



## Central Retinal Vein Occlusion: Current Therapeutic Approach

Marianne L. Shahsuvaryan\*

Yerevan State Medical University, Yerevan, Armenia

7Ap, 1Entr, 26 Sayat-Nova Avenue, Yerevan, 0001, Republic of Armenia

E-mail: mar\_shah@hotmail.com

Tel: (37410) 523 468

### ABSTRACT

*Central Retinal Vein Occlusion (CRVO) is a common disease causing loss of vision and even blindness. Although CRVO is among the most common vascular disorders affecting the retina, second in prevalence only to diabetic retinopathy, and it has been known for more than 150 years, there is a great deal of confusion regarding its management. The pathogenesis of CRVO is multifactorial with both local factors and systemic diseases being etiologically important. There are still gaps in understanding the etiology and pathogenesis of this circulatory disorder.*

*Various new therapeutic approaches have been developed in the past few years. The objective of this review is to evaluate the treatments commonly advocated, emphasizing evidence-based ones, in the light of our current scientific knowledge of CRVO.*

**Keywords:** retina, central retinal vein, occlusion, medical treatment.

#### Abbreviations

CRVO – central retinal vein occlusion; CME – cystoid macular edema; IOP – intraocular pressure; IVTA – intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide; OCT – optical coherence tomography; PST – posterior sub-Tenon injection; RVO – retinal vein occlusion; TA – triamcinolone acetonide; tPA – tissue plasminogen activator; VEGF – Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor

Central retinal vein occlusion (CRVO) is the most common visually disabling disease affecting the retina after diabetic retinopathy [1]. Although it is more common in the middle-aged and elderly population, no age group is immune to it [2].

In spite of the fact that the clinical entity of CRVO has been known since 1878 [3], its management still remains highly controversial. The pathogenesis of CRVO is multifactorial with both local factors and systemic diseases being etiologically important. Many case-control studies have examined the clinical features and risk factors in this disorder [4-9]. Known risk factors for CRVO include systemic vascular disease, hypertension, diabetes mellitus, hyperlipidemia and glaucoma. Hypercoagulable states are associated with CRVO. These include primary hypercoagulable states with a defect in the physiological anticoagulant mechanism [10-13] and secondary hypercoagulable states, which are conditions, associated with an increased risk of thrombosis [14-22].

There are still gaps in understanding the aetiology and pathogenesis of circulatory disorders of the central retinal vein and its branches.

Over the years, many treatments have been advocated enthusiastically and success has been claimed. Except for a few prospective studies, all the reports are based on retrospective collection of information or on limited personal experience. Most of the reported studies have a variety of limitations, which make it hard to evaluate the claimed benefits.

Macular edema is the main reason for decreased visual acuity in CRVO. Macular edema is a common sight-threatening response of the retina. It involves the breakdown of the inner blood-retinal barrier and consists of an abnormal vascular permeability resulting in fluid accumulation and macular thickening, detectable by optical coherence tomography (OCT).

Various new therapeutic approaches have been developed in the past few years. The objective of this review is to evaluate the treatments commonly advocated, emphasizing evidence-based ones, in the light of our current scientific knowledge of CRVO.

### CORTICOSTEROIDS

#### Intravitreal Triamcinolone Acetonide

Glucocorticosteroids have multiple specific and non-specific effects. They are used in particular for their anti-inflammatory, anti-edemic, anti-proliferative and anti-angiogenic properties. In

ophthalmology, steroids are administered topically, as periocular injections, or systemically. However, the problem with topical ocular application of drugs is that it does not allow for sufficient delivery to the posterior segment of the eye while long-term systemic administration of steroids is often associated with serious side effects. Given that the eye constitutes only 0.01% of body volume, that its sclerotic membrane makes it a relatively self-containing organ and that a substance works best when directly administered to the target area, intravitreal local administration by injection recommends itself as a means of high dosage local corticosteroid treatment.

Triamcinolone acetonide is a crystalline, synthetic glucocorticoid with a potency approximately five times that of cortisol. Since soluble triamcinolone is washed out of the eye within 24 hours of intravitreal injection, the crystalline form is preferable.

Recent studies have reported successful treatment of macular edema secondary to CRVO with intravitreal injection of triamcinolone acetonide [23-44]. In patients with non-ischaemic CRVO and macular edema, improvement of macular edema and VA was reported [33, 45-49]. Meanwhile, Cekic et al. [25], Gelston et al. [31], Jonas et al. [50] and Ozdek et al. [33] stated that patients with non-ischaemic CRVO may respond more favourable than patients with ischaemic CRVO, and re-treatment may be necessary in some patients. The general consensus, however, is that improvement is not permanent and usually persists for a maximum of 3-6 months following one intravitreal injection [24, 28, 32, 38, 40, 41, 43,50].

