.1 Introduction	49
3.4.2 Frequency	28	4.4.2 Flap Striae	50
3.4.3 Etiology and Prevention	28	4.4.2.1 Treatment of Macrostriae	51
3.4.4 Management	30	4.4.2.2 Treatment of Microstriae	52
References	31	4.4.3 Phototherapeutic Keratectomy	52
Chapter 4		References	54
LASIK: Early Postoperative Complications	33	Chapter 4.5	
Chapter 4.1		Marginal Sterile Corneal Infiltrates after LASIK	55
Infections after Refractive Surgery	34	Renato Ambrósio, Jr., Daniela Jardim, and Bruno M. Fontes	
José de la Cruz, Joelle Hallak, Dimitri Azar, and Sandeep Jain		4.5.1 Introduction	55
4.1.1 Introduction	34	4.5.2 Defining Sterile Corneal Infiltrates	55
4.1 Suspected infection	36	4.5.3 Pathophysiology	57
4.1.2 Review of Published Literature	36	4.5.4 Clinical Diagnosis and Differential Diagnosis	57
4.1.2.1 Onset and Frequency of Infection	36	4.5.5 Clinical Management and Preventive Measurements	58
4.1.2.2 Characteristics of Infection	37	4.5.6 Conclusion	59
4.1.2.3 Microbiological Profile	37	References	59
4.1.2.4 Outcomes and Sequelae	38		
4.1.3 Conclusion	38		
References	39		

Chapter 4.6

Ptosis	61
Bryan S. Sires	

4.6.1	Introduction.....	61
4.6.2	Anatomy and Factors Predisposing to Ptosis after Refractive Surgery.....	61
4.6.3	Etiology.....	61
4.6.4	Examination.....	62
4.6.5	Treatment.....	63
	References.....	64

Chapter 4.7

Melting	65
José L. Güell, Merce Morral, Oscar Gris, Javier Gaytan, and Felicidad Manero	

4.7.1	Introduction.....	65
4.7.2	Basic Concepts.....	65
4.7.3	Stromal Melting: Classification.....	66
4.7.4	Stromal Melting after Excimer Laser Refractive Surgery.....	67
4.7.4.1	Epidemiology and Etiopathogenesis.....	67
4.7.4.2	Therapeutic Approach.....	69
	References.....	70

Chapter 5

LASIK: Late Postoperative Complications	73
--	----

Chapter 5.1

Dry Eye	74
Jerome C. Ramos-Esteban and Steven Wilson	

5.1.1	Introduction.....	74
5.1.2	Epidemiology of Dry Eye in LASIK Patients.....	74
5.1.2.1	Primary Procedures.....	74
5.1.2.1.1	Myopic LASIK.....	74
5.1.2.1.2	Hyperopic LASIK.....	75
5.1.2.2	LASIK Enhancements.....	75
5.1.3	Risk Factors.....	75
5.1.3.1	Patient Population.....	75
5.1.3.1.1	Gender and Age.....	75
5.1.3.1.2	Race.....	76
5.1.3.2	Preexisting Dry Eye Syndrome.....	76
5.1.3.3	Hinge-Related Factors.....	76
5.1.3.3.1	Hinge Location.....	76
5.1.3.3.2	Hinge Width.....	77
5.1.3.4	High Attempted Corrections and Ablation Depth.....	77
5.1.4	Diagnostic Approach to Patients with Dry Eye after LASIK.....	77
5.1.4.1	Clinical Manifestations.....	77
5.1.4.2	Pathophysiology.....	78

5.1.4.3	Dry Eye Symptoms after LASIK.....	78
5.1.4.4	Clinical Signs.....	78
5.1.4.4.1	Tear Film-Related Abnormalities.....	78
5.1.4.4.2	Ocular Surface Staining.....	79
5.1.4.4.3	Ocular Sensation Abnormalities.....	80
5.1.4.5	Conjunctival Goblet Cell Density.....	81
5.1.4.6	Subjective Evaluation of the Ocular Surface Disease.....	81
5.1.5	Management.....	81
5.1.5.1	Topical Preparations.....	81
5.1.5.1.1	Artificial Tears.....	81
5.1.5.1.2	Lid Scrubs.....	81
5.1.5.1.3	Topical Cyclosporine A.....	82
5.1.5.2	Punctal Plugs.....	82
5.1.5.3	Oral Dietary Supplements.....	82
5.1.5.4	Autologous Serum.....	82
5.1.6	Conclusion.....	83
	References.....	83

Chapter 5.2

Epithelial Ingrowth	85
Gustavo E. Tamayo	

5.2.1	Introduction.....	85
5.2.2	Etiology of Epithelial Ingrowth.....	85
5.2.3	Clinical Manifestations of Epithelial Ingrowth.....	86
5.2.4	Classification of Epithelial Ingrowth.....	86
5.2.5	Management of Epithelial Ingrowth.....	87
5.2.6	Prevention of Epithelial Ingrowth.....	87
5.2.7	Surgical Treatment of Epithelial Ingrowth.....	88
5.2.8	Conclusion.....	88
	Bibliography.....	89

Chapter 5.3

Corneal Ectasia	89
J. Bradley Randleman and R. Doyle Stulting	

5.3.1	Introduction.....	89
5.3.2	Postoperative Ectasia: What Do We Currently Know?.....	89
5.3.3	Risk Factors for Postoperative Ectasia.....	90
5.3.3.1	High Myopia.....	90
5.3.3.2	Preoperative Corneal Thickness.....	90
5.3.3.3	Low Residual Stromal Bed Thickness.....	90
5.3.3.4	Patient Age.....	91
5.3.3.5	Ectatic Corneal Disorders and Abnormal Topographic Patterns.....	91
5.3.3.6	Other Potential Risk Factors.....	91
5.3.3.7	Ectasia Risk Factor Screening: Summary.....	91
5.3.4	Prevention of Postoperative Ectasia.....	91
5.3.4.1	Utilizing Alternative Treatment Strategies for At-Risk Patients.....	91
5.3.4.2	Utilizing New Technology to Identify Abnormal Corneas.....	91

5.3.4.3	Avoiding Retreatment in Corneas with Low residual Stromal Bed Thickness . . .	91	Chapter 6.2	Cylinder	106
5.3.5	Management of Postoperative Ectasia	92		Noel Alpíns and Gemma Walsh	
5.3.6	Conclusion	93	6.2.1	Introduction	106
	Acknowledgment	94	6.2.2	Misaligned Treatments	107
	References	94	6.2.3	Sources of Misalignment	107
	Chapter 5.4		6.2.3.1	Cyclotorsion	107
	Scarring	97	6.2.3.2	The Elusive “Astigmatically Neutral” Incision	107
	Eric E. Gabison and Thanh Hoang-Xuan		6.2.4	Understanding and Analyzing Misaligned Treatments	108
5.4.1	Introduction	97	6.2.4.1	Forces That Act to Change the Cornea	108
5.4.2	LASIK: a Scarless Procedure?	97	6.2.4.2	Vector Analysis of Outcomes	108
5.4.2.1	Flap Margin	97	6.2.4.3	Practical Use in the Clinical Setting	110
5.4.2.2	Flap Interface	97	6.2.4.4	Calculating the Effect of the Incision	110
5.4.3	Scars Linked to Surgical Complications or Postoperative Trauma	98		References	112
5.4.3.1	Corneal Erosion and Epithelial– Stromal Interaction	98		Chapter 7	
5.4.3.2	Flap Misalignment and Folds	98		Optical Aberrations	113
5.4.4	Scars Linked to the Patient’s History	99		Chapter 7.1	
5.4.4.1	Abnormal Local Wound Healing	99		Optical Implications of Corneal Photorefractive Surgery	113
5.4.4.2	Abnormal General Wound Healing	100		Vikentia J. Katsanevaki	
5.4.4.2.1	Keloids	100	7.1.1	Introduction	113
5.4.4.3	Previous Refractive Surgery	100	7.1.2	Night Visual Complaints: Role of the Mesopic Pupil Size	114
5.4.5	Scars Linked to Abnormal Postoperative Inflammation or healing	100	7.1.3	Clinical Assessment of Symptomatic Patients	114
5.4.5.1	Role of Ultraviolet Light	100	7.1.4	Management of Symptomatic Patients	115
5.4.5.2	Diffuse Lamellar Keratitis	100		References	116
5.4.5.3	Epithelial Ingrowth: Fibrosis or Melting?	100		Chapter 7.2	
	References	101		Night Vision Disturbances after Refractive Surgery	117
	Chapter 6			César Albarrán, David Piñero, and Jorge L. Alió	
	Refractive Miscalculation with Refractive Surprise	103	7.2.1	Introduction	117
	Chapter 6.1		7.2.2	Incidence and Measurement	118
	Sphere	103	7.2.3	Etiology	119
	Arturo S. Chayet and Luis F. Torres		7.2.4	Treatment	120
6.1	Sphere	103	7.2.4.1	Optimized Ablation Profiles	122
6.1.1	Introduction	103	7.2.4.2	Customized Ablation Profiles	123
6.1.2	Refractive Surprise of Human Source	104	7.2.4.3	Example of Topographic-Guided Customization	126
6.1.2.1	Data Entry Errors	104		Bibliography	129
6.1.2.2	Inaccurate Refraction	104			
6.1.2.3	Laser Source	104			
6.1.2.3.1	Bad Calibration	104			
6.1.2.3.2	Ablation Issues	104			
6.1.2.4	Laser Suite Conditions	105			
6.1.2.4.1	Humidity	105			
6.1.2.4.2	Room Air Quality	105			
6.1.2.5	Patient Source	105			
6.1.2.5.1	Wound-Healing Response	105			
	References	105			

Chapter 7.3

Decentration	131
Jonathan H. Talamo	

7.3.1	Description of the Problem	131
7.3.1.1	Definition of Centration	131
7.3.1.2	Centering Technique	131
7.3.2	Causes of Decentration or Decentration-Like Effect (Pseudo-Decentration).....	131
7.3.2.1	Misalignment of Reference Point:Static or Dynamic	131
7.3.2.2	Uneven Uptake of Laser Energy	132
7.3.2.3	Uneven Emission of Laser Energy	132
7.3.2.4	Asymmetric or Abnormal Wound Healing	132
7.3.3	Clinical Manifestations of Decentration....	132
7.3.3.1	Symptoms	132
7.3.3.2	Signs	133
7.3.4	Prevention of Decentration	135
7.3.5	Medical Treatment of Decentration.....	136
7.3.6	Surgical Treatment of Decentration.....	136
References	140

Chapter 7.4

Corneal Irregularity	141
Jorge L. Alió	

7.4.1	Concept.....	141
7.4.2	Symptoms.....	141
7.4.3	Clinical Examination and Classification....	141
7.4.4	Clinical Classification of Corneal Irregularity.....	143
7.4.4.1	Macro-Irregular and Micro-Irregular Patterns	143
7.4.4.2	Measuring Corneal Irregularity by Higher-Order Aberration Analysis.....	144
7.4.4.3	Clinical Classification.....	144
7.4.5	Correction and Treatment of Corneal Irregularity.....	144
7.4.5.1	Contact Lens Adaptation	146
7.4.5.2	Wavefront-Guided Excimer Laser Surgery: Global Wavefront versus Corneal Wavefront	146
7.4.5.3	Masking Solutions.....	149
7.4.6	Corneal Excision (Superficial Lamellar Keratectomy)	150
7.4.7	Non-Laser Corneal Surgery.....	151
7.4.7.1	Automated Anterior Lamellar Keratoplasty	151
7.4.7.2	Deep Anterior Lamellar Keratoplasty.....	151
7.4.7.3	Penetrating Keratoplasty	152
References	152

