



Review Article



## Vasooclusive Disorder of the Retinal Vein: Contemporary Pharmacotherapy Therapy in Retinal Vein Occlusion

Marianne L. Shahsuvaryan

Yerevan State Medical University, Yerevan, Armenia,

E-mail: mar\_shah@hotmail.com

### ABSTRACT

*Retinal vein occlusion as a vasooclusive disorder of the retinal vein is the most common visually disabling disease affecting the retina after diabetic retinopathy, and is a frequent cause of vision loss and even blindness. Although it is more common in the middle-aged and elderly population, no age group is immune to it. The retinal vein occlusion pathogenesis has varied systemic and local implications that make it difficult to elaborate treatment guidelines. The disease entity has long been known, but there is a great deal of confusion regarding its management. 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 retinal vein occlusion.*

**Keywords:** medical treatment, retina, retinal vein vasooclusion.

### List of Abbreviations

BRVO – branch retinal vein occlusion  
CRVO – central retinal vein occlusion  
CME – cystoid macular edema  
IOP – intraocular pressure  
OCT – optical coherence tomography  
RVO – retinal vein occlusion  
VEGF - Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor

### INTRODUCTION

Retinal vein occlusion as a vasooclusive disorder of the retinal vein is the most common visually disabling disease affecting the retina after diabetic retinopathy, and is a frequent cause of vision loss and even blindness [1-3]. Although it is more common in the middle-aged and elderly population, no age group is immune to it [4]. In spite of the fact that the clinical entity of RVO has been known since 1878 [5], its management still remains highly controversial. The pathogenesis of RVO 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 [3,6-10]. Known risk factors for RVO include systemic vascular disease, hypertension, diabetes mellitus, hyperlipidemia and glaucoma. Hypercoagulable states are associated with RVO. These include primary hypercoagulable states with a defect in the physiological anticoagulant mechanism [11-14] and secondary hypercoagulable states, which are conditions, associated with an increased risk of thrombosis [15-23].

Depending on the location of the obstruction, the RVOs can be divided into central retinal vein occlusion (CRVO) and branch retinal vein occlusion (BRVO). In CRVO the obstruction is located in the central vein, at the level of the optic nerve, so most of the retina is affected. Anatomic features make the central retinal vein vulnerable to occlusion at this location. As the optic nerve and the accompanying central retinal artery and vein pass through the sieve-like connective tissue of the lamina cribrosa, the central retinal vein normally narrows, and the dense connective tissue of the lamina cribrosa limits any expansion of the traversing optic nerve and vessels within. Any thickening of the central retinal artery, which shares a common fibrous tissue sheath with the vein, might easily compress the lumen of the adjacent central retinal vein and start in motion the sequence of events that lead to thrombus formation [24]. In BRVO, the obstruction is located in one of the branches of the central vein, affecting only part of the posterior pole and the portion of the peripheral retina drained by occluded branch [25].

There are still gaps in understanding the aetiology and pathogenesis of circulatory disorders of the central retinal vein and its branches. Although various new therapeutic approaches have been developed in the past few years, existing therapy forms are subject to controversy and available data to same extent inconsistent.

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.

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 retinal vein occlusion.

## PHARMACOTHERAPY

### Therapeutic complex

Taken into account that pathogenesis of CRVO is multifactorial with both local factors and systemic diseases being etiologically important [26,27] we used the combination of different drugs named the therapeutic complex [28] in treatment of CRVO. Each of used drugs influences the specific link in the chain of pathologic changes resulted in RVO. The treatment included mix of Heparin and Dexamethason followed by Emoxypin and Dexamethason local in peribulbar injections, and Doxium, Solcoseryl [29], Diamox [30], Troxerutin, Vitamin E systemic during 15 days. The treatment is directed towards normalization the rheologic factors, resorbtion of blood clot in occluded vein, restoration of blood circulation, reducing vascular hyperpermeability and macular edema, activating of retinal oxygen metabolism and decreasing ischemic processes to prevent neovascularization. In CRVO patients with systemic hypertension also were used vasodilating drug to control blood pressure. To evaluate the efficacy of the therapeutic complex treatment we conducted a case-control study. A group of 20 patients treated after 2 weeks of the onset of occlusion was compared with controls without treatment after 1 month of the onset of occlusion. The groups were comparable for age, sex, systemic diseases (mainly presented systemic hypertension, less diabetes mellitus, myocardial infarction, atherosclerotic vascular disease). A statistically significant improvement in visual acuity was found in treated patients compared with control ( $t=2.66, p<0.01$ ).

Results of this study revealed that the complex medical therapy in RVO may be more effective than ordinary treatment or spontaneous regression [31] and suggest that a randomized double-masked study should be conducted.

### Intravitreal pharmacotherapy

Macular edema is the main reason for decreased visual acuity in RVO. 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).

Recently the vitreous cavity has increasingly been used as a reservoir of drugs for the direct treatment of macular edema through intravitreal injection route.

### 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 RVO [32,33].

Haller et al.[32] 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.