Gregori et al. [37], in a retrospective review of 40 eyes with CRVO (not differentiated into ischaemic and nonischaemic types) treated with IVTA claimed that some patients demonstrated visual improvement after injection and this improvement was maintained over one year with re-injections of TA. However, most patients did not have such favourable course. They stated that it is difficult to make any generalized prediction on how an individual patient will respond to IVTA even if the edema resolves, since it depends on the degree of macular ischaemia, the amount of retinal haemorrhage and the extent of irreversible photoreceptor damage, and also an initial positive response could be lost with future treatments if the ischaemia progresses.

Some authors have advocated the use of intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide in patients with macular edema due to CRVO, claiming significant anatomic improvement in the majority of patients confirmed by optical coherence tomography (OCT) [25, 33, 41, 51, 52].

Although systemically safe, intravitreal steroids have significant ocular side effects.

Among the side effects mentioned are development of ocular hypertension (requiring antiglaucoma therapy including surgery) in about 50% of eyes after about 1-2 months [23, 26, 28, 30-34, 36, 38, 40, 47,50], progression of cataract in some [26,28,30,32] and rarely endophthalmitis. In the elderly population of patients with CRVO, intravitreal injection of TA leads to clinically significant posterior subcapsular cataract and nuclear cataract in about 15 to 20 % of eyes within one year of the intravitreal injection [28, 32]. Repeated intravitreal injection of TA could also result in primary open-angle glaucoma, particularly since, in patients with CRVO there is already high incidence of glaucoma and ocular hypertension [26, 28, 30, 32, 33, 36-38, 50]. Gregori et al. [37] have found that patients with pre-existing open angle glaucoma had an IOP elevation at a higher rate than eyes without glaucoma, suggesting that this population may be at a higher risk for glaucoma surgery after intravitreal TA treatment. The authors stated that this potential risks need to be seriously considered and discussed with the patient given the transient and modest visual benefit of steroids.

Jonas reported that, after intravitreal injection, triamcinolone acetonide can be detected in the aqueous humour for up to 1.5 years [53] with earlier findings [54] indicating up to 6 months. That may be responsible for the reported high incidence of markedly elevated intraocular pressure following intravitreal TA, as well regression of iris neovascularization [55]. Dosages of TA used for intravitreal injection range from 4 to 20 mg. Thus far, there are no studies on the optimal dose under various conditions. Moreover, the intravitreal method of delivery poses injection-related risks [56] of vitreous haemorrhage, retinal detachment and infections such as endophthalmitis with a rate of about 1:1000 [28,32] and also conjunctival necrosis [57] and macular hole [58]. Recently more prevalent are non-infectious endophthalmitis and pseudoendophthalmitis with TA crystals appearing in the anterior chamber [59].

The SCORE ( Standard care vs. Corticosteroid for Retinal vein occlusion ) study, sponsored by the National Eye Institute (NEI) was a multicentere randomized, controlled clinical trial comparing the

safety and efficacy of standard care with IVTA in either a 1- or 4-mg dose for vision loss associated with macular edema secondary to CRVO [60]. In the CRVO trial, standard care therapy is observation. Retreatments are considered for persistent or new macular edema at 4-month intervals.

The SCORE-CRVO study [60] showed that both triamcinolone groups were superior to observation with respect to VA. The visual benefit of IVTA was demonstrated as early as 4 months and continued to 24 months; although there was less power at this point, the benefit appears to persist. However, in all 3 groups (1mg IVTA, 4mg IVTA or observation, there was a reduction of central retinal thickness from baseline to 24 months. Therefore, the visual benefit of IVTA may be due not only to macular edema decrease, but also to other effects, such as anti-inflammatory or neuroprotective effects. The study report 5 also evidenced the superior safety profile of the 1-mg dose compared with the 4-mg dose, particularly with respect to glaucoma and cataract, rendering in the preferred dose in CRVO [60].

#### **Dexamethasone**

The Ozurdex (Allergan Inc., Irvine, CA, USA) dexamethasone drug delivery system (DDS) was recently developed and approved by the FDA as a biodegradable intravitreal implant to provide sustained delivery of 0.7 mg dexamethasone for the treatment of macular edema associated with CRVO [61,62].

Haller et al.[61] concluded that for patients who have relatively short duration of macular edema, Ozurdex should be considered a viable treatment option. Increases in IOP were generally transient and similar following each treatment. Cataract adverse events occurred in 26% of patients treated with two injections and in 5% of patients who received no treatment over the 12-month study.

#### **Posterior sub-Tenon injection of triamcinolone acetonide**

Some authors [63,64] have recently advocated the posterior sub-Tenon (PST) injection of 40 mg TA under topic anesthesia, based on claims that IOP elevation may be less common after PST injection than after intravitreal injection, however Iwao et al. [64] have found that PST TA injection is associated with high rates of steroid-induced IOP elevation in eyes with previously normal IOP.

Lin et al. [63], in a prospective study of 18 eyes with CRVO treated by three biweekly PST TA injections, claimed that this treatment is effective in reversing cystoid macular edema (CME) and improving VA in recent-onset CRVO in the first 9 months before longstanding macular edema results in irreversible photoreceptor damage. No cataract progression or other complications were observed. They stated that patients with nonischaemic CRVO may respond more favourably than patients with ischaemic CRVO and further study with longer follow-up period is necessary.