Chapter 8

Optic Neuropathy and Retinal Complications after Refractive Surgery	155
J. Fernando Arevalo, Reinaldo A. Garcia, Rafael A. Garcia-Amaris, and Juan G. Sanchez	

8.1	Introduction.....	155
8.2	Optic Neuropathy after LASIK.....	156
8.2.1	History and Mechanism of Optic Nerve Damage	156
8.2.2	Optic Neuropathy Risk Factors	157
8.2.3	Clinical Findings	157
8.2.4	Management	157
8.2.5	Prevention	157
8.3	Retinal Detachments and Retinal Breaks... ..	158
8.3.1	Retinal Detachment Characteristics and Retinal Breaks Distribution.....	159
8.4	Serous Macular Detachment.....	160
8.4.1	Macular Hemorrhage, Lacquer Cracks, and Choroidal Neovascular Membranes....	160
8.4.2	Macular Hole.....	160
8.5	Uveitis.....	163
8.6	LASIK after Retinal Detachment Surgery... ..	163
8.7	Corneoscleral Perforations	163
8.8	Displacement of Corneal Cap during Vitrectomy	164
8.9	Final Considerations.....	164
References	165

Chapter 9

Femtosecond Laser	169
--------------------------------	-----

Chapter 9.1

Complications and Management with the Femtosecond Laser	169
Karl G. Stonecipher, Teresa S. Ignacio, and Kody G. Stonecipher	

9.1.1	Introduction.....	169
9.1.2	Sight-Threatening Complications.....	170
9.1.2.1	Infections	170
9.1.2.2	Vitreoretinal Complications	170
9.1.2.2.1	Macular Hemorrhage	170
9.1.3	Potential Sight-Threatening Complications .	170
9.1.3.1	Diffuse Lamellar Keratitis	170
9.1.3.2	Central Toxic Keratopathy.....	170
9.1.3.3	Flap Slippage	170
9.1.3.4	Partial or Buttonhole Flaps without Excimer Laser Ablation.....	171
9.1.3.5	Vertical (Epithelial) Gas Breakthrough....	171
9.1.3.6	Epithelial Defects or Loose Epithelium....	171
9.1.3.7	Decentration	171
9.1.3.8	Flap Striae and Flap Edema.....	171
9.1.3.9	Interface Haze	172

9.1.3.10	Femtosecond Lasers in Previous Refractive Surgery	172
9.1.4	Non-Sight-Threatening Complications.	172
9.1.4.1	Enhancements	172
9.1.4.2	Transient Light Sensitivity Syndrome	172
9.1.4.3	Anterior Chamber Bubbles	173
9.1.4.4	Rainbow Glare	173
9.1.5	Opaque Bubble Layer	173
9.1.5.1	Early or Hard Opaque Bubble Layer	173
9.1.5.2	Late Opaque Bubble Layer	173
9.1.6	Suction Loss	173
9.1.5	Difficult Lifts	174
9.1.6	Conclusion	174
	References	174

Chapter 9.2

Management of a Perforated Femtosecond Laser-Created Flap

Vance Thompson

9.2.1	Introduction	175
9.2.2	Preoperative Patient Selection Issues	175
9.2.2.1	Steep Corneas and the Risk of a Buttonhole	175
9.2.2.2	Presence of a Stromal Defect Preoperatively	175
9.2.3	Intraoperative Issues	175
9.2.3.1	Flap Creation and Lifting	175
9.2.4	Thin-Flap LASIK	176
9.2.5	Management of a Perforated Flap	176
9.2.6	Conclusion	177
	References	177

Chapter 10

Corneal Haze after Refractive Surgery

David Fahd, José de la Cruz, Sandeep Jain,
and Dimitri Azar

10.1	Introduction	179
10.2	Definition of Haze	179
10.3	Grading System	180
10.4	Course	180
10.5	Pathophysiology	180
10.6	Risk Factors	181
10.7	Clinical Assessment	182
10.8	Preventive Measures	183
10.8.1	Mitomycin C	183
10.8.2	Vitamin C	184
10.8.3	Use of Epithelial Sheets Postoperatively	184
10.9	Control and Treatment	184
10.10	Conclusion	184
	References	185

Chapter 11

Complications of LASEK

David P.S. O'Brart

11.1	Introduction	187
11.2	Intraoperative Complications	188
11.2.1	Alcohol Escape	188
11.2.2	Poor Epithelial Flap	189
11.2.3	Free Flap	189
11.3	Early Postoperative Complications (Hours/Days)	189
11.3.1	Pain	189
11.3.2	Delayed Epithelial Healing	189
11.3.3	Slow Visual Recovery	189
11.3.4	Sterile Infiltrates	190
11.3.5	Infectious Keratitis	190
11.4	Early Postoperative Complications (Days/Weeks)	190
11.4.1	Slow Visual Recovery	190
11.4.2	Intraocular Steroid Pressure Response	190
11.4.3	Recurrent Corneal Erosion Syndrome	191
11.4.4	Corneal Melt	191
11.4.5	Herpes Simplex Keratitis	191
11.4.6	Late Infectious Keratitis	191
11.5	Medium Postoperative Complications (Weeks/Months)	191
11.5.1	Overcorrection/Undercorrection	191
11.5.2	Haze	191
11.5.3	Night Vision Disturbances/Halos	192
11.5.4	Recurrent Erosion	193
11.6	Late Postoperative Complications (Months/Years)	193
11.6.1	Overcorrection/Undercorrection	193
11.6.2	Haze	193
11.6.3	Recurrent Corneal Erosion Syndrome	193
11.6.4	Ectasia	193
	References	194

Chapter 12

Complications of Refractive Keratotomy

Carlo F. Lovisolo, Alessandro Mularoni,
Antonio Calossi, Charles Wm. Stewart

12.1	Introduction	197
12.2	Refractive Complications	197
12.3	Reestablishing the Physiological Corneal Shape	198
12.3.1	Undercorrection	201
12.3.1.1	Considerations about Laser Treatments on Post-RK Eyes	206
12.3.2	Overcorrection	209
12.3.2.1	Consecutive Hyperopia after RK	209
12.3.2.2	Intrastromal Corneal Ring Segments Option	211

12.3.2.3	Phakic IOL Option	212
12.3.2.4	Wavefront-Based Glasses Option	213
12.3.2.5	Contact Lenses Option	213
12.3.3	IOL Power Calculation after RK	214
References	221

Chapter 13

Phakic Intraocular Lens Complications 225

Chapter 13.1

Anterior Chamber Angle-Supported Complications: Prevention and Treatment 226

Orkun Muftuoglu and Jorge L. Alió

113.1.1	Introduction	226
13.1.2	Intraoperative Complications	226
13.1.3	Early Postoperative Complications	226
13.1.3.1	Ocular Hypertension	226
13.1.3.2	Acute Uveitis	227
13.1.3.3	Decentration, Displacement, or Rotation of the IOL	227
13.1.3.4	Endophthalmitis	227
13.1.3.5	Corneal Edema	227
13.1.3.6	Residual Refractive Error	227
13.1.4	Complications after Implantation of Different Types of ASP-IOL and Their Management	227
13.1.4.1	ZB, ZB5M, and NuVITA	227
13.1.4.1.1	Complications	227
13.1.4.2	ZSAL-4 and ZSAL-4/Plus Phakic Refractive IOLS	228
13.1.4.2.1	Complications (according to the series of Perez-Santonja and coauthors [29], which included 23 eyes)	228
13.1.4.3	Phakic 6, 6H, and 6H2 Lenses	229
13.1.4.3.1	Complications	229
13.1.4.4	GBR/Vivarte Angle-Supported Foldable Phakic IOL	229
13.1.4.4.1	Complications	229
13.1.4.5	Kelman Duet Phakic AC Lens	230
13.1.4.6	Alcon AcrySof	230
13.1.4.7	ICARE	230
13.1.5	Treatment of Late Complications That Require Explantation of Phakic IOLS	231
13.1.6	Techniques Used for Phakic IOL Explantation	232
13.1.6.1	Bilensectomy	232
13.1.6.2	Phakic Intraocular Lens Exchange	233
13.1.6.3	Phakic Intraocular Lens Explantation and Penetrating Keratoplasty	233
13.1.6.4	Simple Phakic Intraocular Lens Removal	233
13.1.7	How to Prevent Complications	233
13.1.7.1	Surgical Technique	233

13.1.7.2	IOL Design	233
13.1.7.3	Anterior Segment Imaging and PIOL Sizing	233
13.1.7.3.1	Internal Diameter of the AC	234
13.1.7.3.2	AC Depth	234
13.1.7.3.3	Implant Vaulting	236
References	236

Chapter 13.2

Complications of Iris-Supported Phakic IOLS 238

Antonio A P. Marinho

13.2.1	Introduction	238
13.2.2	Iris-Supported Phakic IOLS	238
13.2.2.1	Characteristics of Different Models of Iris-Supported Phakic IOLS	238
13.2.3	Patient Selection	238
13.2.4	Surgery	240
13.2.4.1	Preoperative Preparation	240
13.2.4.2	Anesthesia	240
13.2.4.3	Surgical Steps	240
13.2.4.4	Postoperative Care	241
13.2.5	Complications	241
13.2.5.1	Short-Term Complications	241
13.2.5.2	Medium-Term Complications	242
13.2.5.3	Long-Term Complications	242
13.2.6	Conclusion	243
References	244

Chapter 13.3

Complications of Posterior Chamber Phakic Intraocular Lenses 245

Carlo F. Lovisolo and Fabio Mazzolani

13.3.1	Introduction	245
13.3.2	Posterior Chamber Phakic IOLS	245
13.3.2.1	The Visian ICL	245
13.3.3	Intraoperative Complications	246
13.3.4	Postoperative Complications	248
13.3.4.1	Visual Outcomes	248
13.3.4.1.1	Loss of Best Corrected Visual Acuity	248
13.3.4.1.2	Overcorrection and Undercorrection	249
13.3.4.1.3	Quality of Vision Disturbances	249
13.3.4.2	Clinical Complications	250
13.3.4.2.1	Ocular Hypertension and Iridopathy	250
13.3.4.2.2	Inflammation	253
13.3.4.2.3	Crystalline Lens Opacity (Anterior Subcapsular Cataract)	254
13.3.4.2.4	Corneal Decompensation	256
13.3.4.2.5	Vitreoretinal Complications	256
13.3.4.2.6	Zonular Damage, Decentration, Anterior and Posterior Dislocation	257
13.3.5	The Lovisolo Custom Phakic IOL Sizer. How to Get Rid of Implant-Related Complications	258
References	262