Recently Mizumo et al. [65] in the experimental study have found that the periocular injection of TA effectively decreased retinal thickness and inhibited leukocyte-endothelium interactions in the retina after ischemia. Down regulation of adhesion molecules of retinal vascular endothelium induced by TA may play a role in the course.

### **ANTI-VEGF THERAPY**

Application of vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) inhibitors represents a treatment option for macular edema secondary to CRVO that targets the disease at the causal molecular level.

Over the past years, ophthalmologists have attempted to treat RVO-associated edema triggered by hypoxia-induced expression of VEGF with ranibizumab (Lucentis®), bevacizumab (Avastin®), and pegaptanib sodium (Macugen®).

#### **Ranibizumab**

Ranibizumab has received FDA approval for the treatment of macular edema due to both CRVO and BRVO, and it is the only available FDA-approved therapy.

With ranibizumab, Pieramici et al.[ 66] designed a study following the scheme of the PIER Study, i.e. the first 3 injections monthly and then after 6 and 9 months, if needed (persistent macular edema). They found that ranibizumab is generally well tolerated and may improve BCVA and decrease central retinal thickness in OCT. But the efficacy was lost after the loading phase, so an interval of 3 months between injections may be too long. In addition, Spaide et al. [67] and Rouvas et al. [68] demonstrated in two prospective studies that the patients with RVO have an improvement in VA, but with a mean of 7.4–8.5 injections in 1 year of follow-up.

Nowadays two phase III multicenter, prospective clinical trial are under way, assessing the safety, tolerability and efficacy of intravitreal ranibizumab injections in the treatment of macular edema secondary to CRVO [69]. It is called CRUISE (study of the efficacy and safety of ranibizumab injection compared with sham in patients with macular edema due to CRVO). During the first 6 months, the patients monthly received either 0.3 or 0.5 mg of ranibizumab or sham injection. During the second 6-month period, the patients were evaluated monthly and treated on an as-needed basis; meanwhile, patients in the sham group received 0.5 mg ranibizumab. For the first 6 months, results are available. Regarding efficacy, at the primary endpoint (mean change from baseline BCVA at month 6), there is a rapid and sustained improvement in BCVA in patients with macular edema due to CRVO. They show a statistically significant number of patients who gained  $\geq 15$  letters from baseline at month 6, in the study group compared to the control group, as well as a change from baseline central foveal thickness over time to month 6. Besides, intravitreal ranibizumab seems to have a safety profile consistent with previous phase III trials, and low rates of ocular and nonocular safety events [69,70,71]. Moreover, this trial demonstrates that the duration of the disease does not matter for taking the decision of treating. Treated patients did always better than sham-treated patients. Therefore, treatment for RVO can also be delayed by 3 months [72, 73]. The latest results from open-label extension trial of the 12-month Ranibizumab assessing long-term safety and efficacy in CRUISE trial [73] evidenced that in patients who completed month 12, the mean number of injections (excluding month 12 injection) in the sham/0.5-, 0.3/0.5-, and 0.5-mg groups was 2.9, 3.8, and 3.5 in central RVO. The incidence of study eye ocular serious adverse events and systemic adverse events potentially related to systemic vascular endothelial growth factor inhibition across treatment arms was 2% to 9% and 1% to 6%, respectively. The mean change from baseline BCVA at month 12 in central RVO patients was -4.2 (sham/0.5 mg), -5.2 (0.3/0.5 mg), and -4.1 (0.5 mg), respectively. The authors concluded that no new safety events were identified with long-term use of ranibizumab; rates of systemic adverse events potentially related to treatment were consistent with prior ranibizumab trials. Reduced follow-up and fewer ranibizumab injections in the second year of treatment were associated with a decline in vision in central RVO patients. Results suggest that during the second year of ranibizumab treatment of RVO patients, follow-up and injections should be individualized and, on average, central RVO patients may require more frequent follow-up than every 3 months.

### **Bevacizumab**

Bevacizumab is a recombinant humanized monoclonal antibody directed against VEGF. There have been several studies with bevacizumab and RVO, retrospective or prospective, all showing improvements in VA and optical coherence tomography (OCT) outcomes, but also short-term efficacy and high recurrence rate. The dosage varies between 1 and 2.5 mg, there are no different outcomes [74-83]. The Pan-American Collaborative Retina Study group concluded that intravitreal injections of bevacizumab at doses up to 2.5 mg were more effective in improving VA and reducing macular edema at 6 months (compared to 1.25 mg), but the study had no control group [79]. By contrast, no statistically significant differences were found between the doses, when the group presented the results at 24 months [84]. In addition, Ach et al. [85] found that CRVO patients who benefit from therapy were significantly younger and had lower central retinal thickness at baseline. Epstein et al. [86] conducted the latest prospective double-masked clinical trial of 60 patients with macular edema secondary to CRVO randomized 1:1 to receive intraocular injections of bevacizumab or sham injection every 6 weeks for 6 months. Results evidenced that the treatment improve VA and reduce macular edema significantly compared with sham.

### **Pegaptanib Sodium**

The pegaptanib sodium is a selective anti-VEGF and it is still not well studied in RVO. Bennet [87] performed a pilot study where Macugen treatment achieved a decrease in macular thickness and an improvement in VA and retinal perfusion. But this study had enrolled only 7 patients with 6 months of follow-up and it had no control group..

### **VEGF TRAP**

The VEGF trap is another novel anti-VEGF agent. It is essentially a small fully human, soluble VEGF receptor that acts as a decoy receptor binding-free VEGF [88]. The VEGF trap eye is currently under evaluation in two phase III studies on CRVO (GALILEO and COPERNICUS Studies) with 6-monthly

injections of drug or sham-controlled injections. The latest six-months results of the Phase 3 from COPERNICUS Study - multicenter, randomized, prospective, controlled trial [89] assessing the efficacy and safety of intravitreal Trap-Eye in one hundred eighty-nine eyes with macular edema secondary to central retinal vein occlusion (CRVO) randomized 3:2 to receive VEGF Trap-Eye 2 mg or sham injection monthly for 6 months evidenced that at week 24, 56.1% of VEGF Trap-Eye treated eyes gained 15 letters or more from baseline versus 12.3% of sham-treated eyes ( $P < 0.001$ ). The VEGF Trap-Eye treated eyes gained a mean of 17.3 letters versus sham-treated eyes, which lost 4.0 letters ( $P < 0.001$ ). Central retinal thickness decreased by 457.2  $\mu\text{m}$  in eyes treated with VEGF Trap-Eye versus 144.8  $\mu\text{m}$  in sham-treated eyes ( $P < 0.001$ ), and progression to any neovascularization occurred in 0 and 5 (6.8%) of eyes treated with VEGF Trap-Eye and sham-treated eyes, respectively ( $P = 0.006$ ). Conjunctival hemorrhage, reduced visual acuity, and eye pain were the most common adverse events. Serious ocular were reported by 3.5% of VEGF Trap-Eye patients and 13.5% of sham patients. Incidences of nonocular serious adverse events generally were well balanced between both groups.

The authors concluded that at 24 weeks, monthly intravitreal injection of VEGF Trap-Eye 2 mg in eyes with macular edema resulting from CRVO improved visual acuity and central retinal thickness, eliminated progression resulting from neovascularization, and was associated with a low rate of ocular adverse events related to treatment.

The general consensus is that the intravitreal injections turned out to be promising in recent clinical trials and appear to be an additional therapeutic option [90-99]. But there are limits in efficacy, need for multiple injections, rebound effect of macular edema and nonresponders. There are still many unclear points, such as: the correct time to start injections and the specific moment to finish them, the number of injections, the long-term efficacy and safety, ocular and systemic side effects.

The International Intravitreal Bevacizumab Safety Survey gathered adverse events from doctors around the world via the internet and showed all ocular and systemic side effects to be under 0.21% [100] including corneal abrasion, lens injury, endophthalmitis, retinal detachment, inflammation or uveitis, cataract progression, acute vision loss, central retinal artery occlusion, subretinal haemorrhage, retinal pigment epithelium tears, blood pressure elevation, transient ischaemic attack, cerebrovascular accident and death. While used intravitreally, the systemic absorption is minimal, however, a trend has been observed towards a higher risk of stroke among patients with a history of heart disease

The latest study [101] revealed that endophthalmitis following intravitreal injection is associated with an increased incidence of *Streptococcus* spp. infection, earlier presentation and poorer visual outcomes when compared with endophthalmitis following cataract surgery.

## CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, studies evaluating interventions for macular edema secondary to CRVO have lacked sufficient sample size and power, lack an adequate control using placebo or best practice intervention, did not have insufficient follow-up times for long-term assessment of outcomes, or a combination thereof. Therefore, definitive conclusions cannot be reached.

In spite of enthusiastic claims of success for various therapies, the reality is that the currently available treatments are associated with visual improvement in only a subset of patients and the approach to treatment of macular edema secondary to CRVO is not evidence-based yet. The benefits and risks of therapy should be weighted in all treatment decisions. There is a need for large well-designed prospective randomized controlled trials with a long-term follow-up of new drugs taken in a non-invasive way.