Chapter 14			
Complications of Refractive Lens Exchange	265		
Chapter 14.1			
Retinal Detachment	265		
José M ^a Ruiz-Moreno, Jorge L. Alió, and Mohamed H. Shabayek			
14.1 Retinal Detachment	265		
14.1.1 Introduction	265		
14.1.2 Retinal Detachment in Highly Myopic Eyes	266		
14.1.3 Incidence of Retinal Detachment in High-Myopic Patients Corrected by Refractive Surgery	266		
14.1.4 Incidence of Retinal Detachment in High-Myopic Patients Corrected by Lens Exchange	267		
14.1.5 Treatment of Retinal Detachment in High-Myopic Patients after Ocular Refractive Surgery	268		
14.1.6 Conclusion	269		
References	269		
Chapter 14.2			
Refractive Lens Exchange and Choroidal Neovascularization	271		
Emanuel Rosen			
14.2.1 Introduction	271		
14.2.2 Pathology	271		
14.2.2.1 Retina in High Myopia	273		
14.2.2.2 Prevalence	273		
14.2.2.3 Light Toxicity and Potential Macular Effects	274		
References	275		
Chapter 14.3			
Refractive Surprises after Cataract Post-Corneal Refractive Surgery	276		
Béatrice Cochener and Jean Louis Arne			
14.3.1 Introduction	276		
14.3.2 Hyperopic Shift	276		
14.3.3 Myopic Shift	276		
14.3.4 Induced Astigmatism	276		
14.3.5 Decentration	276		
14.3.6 Alteration of Vision Quality	277		
14.3.7 Management of Refractive Complications after Cataract Surgery Post-Corneal Surgery	277		
14.3.7.1 Optical Equipment	277		
14.3.7.2 Lens Exchange	277		
14.3.7.3 Photoablation	277		
14.3.7.4 Incisions	277		
14.3.7.5 Piggyback Multifocal IOL	278		
14.3.7.6 Perspectives: Multifocal IOLs? Toric?	278		
14.3.8 Prevention of Surprises: Adjusted Implant Calculation	278		
14.3.8.1 Correcting the Variance	279		
14.3.8.1.1 Estimation of Corneal Power after Corneal Refractive Surgery [31]	279		
14.3.8.1.2 Methods to Calculate IOL Power	280		
14.3.9 Specific Problems	281		
References	282		
Chapter 15			
Complications of Radial Keratotomy and Conductive Keratoplasty	285		
Chapter 15.1			
Cataract Surgery Complications of Radial Keratotomy	285		
Howard Fine, Richard S. Hoffman, Mark Packer, and Laurie Brown			
References	289		
Chapter 15.2			
Complications of Conductive Keratoplasty	290		
Marguerite B. McDonald			
15.2 Complications of Conductive Keratoplasty	290		
15.2.1 Introduction	290		
15.2.2 Presbyopia Multicenter Clinical Trial	290		
15.2.3 NearVision CK with LightTouch	290		
15.2.4 NearVision CK after Excimer Laser Surgery	291		
15.2.5 Complications and Their Management	292		
15.2.6 Surgical Technique for the Primary Procedure	292		
15.2.7 Managing Astigmatism	293		
15.2.8 Undercorrection and Overcorrection	294		
15.2.9 Conclusion	295		
References	295		
Chapter 16			
Complications of Intrastromal Corneal Ring Segments	297		
Mohamed H. Shabayek and Jorge L. Alió			
16.1 Introduction	297		
16.2 Types of ICRS	298		
16.3 Complications Due to Implantation Techniques	298		
16.3.1 Manual Tunnel Dissection	298		
16.3.2 Operative Complications with the Manual Tunnel Dissection Technique	298		
16.3.3 Femtosecond Laser IntraLase Tunnel Dissection	300		

16.3.4	Operative Complications with Femtosecond Laser Tunnel Dissection.	300
16.4	Postoperative Complications.	300
16.4.1	Postoperative Clinical Complications after Manual Dissection Technique	300
16.4.1.1	Infectious Keratitis	300
16.4.1.2	Segment Extrusion and Migration.	301
16.4.1.3	Tunnel Neovascularization	302
16.4.1.4	Tunnel Deposits.	302
16.4.2	Postoperative Clinical Complications after Femtosecond Laser Tunnel Dissection.	302
16.4.2.1	Subconjunctival Hemorrhage	302
16.4.2.2	Superficial Corneal “Incision” Opacification	303
16.4.2.3	Infectious Keratitis	303
16.4.3	Postoperative Visual Complications	303
16.4.3.1	Decrease in BSCVA.	303
16.4.3.2	Increase in Corneal Higher-Order Aberrations	305
16.4.4	Conclusion	305
	References	305

Chapter 17

	Corneal Inlays (Synthetic Keratophakia)	307
	M. Emilia Mulet, Jorge L. Alió, and Michael Knorz	

17.1	Introduction.	307
17.2	Inlay Characteristics.	308
17.3	Surgical Technique	308
17.4	Results.	308
17.5	Complications	309
17.5.1	Inlay Displacement.	309
17.5.2	Small Tears or Holes in the Inlay	309
17.5.3	Loss of Inlay	309
17.5.4	Corneal Edema	310
17.5.5	Deposits	310
17.5.6	Haze.	310
17.5.7	Halos and Glare.	310
17.5.8	Irregular Astigmatism	311
17.5.9	Epithelial Perilenticular Opacity	311
17.5.10	Explant of the Inlay.	312
17.6	Conclusion	312
	References	312

Chapter 18

	The Patient	315
--	------------------------------	-----

Chapter 18.1

	Predicting the Unhappy Patient and Patient Expectations	315
--	--	-----

Nayyirih G. Tahzib and Rudy M.M.A. Nuijts

18.1.1	Introduction.	315
18.1.2	Patient Questionnaires.	316
18.1.3	Clinical Parameters as Predictors of Patient Satisfaction. Two Examples of Refractive Surgery Techniques.	316
18.1.3.1	ARTISAN Phakic Intraocular Lens Implantation Patients.	316
18.1.3.2	LASIK Patients.	317
18.1.4	Discrepancy in Patient Satisfaction and Night Vision Complaints	317
18.1.4.1	Risk Factors for Night Vision Complaints	317
18.1.4.2	Other Postoperative Reasons for Dissatisfaction	318
18.1.5	Managing the Unhappy Patient	318
	References	318

Chapter 18.2

	Informed Consent	320
--	-----------------------------------	-----

James J. Salz

18.2.1	Introduction.	320
18.2.2	Informed Consent as a Process.	320
18.2.3	Language of Informed Consent	321
18.2.3.1	Additions to the Generic Informed Consent	321
18.2.4	Personal Interaction with the Surgeon	322
18.2.5	Timing of the Informed Consent	322
	References	325

Chapter 18.3

	Effect of Refractive Surgery on Strabismus and Binocular Vision	325
--	--	-----

Bharavi Kharod and Natalie A. Afshari

18.3.1	Background	325
18.3.2	Causes of Strabismus and Binocular Vision Impairment in Refractive Patients.	326
18.3.2.1	Patients with Delayed Decompensation of Strabismus after Refractive Surgery	326
18.3.2.2	Patients with Spectacle-Corrected Preoperative Strabismus.	326
18.3.3	Patients with Preoperative Latent Manifest Strabismus	326
18.3.3.1	Monovision and Strabismus	327
18.3.4	Prevention of Strabismus and Binocular Vision Impairment in Refractive Patients.	327
18.3.5	Treatment of Decompensated Strabismus	327
	Bibliography	327

Chapter 19	
Peer-Reviewed Literature	329
Chapter 19.1	
10-Year Classified Review of the Peer Review Literature on Excimer Laser Refractive Complications	329
Takashi Kojima, Tatsuya Ongucci, Joelle Hallak, and Dimitri Azar	
19.1.1 Introduction	329
19.1.2 LASIK Complications	331
19.1.2.1 Flap Complications	331
19.1.2.1.1 Diffuse Lamellar Keratitis	331
19.1.2.1.2 Interface Fluid	331
19.1.2.1.3 Dry Eye	331
19.1.2.1.4 Infectious Keratitis	333
19.1.2.1.5 Epithelial Ingrowth	333
19.1.2.1.6 Ectasia	333
19.1.2.1.7 Night Vision	333
19.1.2.1.8 Retinal Detachment	335
19.1.3 PRK and LASEK Complications	335
19.1.3.1 PRK Haze	335
19.1.3.2 LASEK Haze	337
19.1.4 Conclusion	337
References	337
Chapter 19.2	
10-Year Review of the Literature on Complications of Incisional, Thermal, and Lenticular Refractive Procedures	339
Tatsuya Ongucci, Takashi Kojima, and Dimitri Azar	
19.2.1 Introduction	339
19.2.2 Complications of Incisional, Thermal, and Inlay Keratorefractive Procedures	339
19.2.2.1 Complications of Radial Keratotomy and Astigmatic Keratotomy	339
19.2.2.2 Complications of Conductive Keratoplasty	339
19.2.2.3 Complications of Intacs and Inlay Procedures	339
19.2.2.3.1 Intra Corneal Ring Segment (Intacs)	339
19.2.2.3.2 Inlay Complications	339
19.2.3 Complications of Phakic Intraocular Lenses	339
19.2.3.1 Cataract	340
19.2.3.2 Retinal Detachment	340
19.2.3.3 Intraocular Pressure	340
19.2.3.4 Pupillary Block	340
19.2.3.5 Endothelial Cell Loss	340
19.2.3.6 Pupil Ovalization	340
19.2.4 Retinal Detachment after Refractive Lens Exchange	340
19.2.5 Conclusion	341
References	347
Epilog Preventing Complications in Refractive Surgery – Present and Future	351
George Waring III	
Subject Index	355

List of Contributors

Natalie A. Afshari, M.D.

Assistant Professor of Ophthalmology
Duke University Medical Center
Box 3802
Durham, NC 27710, USA
Email: Natalie.afshari@duke.edu

César Albarrán, O.D.

Vissum Corporation
Avda de Denia s/n
Edificio Vissum
03016 Alicante, Spain
and
Refractive Surgery Department
Instituto Oftalmológico de Alicante
Miguel Hernández University
Alicante, Spain

Jorge L. Alió, M.D., Ph.D.

Professor and Chairman of Ophthalmology
Miguel Hernández University, Medical School
Vissum Corporation
Avda de Denia s/n
Edificio Vissum
03016 Alicante, Spain
E-mail: jlalio@vissum.com

Waleed A. Allam, M.D.

Research Fellow, Ophthalmology
Refractive Surgery Department
New England Eye Center,
Tufts University School of Medicine
750 Washington St., Box 450
Boston, MA 02111, USA
E-mail address: WALLam@tufts-nemc.org

Norma Allemann, M.D.

Professor, Department of Ophthalmology
Federal University of São Paulo
Paulista School of Medicine
São Paulo, Brazil

Noel Alpins, M.D., F.R.A.C.S., F.R.C.Ophth., F.A.C.S.

Centre for Eye Research Australia
The University of Melbourne
Department of Ophthalmology
c/- Royal Victorian Eye & Ear Hospital
Locked Bag 8
East Melbourne, VIC 8002, Australia
E-mail: nalpins@unimelb.edu.au

Renato Ambrosio, Jr., M.D., Ph.D.

Department of Ophthalmology
Fluminense Federal University
Niterói, Brazil
and
Medical Director
Instituto de Olhos Renato Ambrósio
Visare Personal Laser & Refracta-RIO
Rua Conde de Bonfim 211/712
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil 20520-050
E-mail: renatoambrosiojr@terra.com.br

J. Fernando Arevalo, M.D., F.A.C.S.

Edif. Centro Caracas PH-1
Av. Panteon, San Bernardino
Caracas 1010, Venezuela
E-mail address: arevalojf@movistar.net.ve

Jean Louis Arne, M.D.