## REFERENCES

1. Shahid H, Hossain P, Amoaku WM. (2006). The management of retinal vein occlusion: is interventional ophthalmology the way forward? *Br. J Ophthalmol*; 90(5): 627-39.
2. Hayreh SS, Zimmerman MB, Podhajsky P.(1994). Incidence of various types of retinal vein occlusion and their recurrence and demographic characteristics. *Am J Ophthalmol*; 117: 429-41.
3. Michel J. (1878) Ueber die anatomischen Ursachen von Veraenderungen des Augenhintergrundes bei einigen Allgemeinerkrankungen. *Dtsch Arch Klin Med*; 22: 339-45.
4. Sperduto RD, Hiller R, Chew E et al. (1998). Risk factors for hemiretinal vein occlusion: comparison with risk factors for central and branch retinal vein occlusion: the eye disease case-control study. *Ophthalmology*; 105(5):765-71

5. Koizumi H, Ferrara DC, Bruè C, et al.(2007). Central retinal vein occlusion case-control study. *Am J Ophthalmol*;144(6):858-863
6. The Eye Disease Case-Control Study Group. [ 1996] Risk factors for central retinal vein occlusion. *Arch Ophthalmol*; 114: 545-54.
7. Lang GE, Spraul CW.(1997). Risk factors for retinal vein occlusive diseases. *Klin Monatsbl Augenheilkd*; 211: 217-26.
8. Shahsuvaryan ML, Melkonyan AK. (2003) Central retinal vein occlusion risk profile: a case-control study. *Eur J Ophthalmol*; 13: 445-52.
9. Arakawa S, Yasuda M, Nagata M, et al. (2011). Nine-year incidence and risk factors for retinal vein occlusion in a general Japanese population: the Hisayama Study. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*; 52(8):5905-9.
10. Nyberg P, Dahlback B, Garcia de Frutos P. (1998). The SHBG-like region of protein S is crucial for factor V-dependent APC-cofactor function. *FEBS Letters*; 433: 28-32.
11. Gottlieb JL, Blice JP, Mestichelli B, et al. (1998). Activated protein C resistance, factor V
12. Leiden, and central retinal vein occlusion in young adults. *Arch Ophthalmol*; 116: 577-9.
13. Williamson TH, Rumley A, Lowe GD. (1996) Blood viscosity, coagulation, and activated protein C resistance in central retinal vein occlusion: a population controlled study. *Br J Ophthalmol*; 80:203-8.
14. Larsson J, Olafsdottir E, Bauer B.(1996). Activated protein C resistance in young adults with central retinal vein occlusion. *Br J Ophthalmol*; 80: 200-2.
15. Sodi A, Giambene B, Marcucci R, et al. (2011). Atherosclerotic and thrombophilic risk factors in patients with ischemic central retinal vein occlusion. *Retina*;31(4):724-9.
16. Imasawa M, Iijima H.[2002] Multiple retinal vein occlusions in essential thrombocythemia. *Am J Ophthalmol* ; 133: 152-5.
17. Al-Abdulla NA, Thompson JT, La Borwit SE. (2001) Simultaneous bilateral central retinal vein occlusion associated with anticardiolipin antibodies in leukemia. *Am J Ophthalmol*; 132: 266-8.
18. Lip PL, Blann AD, Jones AF, et al. (1998). Abnormalities in haemorrhological factors and lipoprotein (a) in retinal vascular occlusion: implications for increased vascular risk. *Eye*; 12: 245-51.
19. Fegan CD. [2002] Central retinal vein occlusion and thrombophilia. *Eye*; 16: 98-106.
20. Brown BA, Marx JL, Ward TP, et al. (2002). Homocysteine: a risk factor for retinal venous occlusive disease. *Ophthalmology*; 109: 287-90.
21. Marcucci R, Bertini L, Giusti B, et al. (2001). Thrombophilic risk factors in patients with central retinal vein occlusion. *Thromb Haemost*; 86: 772-6.
22. Boyd S, Owens D, Gin T, et al. (2001). Plasma homocysteine, methylene tetrahydrofolate reductase C677T and factor II G20210A polymorphisms, factor VIII, and VWF in central retinal vein occlusion. *Br J Ophthalmol*; 85: 1313-15.