Professor of Ophthalmology and Head of Department
Service d'Ophtalmologie
Hôpital Purpan
Toulouse, France
University of Toulouse
Toulouse, France
E-mail: Jean-louis.arne@wanadoo.fr

Dimitri Azar, M.D.

Professor and Head
Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences
Illinois Eye and Ear Infirmary
University of Illinois at Chicago
3.138 EEI MC 648
1855 W. Taylor Street
Chicago, IL 60612, USA
E-mail: dazar@uic.edu

Julio Baviera, M.D.

Paseo de la Castellana 20
28046 Madrid, Spain
E-mail: jbaviera@clinicabaviera.com

Michael W. Belin, M.D.

Professor
Director of Refractive Surgery
Albany Medical College
Cornea Consultants of Albany
1220 New Scotland Rd., Suite 101
Slingerlands, NY 12159, USA

Laurie Brown, C.O.M.T., C.O.E.

1550 Oak St., Suite 5
Eugene, OR 97401, USA
E-mail: finemd@finemd.com

Marlane J. Brown, O.D., F.A.A.O.

Minnesota Eye Consultants
710 E. 24th Street, Suite 106
Minneapolis, MN 55404, USA

Lucio Buratto, M.D.

Piazza Repubblica 21
20124 Milano, Italy
E-mail: lucio@buratto.com

Wallace Chamon, M.D.

Professor, Department of Ophthalmology
Federal University of São Paulo
Paulista School of Medicine
São Paulo, Brazil
E-mail: visus@pobox.com

Arturo S. Chayet, M.D.

CODET Vision Institute
Padre Kino 10159
Tijuana, Mexico 22320
E-mail: arturo.chayet@codetvision.com

Beatrice Cochener, M.D.

Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Brest
Brest Cedex, France
E-mail: Beatrice.Cochener-lamard@chu-brest.fr

Antonio Calossi, D.O.

via 2 Giugno 52
50053 Certaldo (FI), Italy
E-mail: calossi@tin.it

José de la Cruz, M.D.

Assistant Professor
Department of Ophthalmology
and Visual Sciences
Illinois Eye and Ear Infirmary
University of Illinois at Chicago
3.164 EEI MC 648
1855 W. Taylor Street
Chicago, IL 60612, USA
E-mail: josedlc@uic.edu

Elizabeth A. Davis, M.D.

Assistant Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Minnesota Eye Consultants
710 E. 24th Street, Suite 106
Minneapolis, MN 55404, USA
and
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN USA

David Fahd, M.D.

Research Fellow
Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences
Illinois Eye and Ear Infirmary
University of Illinois at Chicago
3.138 EEI MC 648
1855 W. Taylor Street
Chicago, IL 60612, USA

I. Howard Fine, M.D.

Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Casey Eye Institute
1550 Oak St., Suite 5
Eugene, OR 97401, USA
E-mail: finemd@finemd.com

Eric E. Gabison, M.D.

Fondation Ophtalmologique A.
de Rothschild and Bichat Hospital, APHP
25-29 rue Manin
75940 Paris Cedex 19, France
and
CNRS UMR 7149
University Paris XII
Paris, France

Reinaldo A. Garcia, M.D.

Clinica Oftalmologica Centro Caracas
Edif. Centro Caracas PH-1
Av. Panteon, San Bernardino
Caracas 1010, Venezuela

Bruno M. Fontes, M.D.

Instituto de Olhos Renato Ambrósio
Visare Personal Laser & Refracta-RIO
Rua Conde de Bonfim 211/712
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil 20520-050

and

Department of Ophthalmology
Federal University of São Paulo
“Escola Paulista de Medicina”
São Paulo, Brazil

Rafael A. Garcia-Amaris, M.D.

Clinica Oftalmologica Centro Caracas
Edif. Centro Caracas PH-1
Av. Panteon, San Bernardino
Caracas 1010, Venezuela

Javier Gaytan, M.D.

Instituto de Microcirugía Ocular
Departamento de Cornea
c/Munner 10, 10 CP 08022,
Barcelona Spain

Oscar Gris, M.D.

Instituto de Microcirugía Ocular
Departamento de Cornea
c/Munner 10, 10 CP 08022,
Barcelona Spain

José L. Güell, M.D., Ph.D.

Instituto de Microcirugía Ocular
Departamento de Cornea
c/Munner 10, 10 CP 08022,
Barcelona Spain
E-mail: guell@imo.es

Joelle Hallak, B.Sc.

Research Specialist
Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences
Illinois Eye and Ear Infirmary
University of Illinois at Chicago
3.138 EEI MC 648
1855 W. Taylor Street
Chicago, IL 60612, USA
E-mail: joelle@uic.edu

David R. Hardten, M.D.

Adjunct Associate Professor of Ophthalmology
Minnesota Eye Institute
710 E. 24th Street, Suite 106
Minneapolis, MN 55404, USA
Email: drhardten@mneye.com,
with copy to srrust@mneye.com

Sadeer Hannush, M.D.

Attending Surgeon
Wills Eye Hospital
Department of Ophthalmology
Philadelphia, PA
and
Cornea Consultants of Albany
1220 New Scotland Rd., Suite 101
Slingerlands, NY 12159, USA
E-mail: SBHannush@comcast.net

Thanh Hoang-Xuan, M.D.

Professor of Ophthalmology
University of Paris 7
Director, Cornea, External Diseases
and Refractive Surgery Services
Fondation Ophtalmologique A.
de Rothschild and Bichat Hospital, APHP
25–29 rue Manin
75940 Paris Cedex 19, France
E-mail: hoangxuant@aol.com

Richard S. Hoffman, M.D.

1550 Oak St., Suite 5
Eugene, OR 97401, USA
E-mail: finemd@finemd.com

Teresa S. Ignacio, M.D.

IntraLase Corp.
9701 Jeronimo Rd.
Irvine, CA 92618, USA
E-mail: tignacio@intralase.com

Sandeep Jain, M.D.

Assistant Professor in Ophthalmology
Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences
Illinois Eye and Ear Infirmary
University of Illinois at Chicago
3.164 EEI MC 648
1855 W. Taylor Street
Chicago, IL 60612, USA
E-mail: jains@uic.edu

Daniela Jardim, M.D.

Instituto de Olhos Renato Ambrósio
 Visare Personal Laser & Refracta-RIO
 Rua Conde de Bonfim 211/712
 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil 20520-050

Vikentia J. Katsanevaki, M.D., Ph.D.

Head of Refractive Department
 Vardinoyannion Eye Institute
 University of Crete Medical School
 Voutes P.O. Box 1352
 Heraklion, Crete, Greece
 E-mail: vikatsan@med.uoc.gr

Bharavi Kharod, M.D.

Duke University Medical Center
 Box 3802
 Durham, NC 27710, USA

Michael Knorz, M.D.

Professor of Ophthalmology
 FreeVis LASIK Center
 Medical Faculty Mannheim
 of the University of Heidelberg
 Femto LASIK Professional
 Theodor Kutzer Ufer 1–3
 68167 Mannheim, Germany
 E-mail: knorz@eyes.de

Takashi Kojima, M.D.

Research Fellow, Ophthalmology
 Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences
 Illinois Eye and Ear Infirmary
 University of Illinois at Chicago
 3.138 EEI MC 648
 1855 W. Taylor Street
 Chicago, IL 60612, USA

Richard Lindstrom, M.D.

Professor of Ophthalmology
 Minnesota Eye Consultants
 710 E. 24th Street, Suite 106
 Minneapolis, MN 55404, USA
and
 Medical Director
 University of Minnesota
 Minneapolis, MN USA
 E-mail: rlindstrom@mneyc.com

Carlo F. Lovisolo, M.D.

San Raffaele University Hospital
 Quattroelle Eye Centres
 Milan, Italy
 E-mail: loviseye@fastwebnet.it

Antonio A.P. Marinho, M.D., Ph.D.

R. Crasto 708
 4150-243 Porto, Portugal
 E-mail: marin@mail.telepac.pt

Marguerite McDonald, M.D., F.A.C.S.

Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology Tulane University
 School of Medicine
 New Orleans, LA, USA
and
 Rockville Centre
 Ryan Medical Arts Building
 2000 North Village Avenue, Suite 402
 Rockville Centre,
 NY 11570, USA
 Margueritemcdmd@aol.com

Merce Morral, M.D.

Instituto de Microcirugía Ocular
 Departamento de Cornea
 c/Munner 10, 10 CP 08022,
 Barcelona Spain

Felicidad Manero, M.D.

Instituto de Microcirugía Ocular
 Departamento de Cornea
 c/Munner 10, 10 CP 08022,
 Barcelona Spain

Fabio Mazzolani, M.D.

Quattroelle Eye Centers
 Via Cusani 7
 20121 Milano, Italy
 E-mail: carlo.lovisolo@quattroelle.org

Orkun Muftuoglu, M.D.

Vissum Corporation
 Avda de Denia s/n
 Edificio Vissum
 03016 Alicante, Spain

Alessandro Mularoni, M.D.

Ospedale Maggiore
 Largo Negrisoni 2
 40133 Bologna, Italy
 E-mail: alessandro.mularoni@ausl.bologna.it

M. Emilia Mulet, M.D., Ph.D.

Department of Ophthalmology
 Miguel Hernández University, Medical School
 Vissum Corporation
 Avda de Denia s/n
 Edificio Vissum
 03016 Alicante, Spain

Rudy M.M.A. Nuijts, M.D., Ph.D.

Department of Ophthalmology
Academic Hospital Maastricht
P. Debyelaan 25
6202 AZ, Maastricht, The Netherlands
E-mail: rnu@compaagnet.nl

David P.S. O'Brart, M.D., F.R.C.S., F.R.C.Ophth.

Department of Ophthalmology
St. Thomas' Hospital
London, UK
DavidOBrart@aol.com

Tatsuya Ongucci, M.D.

Research Fellow, Ophthalmology
Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences
Illinois Eye and Ear Infirmary
University of Illinois at Chicago
3.138 EEI MC 648
1855 W. Taylor Street
Chicago, IL 60612, USA

Mark Packer, M.D., F.A.C.S.

Clinical Associate Professor
Oregon Eye Institute
1550 Oak St., Suite 5
Eugene, OR 97401, USA
E-mail: finemd@finemd.com

David Piñero, O.D.

Department of Ophthalmology
Miguel Hernández University, Medical School
Vissum Corporation
Avda de Denia s/n
Edificio Vissum
03016 Alicante, Spain

Konrad Pseudovs, Ph.D.

NH&MRC Centre for Clinical Eye Research,
Department of Ophthalmology,
Flinders Medical Centre and Flinders University
Bedford Park, South Australia 5045, Australia
E-mail: Konrad.Pseudovs@flinders.edu.au

Jerome C. Ramos-Esteban, M.D.

Eye Institute
Cleveland Clinic
9500 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44195, USA

J. Bradley Randleman, M.D.

Assistant Professor of Ophthalmology
Emory University Department of Ophthalmology
1365 B Clifton Road NE, Suite 4500
Atlanta, GA 30322, USA
E-mail: Jrandle@emory.edu

Emanuel Rosen, M.D., F.R.C.S.Ed.

10 St. John Street
Manchester M3 4DY, UK
E-mail: ERosen9850@aol.com

José M^a Ruiz-Moreno, M.D., Ph.D.

Miguel Hernández University, Medical School
Vissum Corporation
Avda de Denia s/n
Edificio Vissum
03016 Alicante, Spain

James J. Salz, M.D.