23. Kadayifcilar S, Ozatli D, Ozcebe O, et al. (2001). Is activated factor VII associated with retinal vein occlusion? *Br J Ophthalmol*; 85: 1174-8.
24. Avitabile T, Longo A, Reibaldi A. (2005). Intravitreal triamcinolone compared with macular laser grid photocoagulation for the treatment of cystoid macular edema. *Am J Ophthalmol*; 140(4): 695-702.
25. Ladjimi A, Zeghidi H, Ben Yahia S. et al. (2005). Intravitreal injection of triamcinolone acetonide for the treatment of macular edema. *J Fr Ophthalmol*; 28(7): 749-57.
26. Cekic O, Chang S, Tseng JJ *et al.* (2005). Intravitreal triamcinolone treatment for macular edema associated with central retinal vein occlusion and hemiretinal vein occlusion. *Retina*; 25(7): 846-50.
27. Cekic O, Chang S, Tseng JJ *et al.* (2005). Intravitreal triamcinolone injection for treatment of macular edema secondary to branch retinal vein occlusion. *Retina*; 25(7): 851-5.
28. Krepler K, Ergun E, Sacu S. *et al.* (2005). Intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide in patients with macular oedema due to branch retinal vein occlusion: a pilot study. *Acta Ophthalmol Scand*; 83(5): 600-4.
29. Jonas JB. (2005). Intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide for treatment of intraocular oedematous and neovascular diseases. *Acta Ophthalmol Scand*; 83(6): 645-63.
30. Prasad AG, Shah GK. (2006). Intravitreal triamcinolone for ischaemic branch retinal vein occlusion with serous retinal detachment. *Retina*; 26(2): 234-6.
31. Chen SD, Sundaram V, Lochhead J, *et al.* (2006). Intravitreal triamcinolone for the treatment of ischaemic macular edema associated with branch retinal vein occlusion. *Am J Ophthalmol*; 141(5): 876-83.
32. Gelston CD, Olson JL, Mandava N. (2006). Macular edema in central retinal vein occlusion treated with intravitreal triamcinolone. *Acta Ophthalmol Scand*; 84(3): 314-8.
33. Jonas JB.[2006] Intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide: a change in a paradigm. *Ophthalmic Res*; 38(4): 218-45.
34. Ozdek SC, Aydin B, Gurelik G, *et al.* (2005). Effects of Intravitreal Triamcinolone Injection on Macular Edema and Visual Prognosis in Central Retinal Vein Occlusion. *Int Ophthalmol*; 26(1-2): 27-34.
35. Konjevic Pernar S, Vatauvuk Z, Bencic G, *et al.*(2006). Intravitreal application of triamcinolone – our experiences. *Acta Med Croatica*; 61(2): 133-5.
36. Cheng KC, Wu WC. [2006] Intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide for patients with macular edema due to branch retinal vein occlusion. *Kaohsiung J Med Sci*; 22(7): 321-30.
37. Ozkiris A, Evereklioglu C, Erkilic K, *et al.* (2006) Intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide for treatment of persistent macular oedema in branch retinal vein occlusion. *Eye*; 20(1): 13-7.
38. Gregori NZ, Rozenfeld PJ, Puliafito CA. *et al.* (2006). One-year safety and efficacy of intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide for the management of macular edema secondary to central retinal vein occlusion. *Retina*; 26(8): 889-95.
39. Goff MJ, Jumper JM, Yang SS. *et al.* (2006). Intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide treatment of macular edema associated with central retinal vein occlusion. *Retina*; 26(8): 896-901.
40. Miyamoto N, Iossifov D, Metge F, *et al.* (2006). Early effects of intravitreal triamcinolone on macular edema: mechanistic implication. *Ophthalmology*; 113(11): 2048-53.

41. Gunnlaugsdottir E, Oehman DO, Gunnarsdottir SG, et al. (2006). Macular oedema and intravitreal triamcinolone injections. *Laeknabladid*; 92(12): 847-57.
42. Moschos MM, Brouzas D, Loukianou E, et al. (2007). Intraocular triamcinolone acetonide for macular edema due to CRVO. A multifocal-ERG and OCT study. *Doc Ophthalmol*; 114(1): 1-7
43. Yamaike N, Kita M, Tsujikawa A, et al. (2007). Perimetric sensitivity with the micro perimeter 1 and retinal thickness in patients with branch retinal vein occlusion. *Am J Ophthalmol*; 143(2): 342-4.
44. Oh JY, Seo JH, Ahn JK, et al. (2007). Early versus late intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide for macular edema associated with branch retinal vein occlusion. *Korean J Ophthalmol*; 21(1): 18-20.
45. Hoh AE, Schaal KB, Dithmar S. (2007) Central and branch retinal vein occlusion. Current strategies for treatment in Germany, Austria and Switzerland. *Ophthalmologe*; 104(4): 290-4.
46. Greenberg PB, Martidis A, Rogers AH, et al. (2002). Intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide for macular oedema due to central retinal vein occlusion. *Br J Ophthalmol*; 86: 247-8.
47. Jonas JB, Kreissig I, Degenring RF. (2002). Intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide as treatment of macular edema in central retinal vein occlusion. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol*; 240: 782-3.
48. Park CH, Jaffe GJ, Fekrat S. (2003). Intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide in eyes with cystoid macular edema associated with central retinal vein occlusion. *Am J Ophthalmol*; 136(3): 419-25.
49. Bynoe LA, Weiss JN. (2003). Retinal endovascular surgery and intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide for central retinal vein occlusion in young adults. *Am J Ophthalmol*; 135(3): 382-4.
50. Inoue M, Nagai N, Shinoda H, et al. (2004). Intravitreal injection of triamcinolone acetonide for cystoid macular edema resistant to vitreous surgery. *Nippon Ganka Gakkai Zasshi*; 108(2): 92-7.
51. Jonas JB, Akkoyun I, Kamppeiter B, et al. (2005). Intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide for treatment of central retinal vein occlusion. *Eur J Ophthalmol*; 15(6): 751-8.
52. Ip M, Kahana A, Altaweel M. (2003). Treatment of central retinal vein occlusion with triamcinolone acetonide: an optical coherence tomography study. *Semin Ophthalmol*; 18(2): 67-73.
53. Degenring RF, Kamppeiter B, Kreissig I, et al. (2003). Morphological and functional changes after intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide for retinal vein occlusion. *Acta Ophthalmol Scand*; 81(5): 548-50.
54. Jonas JB. (2004). Intraocular availability of triamcinolone acetonide after intravitreal injection. *Am J Ophthalmol*; 137(3): 560-2.
55. Jonas JB. (2002). Concentration of intravitreally injected triamcinolone acetonide in aqueous humor. *Br J Ophthalmol*; 86: 1066.
56. Jonas JB, Hayler JK, Sofker A, et al. (2001). Regression of neovascular iris vessels by intravitreal injection of crystalline cortisone. *J Glaucoma*; 10: 284-7.
57. Jager RD, Aiello LP, Patel SC, et al. (2004). Risks of intravitreal injection: a comprehensive review. *Retina*; 24: 676-98.
58. Srinivasan S, Prasad S. (2005). Conjunctival necrosis following intravitreal injection of triamcinolone acetonide. *Cornea*; 24(8): 1027-8.
59. Lattanzio R, Ramoni A, Scott F, et al. (2007). Macular hole and intravitreal injection of triamcinolone acetonide for macular edema due to central retinal vein occlusion. *Eur J Ophthalmol*; 17: 451-3.
60. Jonas JB, Kreissig I, Spasda UH, et al. (2006). Infectious and noninfectious endophthalmitis after intravitreal high-dosage triamcinolone acetonide. *Am J Ophthalmol*; 141(3): 579-80.
61. The SCORE Study Research Group. (2009). A randomized trial comparing the efficacy and safety of intravitreal triamcinolone with observation to treat vision loss associated with macular edema secondary to central retinal vein occlusion (SCORE) study report 5. *Arch Ophthalmol*; 127:1101-1114.
62. Haller JA, Bandello F, Belfort R. et al. (2010). OZURDEX GENEVA S tudy Group: Randomized, sham-controlled trial of dexamethasone intravitreal implant in patients with macular edema due to retinal vein occlusion. *Ophthalmology*; 117:1134-46.
63. London NJ, Chiang A, Haller JA. (2011). The dexamethasone drug delivery system: indications and evidence. *Adv Ther*; 28(5):351-66.
64. Lin JM, Chiu YT, Hung PT, Tsai YY. (2007). Early treatment of severe cystoid macular edema in central retinal vein occlusion with posterior sub-tenon triamcinolone acetonide. *Retina*; 27(2): 180-9.
65. Iwao K, Inatani M, Kawaji T, et al. (2007). Frequency and risk factors for intraocular pressure elevation after posterior sub-Tenon capsule triamcinolone acetonide injection. *J Glaucoma*; 16(2): 251-6.
66. Mizuno S, Nishiwaki A, Morita H, et al. (2007). Mivake T, Ogura Y. Effects of periocular administration of triamcinolone acetonide on leukocyte-endothelium interactions in the ischaemic retina. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*; 48(6): 2831-6.
67. Pieramici DJ, Rabena M, Castellarin AA, et al. (2008). Ranibizumab for the treatment of macular edema associated with perfused central retinal vein occlusion. *Ophthalmology*; 115:e47-e54.
68. Spaide RF, Chang LK, Klancnik JM, et al. (2009). Prospective study of ranibizumab as a treatment of decreased visual acuity secondary to central retinal vein occlusion. *Am J Ophthalmol*; 147:298-306.
69. Rouvas A, Petrou P, Vergados I, et al. (2009). Intravitreal ranibizumab (Lucentis) for treatment of central retinal vein occlusion: a prospective study. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol*; 247:1609-1616.
70. Pieramici DJ: (2009). Intravitreal ranibizumab for treatment of macular edema secondary to retinal vein occlusion. *Retina Today*; 4:44-46.
71. Brown DM, Campochiaro PA, Singh RP, et al.(2010). CRUISE Investigators: Ranibizumab for macular edema following central retinal vein occlusion six-month primary end point results of a phase III study. *Ophthalmology*; 117:1124-1133.
72. Garnock-Jones KP. (2011). Ranibizumab: in macular oedema following retinal vein occlusion. *Drugs*; 5;71(4):455-63.