Medical Director
Laser Vision Medical Associates
240 South La Cienega Blvd., Suite 250
Beverly Hills, CA 90211, USA
E-mail: drsalz@drsalz.com

Juan G. Sanchez, M.D.

Clinica Oftalmologica Centro Caracas
Edif. Centro Caracas PH-1
Av. Panteon, San Bernardino
Caracas 1010, Venezuela

Mohamed H. Shabayek, M.D, M.Sc.

Department of Ophthalmology
Miguel Hernández University, Medical School
Vissum Corporation
Avda de Denia s/n
Edificio Vissum
03016 Alicante, Spain
and
Research Institute of Ophthalmology
Giza, Egypt

Bryan S. Sires, M.D., Ph.D.

Allure Facial Laser and Medispa
University of Washington
Clinical Associate Professor
Kirkland, WA 98033, USA
E-mail: bsires@u.washington.edu

Stephen Slade, M.D.

3900 Essex Lane, Suite 101
Houston, TX 77027, USA
E-mail: sgs@visiontexas.com

Roger F. Steinert, M.D.

Professor of Ophthalmology
Professor of Biomedical Engineering
Department of Ophthalmology
118 Med Surge I
University of California, Irvine
Irvine, CA 92697-4375, USA
E-mail: steinert@uci.edu

Charles Wm. Stewart, D.O.

LIGI Tecnologie Medicali S.p.A.
via Luigi Corsi, 50
74100 Taranto, Italy

Karl G. Stonecipher, M.D.

Medical Director
TLC Greensboro
3312 Battleground Ave.
Greensboro, NC 27410, USA
E-mail: StoneNC@aol.com

Kody G. Stonecipher

1009 Country Club Drive
Greensboro, NC 27408, USA
E-mail: stonenc@gmail.com

R. Doyle Stulting, M.D., Ph.D.

Professor of Ophthalmology
Emory University Department of Ophthalmology
1365 B Clifton Road NE, Suite 4500
Atlanta, GA 30322, USA
E-mail: ophtrds@emory.edu

Jonathan H. Talamo, M.D.

Associate Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Harvard Medical School
Talamo Laser Eye Consultants
Reservoir Place, Suite 184
1601 Trapelo Rd.
Waltham, MA 02451, USA
E-mail: jht1@comcast.net; jtalamo@lecb.com

Gustavo E. Tamayo, M.D.

Bogota Laser Refractive Surgery
Calle 114 #9-45 Torre B, Suite 906
Bogota, Colombia
E-mail: gtvotmy@telecorp.net

Nayyirih G. Tahzib, M.D.

Department of Ophthalmology
Academic Hospital Maastricht
P. Debyelaan 25
6202 AZ, Maastricht, The Netherlands

Luis F Torres, M.D., Ph.D.

INOVA Vision Institute
Department of Surgery,
Biomedical Center, Autonomous
University of Aguascalientes
Sierra Morena 238, Bosques del Prado
Aguascalientes, Ags, Mexico 20127
E-mail: ftorresb@yahoo.com

Vance Thompson, M.D., F.A.C.S.

Director
Sioux Valley
Clinic, Talley Building
Sioux Falls, SD, USA
and
Sanford Clinic Vance Thompson Vision
1310 West 22nd Street, 2nd Floor
Sioux Falls, SD 57105, USA
E-mail: thompsov@siouxvalley.org

Gemma Walsh, B.Optom.

Centre for Eye Research Australia
The University of Melbourne
Department of Ophthalmology
c/- Royal Victorian Eye & Ear Hospital
Locked Bag 8
East Melbourne, VIC 8002, Australia

Steve Wilson, M.D.

Eye Institute
Cleveland Clinic
9500 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44195, USA
E-mail: WILSONS4@ccf.org

Helen K. Wu, M.D.

Assistant Professor of Ophthalmology
New England Eye Center,
Tufts University School of Medicine
750 Washington St., Box 450
Boston, MA 02111, USA
E-mail: HWu@tufts-nemc.org

George O. Waring III, M.D., F.A.C.S., F.R.C.Ophth.

Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Emory University, School of Medicine
Atlanta, Georgia, USA

Refractive Surgery Outcomes and Frequency of Complications

Wallace Chamon and Norma Alleman

Contents

1.1	Common Complications Associated with Refractive Surgery	1
1.1.1	Refractive Imprecision and Loss of Spectacle-Corrected Visual Acuity	1
1.1.2	Infection	3
1.1.3	Infection and Contact Lenses	3
1.1.4	Subjective Complaints	3
1.1.5	Retinal Detachment	4
1.2	Keratorefractive Procedures	4
1.2.1	Photorefractive Keratectomy	4
1.2.1.1	Haze	4
1.2.1.2	Mitomycin C	4
1.2.1.3	Keratectasia	4
1.2.2	LASIK	4
1.2.2.1	Microkeratome-Related Complications	4
1.2.2.2	Femtosecond Laser	4
1.2.2.3	Dislocated Flap	4
1.2.2.4	Diffuse Lamellar Keratitis	4
1.2.2.5	Keratectasia	4
1.3	Phakic Intraocular Lenses	4
1.3.1	Endothelial Cell Loss	4
1.3.2	Pupillary Block Glaucoma	5
1.3.3	Iris Atrophy and Pupil Ovalization	5
1.3.4	Chronic Inflammation	5
1.3.5	Intraocular Lens Dislocation	5
1.3.6	Cataract	5
1.3.7	Pigment Dispersion	5
1.3.8	Posterior Luxation (in Phakic Refractive Lens)	5
	References	5

Core Messages

- There is no risk-free surgical procedure.
- There are enough data in literature to determine the risk for the majority of the refractive surgery procedures.
- Refractive surgery risks and benefits should be evaluated individually in order to choose the surgical approach properly.

- Not only incidence, but also morbidity of each possible complication should be considered in this choice.
- Decision making in refractive procedure is an individualized process that should be based on scientific knowledge, patient's characteristics, and surgeon experience.

1.1 Common Complications Associated with Refractive Surgery

Some complications are implicit to any surgical procedure, varying only in their incidence and morbidity. Such complications will be evaluated here according to their characteristics in each group of refractive surgical procedures.

1.1.1 Refractive Imprecision and Loss of Spectacle-Corrected Visual Acuity

The most frequent complication observed in any refractive procedure is the lack in achieving accurate refraction outcome. As a rule, accuracy decreases with the amount of refractive error. Photoablative procedures tend to be the most accurate ones for low ametropias. Photorefractive keratectomy (PRK) and laser-assisted in situ keratomileusis (LASIK) deal with different variables that may affect predictability: corneal wound healing and stromal bed elasticity, respectively [1].

Although results minimally favor LASIK, we may expect that in any photoablative procedure, approximately 60–70% of eyes will achieve 20/20 uncorrected visual acuity and will be within ± 0.50 D after surgery. If we analyze only low myopias (under 6.00 D), approximately 70–80% will achieve 20/20 uncorrected visual acuity (Table 1.1) [1–9].

A general evaluation of surgical safety should consider spectacle-corrected visual acuity (SCVA). One to 5% of eyes will lose at least two lines of SCVA 6 months after surgery, but 1% or less of all eyes will achieve less than 20/40 of SCVA. One to 2% of eyes that achieved, preoperatively, 20/20 of SCVA will achieve less than 20/25 SCVA after surgery (Table 1.2) [1–9].

Phakic intraocular lenses (IOLs) tend to present less accurate refractive correction; although, since they are nor-

Table 1.1. LASIK versus PRK for correction of myopia

	UCVA 20/20			+/- 0.50 D			UCVA 20/20 (low myopia)			
	LASIK	PRK	%	LASIK	PRK	%	LASIK	PRK	%	
	n	n	%	n	n	%	n	n	%	
Literature: 6 months postoperative										
Wang et al. [4]	109	81.7	335	71.6			109	81.7	335	71.6
Hersh et al. [5]	61	26.2	68	19.1						
El-Magrabi et al. [7]	28	67.9	28	42.9	59	27.1	68	29.4		
Forseto et al. [6]	8	100	9	88.9	8	87.5	9	88.9	8	100
Hjortdal et al. [1]	25	4	20	15	25	20	20	25		
Literature: 12 months postoperative										
Wang et al. [4]	103	82.5	307	72	103	70.9	307	61.2	103	82.5
El-Magrabi et al. [7]	30	66.7	30	53.3	30	73.3	30	66.7		
el Danasuri et al. [8]	24	79.2	24	62.5	24	87.5	24	83.3	24	79.2
Forseto et al. [6]	15	73.3	15	53.3	15	93.3	15	86.7	15	73.3
Hjortdal et al. [1]	25	4	20	15	25	16	20	30		
FDA: 6 months postoperative	6,615	59.4	3,173	59.9	7,207	69.9	3,296	62.7		
FDA: 12 months postoperative	2,774	58.1	2,094	54.5	2,985	61	2,065	56.3		
6 months total	6,846	59.4	3,633	59.9	7,299	69.4	3,393	61.9	117	82.9
6 months literature total	231	57.6	460	60	92	30.4	97	34	117	82.9
6 months FDA total	6,615	59.4	3,173	59.9	7,207	69.9	3,296	62.7	0	NA
12 months total	2,971	58.8	2,490	56.4	3,182	61.4	2,461	57.3	142	81
12 months literature total	197	69	396	66.4	197	68	396	62.4	142	81
12 months FDA total	2,774	58.1	2,094	54.5	2,985	61	2,065	56.3	0	NA

Data set modified from Shortt et al. [3]

PRK photorefractive keratectomy, UCVA 20/20 eyes that achieved post treatment uncorrected visual acuity (UCVA) of 20/20, +/- 0.50 D eyes within 0.50 D of target refraction, UCVA 20/20 (low myopia) eyes that achieved post treatment UCVA of 20/20 in a subgroup of myopia ≤6 D, FDA US Food and Drug Administration, NA not applicable

Table 1.2 LASIK versus PRK for spectacle-corrected visual acuity (SCVA)

	Loss of ≥ 2 lines				SCVA < 20/40				SCVA < 20/25			
	LASIK		PRK		LASIK		PRK		LASIK		PRK	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Literature: 6 months postoperative												
Wang et al. [4]	307	3.9	103	1								
Hersh et al. [5]	68	11.8	59	3.4	68	1.5	61	0	68	1.5	59	1.7
El-Magrabi et al. [7]	27	7.4	27	7.4	27	3.7	27	0	27	3.7	27	3.7
Forseto et al. [6]	24	0	24	0	24	0	24	0	24	0	24	0
Hjordtal et al. [1]	20	10	25	4	20	0	25	0	20	0	25	0
FDA: 6 months postoperative	4,412	3.2	7,554	1.1	4,414	0.3	7,810	0.3	4,299	2.4	7,612	1.4
6 months total	4,858	3.4	7,792	1.2	4,553	0.4	7,947	0.3	4,438	2.3	7,747	1.4
6 months literature total	446	5.4	238	2.5	139	1.4	137	0	139	1.4	135	1.5
6 months FDA total	4,412	3.2	7,554	1.1	4,414	0.3	7,810	0.3	4,299	2.4	7,612	1.4

Data set modified from Shortt et al. [3]

PRK photorefractive keratectomy, loss of ≥ 2 lines eyes that lost of ≥ 2 lines of SCVA, SCVA < 20/40 final SCVA worse than 20/40, SCVA < 20/25 final SCVA worse than 20/25 when preoperative best SCVA $\geq 20/20$, FDA US Food and Drug Administration, NA not applicable

mally used to correct higher ametropias, an expected result with most of the patients within ± 1.00 , should be appreciated [10–14]. Image magnification after correcting high-myopic eyes with IOLs generate a confounding factor in evaluating pre- and post-SCVA; therefore, information published on this subject lacks credibility [15].

The only procedure that does not rely on clinical refraction to determine total correction is clear lens extraction. Its predictability depends on how accurately we can determine corneal power, axial length, and the effective position of the implanted IOL. Approximately 95% of normal eyes should present less than 1.00 D of refractive error [16]. Predictability reduces greatly when operating eyes that underwent corneal refractive surgery, but new approaches for calculating IOL power have improved the results [17, 18].

1.1.2 Infection

Determining the risk of infection on photoablative procedures is a difficult task due to misdiagnoses and lack in laboratorial information. We may expect an incidence between 0.1:10,000 and 1:10,000, favoring LASIK over PRK [19–21]. Infection has been reported after LASIK with femtosecond laser [22]. Bilateral simultaneous keratorefractive procedures are considered standard of care [23, 24], but the risk of bilateral infection may add extra damage to this po-

tentially devastating complication. Risk of infection in intraocular surgeries should follow the incidence of infection in cataract surgery that is approximately 1:1,000 [25–27]. Intracorneal implants are theoretically more susceptible to infection due the difficulty of the immune system to act in an intrastromal fashion [28–30].

1.1.3 Infection and Contact Lenses

Risk of infection in contact lenses wearers should be considered when evaluating incidence of infection in refractive surgery. The risk of keratitis in contact lenses wearers depends on the modality of use (daily wear or extended wear) and the lens type. Literature has shown that, per year, the risk of presenting a severe keratitis will vary from 3:10,000 to almost 100:10,000 [31], and the risk of presenting loss of visual acuity is 3.6:10,000 among silicone hydrogel extended wearers [32].

1.1.4 Subjective Complaints

Subjective complaints such as halos, glare, starburst, and low-contrast sensitivity maybe correlated to low- and high-order optical aberrations [33, 34] as well as to optical characteristics of the implanted IOL [35–38] and the diameter of

the pupil [39]. All refractive procedures present the risk of subjective complaints, but special attention should be paid in keratorefractive surgeries in eyes with larger pupil diameter, since this procedure is performed further from the pupil plane, when compared with phakic intraocular implants or clear lens extraction.

1.1.5 Retinal Detachment

Retinal detachment has been associated with LASIK [40–44]; but, so far, it is not possible to detect a cause–effect relationship nor to determine a higher incidence of vitreoretinal pathological conditions post-LASIK.

Cataract extraction increases the cumulative risk of retinal detachment an average of fourfold. There is no difference between patients who underwent extracapsular cataract extraction and phacoemulsification. The risk increases in myopic [45], younger men (less than 50 years old) [46, 47]. It has been suggested that phakic IOLs implantation may be related to a higher risk of retinal detachment [48, 49].

1.2 Keratorefractive Procedures

1.2.1 Photorefractive Keratectomy

1.2.1.1 Haze

Incidence of haze and treatment regression is associated to the attempted correction and may be expected to be up to 2% in the first year post-PRK [50]. Although it is commonly suggested that haze may be less incident with newer lasers, there is no scientific evidence that it is true [51].

1.2.1.2 Mitomycin C

The use of intraoperative mitomycin C has raised the expectation for treating higher ametropias with PRK [52–57]. Potential risks associated to its use are the consequences of keratocyte depletion [58] as well as endothelium and anterior chamber toxicity [59, 60].

1.2.1.3 Keratectasia

Although there are reports of keratectasia that occurred in normal eyes after PRK [61], most the few cases reported so far are of forme fruste keratoconus that progressed after PRK [62–64] or phototherapeutic keratectomy (PTK) [65, 66]. It is still to be proven if the procedure influences the progression of the disease.

1.2.2 LASIK

1.2.2.1 Microkeratome-Related Complications

Irregular flaps related to the microkeratome cut maybe presented as incomplete flaps, free caps, buttonholed flaps [67], thin flaps, thick flaps, and partially cut flaps. Irregular flaps

are expected in less than 1% of the procedures performed with new microkeratomes [23, 68–72]. Microkeratome-related complications depend on the learning curve and may be two or three times more frequent in the first 1,000 surgeries [69]. Initial microkeratomes had a complication rate of up to 6%; their evolution, with new safety concerns, decreased the incidence [70, 72]. Outcomes after an irregular flap are improved if photoablation is not carried out at the time of the complication [73, 74].

1.2.2.2 Femtosecond Laser

Most of the literature shows that reliability in flap creation has increased with the use of femtosecond laser [75–77], but some articles do not differentiate the outcomes between microkeratome and femtosecond laser [78, 79]. A new entity, transient light-sensitivity syndrome (TLSS), was reported in approximately 1% of the eyes with femtosecond laser-created flaps [80, 81].

1.2.2.3 Dislocated Flap

Flap dislocation is a complication encountered in approximately 2% of the procedures [71, 82] and has been reported up to 30 months after the surgery [83–85].

1.2.2.4 Diffuse Lamellar Keratitis

Diffuse lamellar keratitis (DLK) is a disease of unknown pathophysiology [86–88] that was first described in 1998 [89]. It occurs in an average of 0.7% of the procedures, and it is most frequently present in outbreaks [90]. A hyperopic shift and increased optical aberrations are expected in patients that presented DLK [91, 92].

1.2.2.5 Keratectasia

Although there are reports of ectasia that occurred in eyes without known risk factors [93], approximately 90% of the eyes that develop ectasia have preoperative signs of forme fruste keratoconus [94]. Besides the diagnosis of forme fruste keratoconus and residual stromal bed of less than 250 μm [94], known topographical risk factors for corneal ectasia post-LASIK are corneal curvature, pachymetry, oblique astigmatism, posterior corneal surface elevation, difference between inferior and superior corneal dioptric power, and correlation between anterior and posterior best-fit sphere [95]. Treatments for corneal ectasia include rigid contact lenses, intrastromal corneal rings [96], keratoplasty, and collagen cross-linking [97, 98].

1.3 Phakic Intraocular Lenses

1.3.1 Endothelial Cell Loss

Anterior chamber angle-supported phakic IOLs present an initial decrease in endothelium cell density of 5–10% in 2

years, with a slightly higher than normal decrease after that [99–102]. Iris-supported lenses appear to present continuous decrease in cell density at longer follow-up, achieving between 10 and 15% at 2 years [99, 103, 104]. Although posterior-chamber IOLs have a lower risk of endothelial cell loss, a decrease of 5 to 10% may be expected 2 years after surgery [105]. Careful follow-up of patients who have undergone phakic implants should allow lenses to be removed before any clinical symptoms present, if damage of the endothelium persists.

1.3.2 Pupillary Block Glaucoma

Pupillary block glaucoma has been reported in anterior chamber iris-supported [106], angle-supported [107, 108], and posterior chamber phakic IOLs [109–111]. Preoperative iridectomy is mandatory, but pupillary block has been reported even in the presence of effective iridectomy [111].

1.3.3 Iris Atrophy and Pupil Ovalization

Eyes with anterior chamber angle-supported phakic IOLs have a tendency to present sectorial iris atrophy and consequent pupil ovalization [100–102, 107]. Its frequency depends on the limits accepted, but up to 40% ovalization (difference of 0.5 mm in orthogonal diameters) may be expected [101].

1.3.4 Chronic Inflammation

Chronic inflammation is present in all phakic IOL models. It has been reported to be higher than are controls in anterior chamber iris-supported and anterior chamber angle-supported at 12, 18, and 24 months after surgery [101, 112]. Aqueous flare was slightly better for the angle-supported group.

In posterior chamber IOLs, aqueous flare increased by 49.19% in the first postoperative month in relation to preoperative values, decreasing afterward, but remaining above preoperative values up to 2 years postoperatively [105].

1.3.5 Intraocular Lens Dislocation

Traumatic and spontaneous IOL dislocations have been described in anterior chamber iris-supported phakic IOLs [113, 114].

1.3.6 Cataract

Anterior subcapsular cataracts are related to posterior chamber phakic IOLs implants and are present in 8.2% of the eyes [115–118]. Most of the eyes that presented cataract were operated on in the beginning of the surgeon's learning curve [117]. Nuclear cataract has been reported in ante-

rior chamber angle-supported IOLs [118, 119], but it has not possible to determine a cause–effect relationship.

1.3.7 Pigment Dispersion

Pigment dispersion has been observed in approximately 3% of eyes that underwent posterior chamber phakic IOL implants [110, 120, 121]. There are no reports of glaucoma in eyes that presented pigment dispersion.

1.3.8 Posterior Luxation (in Phakic Refractive Lens™)

Spontaneous luxation to the vitreous of one specific model of silicone posterior chamber phakic IOL (Phakic Refractive Lens, PRL™) is a severe complication related to the weakening of the zonule [122, 123].

Take-Home Pearls

- Refractive surgery provides a variety of elective procedures to be performed in otherwise healthy eyes. The knowledge of their possible complications is mandatory to inform our patients of their options.

References

1. Hjortdal JO, Moller-Pedersen T, Ivarsen A, Ehlers N (2005) Corneal power, thickness, and stiffness: results of a prospective randomized controlled trial of PRK and LASIK for myopia. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 31:21–29
2. Shortt AJ, Allan BD (2006) Photorefractive keratectomy (PRK) versus laser-assisted in-situ keratomileusis (LASIK) for myopia. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* CD005135
3. Shortt AJ, Bunce C, Allan BD (2006) Evidence for superior efficacy and safety of LASIK over photorefractive keratectomy for correction of myopia. *Ophthalmology* 113:1897–1908
4. Wang Z, Chen J, Yang B (1997) Comparison of laser in situ keratomileusis and photorefractive keratectomy to correct myopia from -1.25 to -6.00 diopters. *J Refract Surg* 13:528–534
5. Hersh PS, Brint SF, Maloney RK, Durrie DS, Gordon M, Michelson MA (1998) Photorefractive keratectomy versus laser in situ keratomileusis for moderate to high myopia. A randomized prospective study. *Ophthalmology* 105:1512–1522, discussion 1522–1523
6. Forseto AS, Nosé RA, Nosé W (2000) PRK versus LASIK for correction of low and moderate myopia [in Portuguese]. *Arq Bras Oftalmol* 63:257–262
7. El-Maghraby A, Salah T, Waring GO III, Klyce S, Ibrahim O (1999) Randomized bilateral comparison of excimer laser in situ keratomileusis and photorefractive keratectomy for 2.50 to 8.00 diopters of myopia. *Ophthalmology* 106:447–457
8. el Danasoury MA, el Maghraby A, Klyce SD, Mehrez K (1999) Comparison of photorefractive keratectomy with excimer laser in situ keratomileusis in correcting low myopia (from -2.00 to -5.50 diopters): a randomized study. *Ophthalmology* 106:411–420; discussion 420–421