73. Brown DM. (2010) Clinical implications of the BRAVO and CRUISE trials. *Retina Today*;5:38–40.
74. Heier JS, Campochiaro PA, Yau L, et al. (2012). Ranibizumab for Macular Edema Due to Retinal Vein Occlusions Long-term Follow-up in the HORIZON Trial. *Ophthalmology*;11 (2):145-57.
75. Iturralde D, Spaide RF, Meyerle CB, et al. (2006). Intravitreal bevacizumab (Avastin) treatment of macular edema in central retinal vein occlusion. A short-term study. *Retina*;26:279–284.
76. Costa RA, Jorge R, Calucci D, et al. (2007). Intravitreal bevacizumab (Avastin) for central and retinal vein occlusions. IBeVo study. *Retina*;27:141–149.
77. Fish GE. (2008). Intravitreal bevacizumab in the treatment of macular edema from branch retinal vein occlusion and hemisphere retinal vein occlusion (an AOS thesis). *Trans Am Ophthalmol Soc*;106:276–300.
78. Rabena MD, Pieramici DJ, Castellarin AA, et al. (2007). Intravitreal bevacizumab (Avastin) in the treatment of macular edema secondary to branch retinal vein occlusion. *Retina*;27:419–425.
79. Badalá F. (2008) The treatment of branch retinal vein occlusion with bevacizumab. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol*;19:234–238.
80. Wu L, Arevalo JF, Roca JA, et al. (2008). Comparison of two doses of intravitreal bevacizumab (Avastin) for treatment of macular edema secondary to branch retinal vein occlusion: results from the Pan-American Collaborative Retina Study (PACORES) Group at 6 months of follow-up. *Retina*;28:212–219.
81. Chung EJ, Hong YT, Lee SC, et al. (2008). Prognostic factors for visual outcome after intravitreal bevacizumab for macular edema due to branch retinal vein occlusion. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol*;246:1241–1247.
82. Ahmadi AA, Chou JY, Banashkevich A, et al. (2009). The effects of intravitreal bevacizumab on patients with macular edema secondary to branch retinal vein occlusion. *Can J Ophthalmol*;44:154–159.
83. Prager F, Michels S, Kriechbaum K, et al. (2009) Intravitreal bevacizumab (Avastin) for macular oedema secondary to retinal vein occlusion: 12-month results of a prospective clinical trial. *Br J Ophthalmol*;93:452–456.
84. Kondo M, Kondo N, Ito Y, et al. (2000). Intravitreal injection of bevacizumab for macular edema secondary to branch retinal vein occlusion. Results after 12 months and multiple regression analysis. *Retina*;29:1242–1248.
85. Wu L, Arevalo JF, Berrocal MH, et al. (2009). Comparison of two doses of intravitreal bevacizumab as primary treatment of macular edema secondary to branch retinal vein occlusions: results from the Pan-American Collaborative Retina Study (PACORES) Group at 24 months. *Retina*;29:1396–1403.
86. Ach T, Hoeh AE, Schaal KB, et al. (2010). Predictive factors for changes in macular edema in intravitreal bevacizumab therapy of retinal vein occlusion. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol*;248:155–159.
87. Epstein DL, Algvere PV, von Wendt G, et al. (2012). Bevacizumab for Macular Edema in Central Retinal Vein Occlusion: A Prospective, Randomized, Double-Masked Clinical Study. *Ophthalmology* (Mar 2012)
88. Bennet MD. (2009) Pegaptanib for the treatment of ischemic retinopathy in patients with diabetes and retinal vascular occlusive disorders. *Retina Today*;4:63–66.
89. Pieramici DJ, Rabena MD. (2008) Anti-VEGF therapy: comparison of current and future agents. *Eye* ;22:1330–1336.
90. Boyer D, Heier J, Brown DM, et al. (2012) Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor Trap-Eye for Macular Edema Secondary to Central Retinal Vein Occlusion: Six-Month Results of the Phase 3 COPERNICUS Study. *Ophthalmology*; Mar 20.
91. Braithwaite T, Nanji AA, Greenberg PB. (2010) *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Anti-vascular endothelial growth factor for macular edema secondary to central retinal vein occlusion.;(10):CD007325
92. Jonas J, Paques M, Mones J, et al. (2010). Retinal vein occlusions. *Dev Ophthalmol*;47:111-35.
93. Rehak M, Wiedemann P. (2010) Retinal vein thrombosis: pathogenesis and management. *J Thromb Haemost*; 8(9):1886-94.
94. Scott IU.[2010] Macular edema associated with retinal vein occlusion. *Retina today*; 4:54-5.
95. Ehlers JP, Fekrat S. (2011). Retinal vein occlusion: beyond the acute event. *Surv Ophthalmol*;56(4):281-99.
96. Laouri M, Chen E, Looman M, et al. (2011). The burden of disease of retinal vein occlusion: review of the literature. *Eye (Lond)*;25(8):981-8.
97. London NJ, Brown G. (2011). Update and review of central retinal vein occlusion. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol*;22(3):159-65.
98. Wells JA. (2011). The Paradigm Shifts in the Management of Retinal Vein Occlusion. *Retinal physician*, November 2011
99. Lattanzio R, Torres Gimeno A, Battaglia Parodi M, et al. (2011). Retinal vein occlusion: current treatment. *Ophthalmologica*;225(3):135-43.
100. Hahn P, Fekrat S. (2012). Best practices for treatment of retinal vein occlusion. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol* 2012 Mar 23.
101. Lynch SS, Cheng CM. (2007). Bevacizumab for neovascular ocular diseases. *Ann Pharmacother* 2007; 41(4): 614-25.
102. Simunovic MP, Rush RB, Hunyor AP, et al.(2012). Endophthalmitis following intravitreal injection versus endophthalmitis following cataract surgery: clinical features, causative organisms and post-treatment outcomes. *Br J Ophthalmol* published 24 March 2012, 10.1136/bjophthalmol