9. US Food and Drug Administration (2006) Lasik eye surgery. Available via <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/LASIK/>. Cited 22 March 2007
10. Roy S, Tritten JJ (2002) [Myopic implant of the posterior chamber using a flexible Collamer lens]. *Klin Monatsbl Augenheilkd* 219:196–200
11. Liekfeld A, Friederici L, Klotz O (2005) [Monocentric two-year results after phakic posterior chamber lens (PRL) implantation in myopic patients]. *Klin Monatsbl Augenheilkd* 222:888–893
12. Leroux-Les-Jardins S, Ullern M, Werthel AL (1999) [Myopic anterior chamber intraocular lens implantation: evaluation at 8 years]. *J Fr Ophtalmol* 22:323–327
13. Lackner B, Pieh S, Schmidinger G, Hanselmayer G, Dejacoruhswurm I, Funovics MA, (2003) Outcome after treatment of ametropia with implantable contact lenses. *Ophthalmology* 110:2153–2161
14. Benedetti S, Casamenti V, Marcaccio L, Brogioni C, Assetto V (2005) Correction of myopia of 7 to 24 diopters with the Artisan phakic intraocular lens: two-year follow-up. *J Refract Surg* 21:116–126
15. Garcia M, Gonzalez C, Pascual I, Fimia A (1996) Magnification and visual acuity in highly myopic phakic eyes corrected with an anterior chamber intraocular lens versus by other methods. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 22:1416–1422
16. Holladay JT, Prager TC, Chandler TY, Musgrove KH, Lewis JW, Ruiz RS (1988) A three-part system for refining intraocular lens power calculations. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 14:17–24
17. Aramberry J (2003) Intraocular lens power calculation after corneal refractive surgery: double-K method. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 29:2063–2068
18. Chamon W (2004) A new approach to correct an inherent error in IOL calculation formulas for eyes submitted to keratorefractive procedures. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 45(Abstr):341
19. de Oliveira GC, Solari HP, Ciola FB, Lima AL, Campos MS (2006) Corneal infiltrates after excimer laser photorefractive keratectomy and LASIK. *J Refract Surg* 22:159–165
20. Wroblewski KJ, Pasternak JF, Bower KS, Schallhorn SC, Hubickey WJ, Harrison CE (2006) Infectious keratitis after photorefractive keratectomy in the United States army and navy. *Ophthalmology* 113:520–525
21. Moshirfar M, Welling JD, Feiz V, Holz H, Clinch TE (2007) Infectious and noninfectious keratitis after laser in situ keratomileusis Occurrence, management, and visual outcomes. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 33:474–483
22. Lifshitz T, Levy J, Mahler O, Levinger S (2005) Peripheral sterile corneal infiltrates after refractive surgery. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 31:1392–1395
23. Gimbel HV, van Westenbrugge JA, Penno EE, Ferensowicz M, Feinerman GA, Chen R (1999) Simultaneous bilateral laser in situ keratomileusis: safety and efficacy. *Ophthalmology* 106:1461–1467, discussion 1467–1468
24. Huang D, Krueger R, Stulting RD (2000) Correlation between eyes in bilateral LASIK. *Ophthalmology* 107:1962–1963
25. Kattan HM, Flynn HW, Jr., Pflugfelder SC, Robertson C, Forster RK (1991) Nosocomial endophthalmitis survey. Current incidence of infection after intraocular surgery. *Ophthalmology* 98:227–238
26. Marty N, Malavaud S (2002) [Epidemiology of nosocomial infections after cataract surgery and role of the Infection Control Committee in prevention]. *Bull Acad Natl Med* 186:635–645, discussion 645–648
27. Haapala TT, Nelimarkka L, Saari JM, Ahola V, Saari KM (2005) Endophthalmitis following cataract surgery in southwest Finland from 1987 to 2000. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol* 243:1010–1017
28. McAlister JC, Ardjomand N, Ilari L, Mengher LS, Gartry DS (2006) Keratitis after intracorneal ring segment insertion for keratoconus. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 32:676–678
29. Mondino BJ, Rabin BS, Kessler E, Gallo J, Brown SI (1977) Corneal rings with gram-negative bacteria. *Arch Ophthalmol* 95:2222–2225
30. Hofling-Lima AL, Branco BC, Romano AC, Campos MQ, Moreira H, Miranda D (2004) Corneal infections after implantation of intracorneal ring segments. *Cornea* 23:547–549
31. Morgan PB, Efron N, Hill EA, Raynor MK, Whiting MA, Tullo AB (2005) Incidence of keratitis of varying severity among contact lens wearers. *Br J Ophthalmol* 89:430–436
32. Schein OD, McNally JJ, Katz J, Chalmers RL, Tielsch JM, Alfonso E (2005) The incidence of microbial keratitis among wearers of a 30-day silicone hydrogel extended-wear contact lens. *Ophthalmology* 112:2172–2179
33. Chalita MR, Chavala S, Xu M, Krueger RR (2004) Wavefront analysis in post-LASIK eyes and its correlation with visual symptoms, refraction, and topography. *Ophthalmology* 111:447–453
34. Chalita MR, Krueger RR (2004) Correlation of aberrations with visual acuity and symptoms. *Ophthalmol Clin North Am* 17:135–42, v–vi
35. Chiam PJ, Chan JH, Aggarwal RK, Kasaby S (2006) ReSTOR intraocular lens implantation in cataract surgery: quality of vision. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 32:1459–1463
36. Casprini F, Balestrazzi A, Tosi GM, Miracco F, Martone G, Cevenini G (2005) Glare disability and spherical aberration with five foldable intraocular lenses: a prospective randomized study. *Acta Ophthalmol Scand* 83:20–25
37. Bellucci R, Morselli S, Pucci V (2007) Spherical aberration and coma with an aspherical and a spherical intraocular lens in normal age-matched eyes. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 33:203–209
38. Tester R, Pace NL, Samore M, Olson RJ (2000) Dysphotopsia in phakic and pseudophakic patients: incidence and relation to intraocular lens type(2). *J Cataract Refract Surg* 26:810–816
39. Oshika T, Tokunaga T, Samejima T, Miyata K, Kawana K, Kaji Y (2006) Influence of pupil diameter on the relation between ocular higher-order aberration and contrast sensitivity after laser in situ keratomileusis. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 47:1334–1338
40. Ruiz-Moreno JM, Perez-Santonja JJ, Alio JL (1999) Retinal detachment in myopic eyes after laser in situ keratomileusis. *Am J Ophthalmol* 128:588–594
41. Arevalo JF, Freeman WR, Gomez L (2001) Retina and vitreous pathology after laser-assisted in situ keratomileusis: is there a cause-effect relationship? *Ophthalmology* 108:839–840
42. Lin J, Xie X, Du X, Yang Y, Yao K (2002) [Incidence of vitreoretinal pathologic conditions in myopic eyes after laser in situ keratomileusis]. *Zhonghua Yan Ke Zhi* 38:546–549
43. Suzuki CR, Farah ME (2004) Retinal peripheral changes after laser in situ keratomileusis in patients with high myopia. *Can J Ophthalmol* 39:69–73
44. Faghihi H, Jalali KH, Amini A, Hashemi H, Fotouhi A, Esfahani MR (2006) Rhegmatogenous retinal detachment after LASIK for myopia. *J Refract Surg* 22:448–452
45. Sheu SJ, Ger LP, Chen JF (2006) Axial myopia is an extremely significant risk factor for young-aged pseudophakic retinal detachment in taiwan. *Retina* 26:322–327
46. Erie JC, Raecker MA, Baratz KH, Schleck CD, Burke JP, Robertson DM (2006) Risk of retinal detachment after cataract extraction, 1980–2004: a population-based study. *Ophthalmology* 113:2026–2032
47. Olsen G, Olson RJ (2000) Update on a long-term, prospective study of capsulotomy and retinal detachment rates after cataract surgery. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 26:1017–1021
48. Martinez-Castillo V, Boixadera A, Verdugo A, Elies D, Coret A, Garcia-Arumi J (2005) Rhegmatogenous retinal detachment in

- phakic eyes after posterior chamber phakic intraocular lens implantation for severe myopia. *Ophthalmology* 112:580–585
49. Navarro R, Gris O, Broc L, Corcostegui B (2005) Bilateral giant retinal tear following posterior chamber phakic intraocular lens implantation. *J Refract Surg* 21:298–300
 50. Kuo IC, Lee SM, Hwang DG (2004) Late-onset corneal haze and myopic regression after photorefractive keratectomy (PRK). *Cornea* 23:350–355
 51. Fiore T, Carones F, Brancato R (2001) Broad beam vs. flying spot excimer laser: refractive and videokeratographic outcomes of two different ablation profiles after photorefractive keratectomy. *J Refract Surg* 17:534–541
 52. Bedei A, Marabotti A, Giannecchini I, Ferretti C, Montagnani M, Martinucci C (2006) Photorefractive keratectomy in high myopic defects with or without intraoperative mitomycin C: 1-year results. *Eur J Ophthalmol* 16:229–234
 53. Netto MV, Chalita MR, Krueger RR (2007) Corneal haze following PRK with mitomycin C as a retreatment versus prophylactic use in the contralateral eye. *J Refract Surg* 23:96–98
 54. Netto MV, Mohan RR, Sinha S, Sharma A, Gupta PC, Wilson SE (2006) Effect of prophylactic and therapeutic mitomycin C on corneal apoptosis, cellular proliferation, haze, and long-term keratocyte density in rabbits. *J Refract Surg* 22:562–574
 55. Carones F, Vigo L, Scandola E (2006) Wavefront-guided treatment of symptomatic eyes using the LADAR6000 excimer laser. *J Refract Surg* 22:S983–S989
 56. Chalita MR, Roth AS, Krueger RR (2004) Wavefront-guided surface ablation with prophylactic use of mitomycin C after a buttonhole laser in situ keratomileusis flap. *J Refract Surg* 20:176–181
 57. Carones F, Vigo L, Scandola E, Vacchini L (2002) Evaluation of the prophylactic use of mitomycin-C to inhibit haze formation after photorefractive keratectomy. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 28:2088–2095
 58. Netto MV, Mohan RR, Ambrosio R, Jr., Hutcheon AE, Zieske JD, Wilson SE (2005) Wound healing in the cornea: a review of refractive surgery complications and new prospects for therapy. *Cornea* 24:509–522
 59. Torres RM, Merayo-Llodes J, Daya SM, Blanco-Mezquita JT, Espinosa M, Nozal MJ (2006) Presence of mitomycin-C in the anterior chamber after photorefractive keratectomy. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 32:67–71
 60. Morales AJ, Zadok D, Mora-Retana R, Martinez-Gama E, Robledo NE, Chayet AS (2006) Intraoperative mitomycin and corneal endothelium after photorefractive keratectomy. *Am J Ophthalmol* 142:400–404
 61. Malecaze F, Couillet J, Calvas P, Fournie P, Arne JL, Brodaty C (2006) Corneal ectasia after photorefractive keratectomy for low myopia. *Ophthalmology* 113:742–746
 62. Lovisolo CF, Fleming JF (2002) Intracorneal ring segments for iatrogenic keratectasia after laser in situ keratomileusis or photorefractive keratectomy. *J Refract Surg* 18:535–441
 63. Javadi MA, Mohammadpour M, Rabei HM (2006) Keratectasia after LASIK but not after PRK in one patient. *J Refract Surg* 22:817–820
 64. Seiler T, Koufala K, Richter G (1998) Iatrogenic keratectasia after laser in situ keratomileusis. *J Refract Surg* 14:312–317
 65. Miyata K, Takahashi T, Tomidokoro A, Ono K, Oshika T (2001) Iatrogenic keratectasia after phototherapeutic keratectomy. *Br J Ophthalmol* 85:247–248
 66. Dean SJ, McGhee CN (2002) Keratectasia after PTK. *Br J Ophthalmol* 86:486
 67. Leung AT, Rao SK, Cheng AC, Yu EW, Fan DS, Lam DS (2000) Pathogenesis and management of laser in situ keratomileusis flap buttonhole. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 26:358–362
 68. Nakano K, Nakano E, Oliveira M, Portellinha W, Alvarenga L (2004) Intraoperative microkeratome complications in 47,094 laser in situ keratomileusis surgeries. *J Refract Surg* 20(Suppl):S723–S726
 69. Tham VM, Maloney RK (2000) Microkeratome complications of laser in situ keratomileusis. *Ophthalmology* 107:920–924
 70. Walker MB, Wilson SE (2000) Lower intraoperative flap complication rate with the Hansatome microkeratome compared to the Automated Corneal Shaper. *J Refract Surg* 16:79–82
 71. Yildirim R, Devranoglu K, Ozdamar A, Aras C, Ozkiris A, Ozkan S (2001) Flap complications in our learning curve of laser in situ keratomileusis using the Hansatome microkeratome. *Eur J Ophthalmol* 11:328–332
 72. Jacobs JM, Taravella MJ (2002) Incidence of intraoperative flap complications in laser in situ keratomileusis. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 28:23–28
 73. Pallikaris IG, Katsanevaki VJ, Panagopoulou SI (2002) Laser in situ keratomileusis intraoperative complications using one type of microkeratome. *Ophthalmology* 109:57–63
 74. Sharma N, Ghate D, Agarwal T, Vajpayee RB (2005) Refractive outcomes of laser in situ keratomileusis after flap complications. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 31:1334–1337
 75. Talamo JH, Meltzer J, Gardner J (2006) Reproducibility of flap thickness with IntraLase FS and Moria LSK-1 and M2 microkeratomes. *J Refract Surg* 22:556–561
 76. Montes-Mico R, Rodriguez-Galietero A, Alio JL (2007) Femtosecond laser versus mechanical keratome LASIK for myopia. *Ophthalmology* 114:62–68
 77. Binder PS (2006) One thousand consecutive IntraLase laser in situ keratomileusis flaps. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 32:962–969
 78. Lim T, Yang S, Kim M, Tchah H (2006) Comparison of the IntraLase femtosecond laser and mechanical microkeratome for laser in situ keratomileusis. *Am J Ophthalmol* 141:833–839
 79. Patel SV, Maguire LJ, McLaren JW, Hodge DO, Bourne WM (2007) Femtosecond laser versus mechanical microkeratome for LASIK: a randomized controlled study. *Ophthalmology* 114:1482–1490
 80. Munoz G, Albarran-Diego C, Sakla HF, Javaloy J, Alio JL (2006) Transient light-sensitivity syndrome after laser in situ keratomileusis with the femtosecond laser Incidence and prevention. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 32:2075–2079
 81. Stonecipher KG, Dishler JG, Ignacio TS, Binder PS (2006) Transient light sensitivity after femtosecond laser flap creation: clinical findings and management. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 32:91–94
 82. Recep OF, Cagil N, Hasiripi H (2000) Outcome of flap subluxation after laser in situ keratomileusis: results of 6-month follow-up. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 26:1158–1162
 83. Aldave AJ, Hollander DA, Abbott RL (2002) Late-onset traumatic flap dislocation and diffuse lamellar inflammation after laser in situ keratomileusis. *Cornea* 21:604–607
 84. Booth MA, Koch DD (2003) Late laser in situ keratomileusis flap dislocation caused by a thrown football. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 29:2032–2033
 85. Tumbocon JA, Paul R, Slomovic A, Rootman DS (2003) Late traumatic displacement of laser in situ keratomileusis flaps. *Cornea* 22:66–69
 86. Kocak I, Karabela Y, Karaman M, Kaya F (2006) Late onset diffuse lamellar keratitis as a result of the toxic effect of Ecballium elaterium herb. *J Refract Surg* 22:826–827
 87. Lazaro C, Perea J, Arias A (2006) Surgical-glove-related diffuse lamellar keratitis after laser in situ keratomileusis: long-term outcomes. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 32:1702–1709
 88. Shen YC, Wang CY, Fong SC, Tsai HY, Lee YF (2006) Diffuse lamellar keratitis induced by toxic chemicals after laser in situ keratomileusis. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 32:1146–1150

89. Smith RJ, Maloney RK. Diffuse lamellar keratitis (1998) A new syndrome in lamellar refractive surgery. *Ophthalmology* 105:1721–1726
90. Bigham M, Enns CL, Holland SP, Buxton J, Patrick D, Marion S (2005) Diffuse lamellar keratitis complicating laser in situ keratomileusis: post-marketing surveillance of an emerging disease in British Columbia, Canada, 2000–2002. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 31:2340–2344
91. Dada T, Pangtey MS, Sharma N, Vajpayee RB, Jhanji V, Sethi HS (2006) Hyperopic shift after LASIK induced diffuse lamellar keratitis. *BMC Ophthalmol* 6:19
92. Beer SM, Campos M, Lopes PT, Andre JA, Jr., Schor P (2007) Ocular wavefront aberrations in patients after diffuse lamellar keratitis. *Cornea* 26:6–8
93. Klein SR, Epstein RJ, Randleman JB, Stulting RD (2006) Corneal ectasia after laser in situ keratomileusis in patients without apparent preoperative risk factors. *Cornea* 25:388–403
94. Randleman JB, Russell B, Ward MA, Thompson KP, Stulting RD (2003) Risk factors and prognosis for corneal ectasia after LASIK. *Ophthalmology* 110:267–275
95. Tabbara KF, Kotb AA (2006) Risk factors for corneal ectasia after LASIK. *Ophthalmology* 113:1618–1622
96. Kymionis GD, Siganos CS, Kounis G, Astyrakakis N, Kalyvianaki MI, Pallikaris IG (2003) Management of post-LASIK corneal ectasia with Intacs inserts: one-year results. *Arch Ophthalmol* 121:322–326
97. Wollensak G, Sporn E, Seiler T (2003) [Treatment of keratoconus by collagen cross-linking]. *Ophthalmologie* 100:44–49
98. Kohlhaas M, Spoerl E, Speck A, Schilde T, Sandner D, Pillunat LE (2005) [A new treatment of keratectasia after LASIK by using collagen with riboflavin/UVA light cross-linking]. *Klin Monatsbl Augenheilkd* 222:430–436
99. Perez-Santonja JJ, Iradier MT, Sanz-Iglesias L, Serrano JM, Zato MA (1996) Endothelial changes in phakic eyes with anterior chamber intraocular lenses to correct high myopia. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 22:1017–1022
100. Baikoff G, Arne JL, Bokobza Y, Colin J, George JL, Lagoutte F (1998) Angle-fixated anterior chamber phakic intraocular lens for myopia of –7 to –19 diopters. *J Refract Surg* 14:282–293
101. Allemann N, Chamon W, Tanaka HM, Mori ES, Campos M, Schor P (2000) Myopic angle-supported intraocular lenses: two-year follow-up. *Ophthalmology* 107:1549–1554
102. Alio JL, de la Hoz F, Perez-Santonja JJ, Ruiz-Moreno JM, Quesada JA (1999) Phakic anterior chamber lenses for the correction of myopia: a 7-year cumulative analysis of complications in 263 cases. *Ophthalmology* 106:458–466
103. Menezo JL, Cisneros AL, Rodriguez-Salvador V (1998) Endothelial study of iris-claw phakic lens: four year follow-up. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 24:1039–1049
104. Saxena R, Landes M, Noordzij B, Luyten GP (2003) Three-year follow-up of the Artisan phakic intraocular lens for hypermetropia. *Ophthalmology* 110:1391–1395
105. Jimenez-Alfaro I, Benitez del Castillo JM, Garcia-Feijoo J, Gil de Bernabe JG, Serrano de La Iglesia JM (2001) Safety of posterior chamber phakic intraocular lenses for the correction of high myopia: anterior segment changes after posterior chamber phakic intraocular lens implantation. *Ophthalmology* 108:90–99
106. Budo C, Hessloehl JC, Izak M, Luyten GP, Menezo JL, Sener BA (2000) Multicenter study of the Artisan phakic intraocular lens. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 26:1163–1171
107. Leccisotti A (2005) Angle-supported phakic intraocular lenses in hyperopia. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 31:1598–1602
108. Ardjomand N, Kolli H, Vidic B, El-Shabrawi Y, Faulborn J (2002) Pupillary block after phakic anterior chamber intraocular lens implantation. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 28:1080–1081
109. Smallman DS, Probst L, Rafuse PE (2004) Pupillary block glaucoma secondary to posterior chamber phakic intraocular lens implantation for high myopia. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 30:905–907
110. Hoyos JE, Dementiev DD, Cigales M, Hoyos-Chacon J, Hoffer KJ (2002) Phakic refractive lens experience in Spain. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 28:1939–1946
111. Bylsma SS, Zalta AH, Foley E, Osher RH (2002) Phakic posterior chamber intraocular lens pupillary block. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 28:2222–2228
112. Perez-Santonja JJ, Iradier MT, Benitez del Castillo JM, Serrano JM, Zato MA (1996) Chronic subclinical inflammation in phakic eyes with intraocular lenses to correct myopia. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 22:183–187
113. Menezo JL, Avino JA, Cisneros A, Rodriguez-Salvador V, Martinez-Costa R (1997) Iris claw phakic intraocular lens for high myopia. *J Refract Surg* 13:545–555
114. Perez-Santonja JJ, Alio JL, Jimenez-Alfaro I, Zato MA (2000) Surgical correction of severe myopia with an angle-supported phakic intraocular lens. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 26:1288–1302
115. Trindade F, Pereira F (1998) Cataract formation after posterior chamber phakic intraocular lens implantation. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 24:1661–1663
116. Fink AM, Gore C, Rosen E (1999) Cataract development after implantation of the Staar Collamer posterior chamber phakic lens. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 25:278–282
117. Sanchez-Galeana CA, Smith RJ, Sanders DR, Rodriguez FX, Litwak S, Montes M (2003) Lens opacities after posterior chamber phakic intraocular lens implantation. *Ophthalmology* 110:781–785
118. Menezo JL, Peris-Martinez C, Cisneros AL, Martinez-Costa R (2004) Phakic intraocular lenses to correct high myopia: Adatomed, Staar, and Artisan. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 30:33–44
119. Alio JL, de la Hoz F, Ruiz-Moreno JM, Salem TF (2000) Cataract surgery in highly myopic eyes corrected by phakic anterior chamber angle-supported lenses. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 26:1303–1311
120. Baikoff G, Bourgeon G, Jodai HJ, Fontaine A, Lellis FV, Trinquet L (2005) Pigment dispersion and Artisan phakic intraocular lenses: crystalline lens rise as a safety criterion. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 31:674–680
121. Trindade F, Pereira F, Cronemberger S (1998) Ultrasound biomicroscopic imaging of posterior chamber phakic intraocular lens. *J Refract Surg* 14:497–503
122. Eleftheriadis H, Amoros S, Bilbao R, Teijeiro MA (2004) Spontaneous dislocation of a phakic refractive lens into the vitreous cavity. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 30:2013–2016
123. Hoyos JE, Cigales M, Hoyos-Chacon J (2005) Zonular dehiscence two years after phakic refractive lens (PRL) implantation. *J Refract Surg* 21:13–17