### Anti-VEGF therapy

Application of vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) inhibitors represents a treatment option for macular edema secondary to RVO 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. [34] 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. [35] and Rouvas et al. [36] 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 trials are under way, assessing the safety, tolerability and efficacy of intravitreal ranibizumab injections in the treatment of macular edema secondary to BRVO and CRVO [37]. They are called BRAVO (study of the efficacy and safety of ranibizumab injection compared with sham in patients with macular edema due to BRVO) and 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. In addition, in the BRAVO study, rescue laser therapy was performed if criteria were met. 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 BRVO or 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. In the BRVO group, more patients in the sham group received rescue grid laser, compared with the 0.3 or 0.5 mg ranibizumab groups. Besides, intravitreal ranibizumab seems to have a safety profile consistent with previous phase III trials, and low rates of ocular and nonocular safety events [38-40]. Moreover, these two trials demonstrate 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 [41,42]. The latest results from open-label extension trial of the 12-month Ranibizumab assessing long-term safety and efficacy in BRAVO and CRUISE trials [41] 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 2.0, 2.4, and 2.1 (branch RVO) and 2.9, 3.8, and 3.5 (central RVO), respectively. 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 letter score at month 12 in branch RVO patients was 0.9 (sham/0.5 mg), -2.3 (0.3/0.5 mg), and -0.7 (0.5 mg), 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, but vision in branch RVO patients remained stable. 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 [43-55]. 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 [56]. By contrast, no statistically significant differences were found between the doses, when the group presented the results at 24 months [50]. In addition, Ach et al. [54] found that CRVO patients who benefit from therapy were significantly younger and had lower central retinal thickness at baseline, while BRVO patients showed no predictive factors for effectiveness of bevacizumab therapy.

Recently, Ghayoor et al. [55] evaluated the effect of Avastin (mean 2.8 injections) in 8 eyes with CRVO- and 22 with BRVO-associated macular edema and claimed that significant improvement in best corrected VA was observed at 6<sup>th</sup> week of follow-up. At 6<sup>th</sup> month more than 60% showed improvement in best corrected visual acuity, similarly 70% patients had complete resolution of macular edema. The authors concluded that anti-VEGF therapy should be further evaluated in large, prospective, controlled clinical studies.

Epstein et al. [56] 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 [57] 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. On the other hand, Wroblewski et al. [58] conducted a study where subjects with BRVO were randomized 3:1 to intravitreal injections of pegaptanib 0.3 or 1 mg at baseline and at weeks 6 and 12 with subsequent injections at 6-week intervals at the discretion of the investigator until week 48. He also found improvements in VA and macular thickness in this study with a 54-week follow-up. Therefore, the authors consider that intravitreal pegaptanib offers a promising alternative for macular edema secondary to BRVO.

### **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 [59]. 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 six-months results of the Phase 3 from COPERNICUS Study - multicenter, randomized, prospective, controlled trial [60] 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 [61-70]. 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% [71] 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.

The latest study [72] 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. 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 [58].

In conclusion, patients should discuss the potential risks and benefits of intravitreal pharmacotherapy with their physicians before receiving treatment.

## CONCLUSION

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 RVO is not evidence-based yet. The benefits and risks of therapy should be weighted in all treatment decisions. Current angiostatic regimens target aberrant angiogenesis, but fail to address the underlying hypoxia. 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. Central Vein Occlusion Study Group: Baseline and early natural history report.( 1993). *Arch Ophthalmol* ;111:1087-1095.
2. Shahid, H, Hossain, P, Amoaku, W.M.(2006). The management of retinal vein occlusion: is interventional ophthalmology the way forward? *Br J Ophthalmol*, 90(5), 627-639.
3. Shahsuvaryan, M.L., Melkonyan, AK. Central retinal vein occlusion risk profile: a case-control study.(2003). *Eur J.Ophthalmol* 2003; 13: 445-452.
4. Hayreh , SS., Zimmerman, MB., Podhajsky, P.(1994). Incidence of various types of retinal vein occlusion and their recurrence and demographic characteristics. *Am J Ophthalmol*, 117,1994, 429-441.
5. Michel J. Ueber die anatomischen Ursachen von Veraenderungen des Augenhintergrundes bei einigen Allgemeinerkrankungen. (1878).*Dtsch Arch Klin Med* 1878; 22: 339-45.
6. 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* 98;105(5):765- 71.
7. Koizumi, H., Ferrara, DC., Bruè, C., Spaide, RF. Central retinal vein occlusion case-control study.(2007) *Am J Ophthalmol*,144(6):858-863
8. The Eye Disease Case-Control Study Group. Risk factors for central retinal vein occlusion.(1996). *Arch Ophthalmol*. 114: 545-54.
9. Lang, GE., Spraul ,CW. Risk factors for retinal vein occlusive diseases. (1997).*Klin Monatsbl Augenheilkd* 211: 217-26.
10. 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.
11. 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
12. Gottlieb, JL, Blice, JP., Mestichelli, B., Konkle, BA., Benson, WE.(1998). Activated protein C resistance, factor V Leiden, and central retinal vein occlusion in young adults. *Arch Ophthalmol* . 116: 577-9.
13. Williamson, TH., Rumley, A., Lowe, GDO. (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., Lip GY. (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., Hollifield, RD., Dick, JS., Brozetti, JJ., Howard, RS., Thach, AB. (2002). Homocysteine: a risk factor for retinal venous occlusive disease. *Ophthalmology* . 109: 287-90.
21. Marcucci, R., Bertini, L., Giusti, B., Brunelli, T., Fedi, S, Cellai, AP., Poli, D, Pepe G, Abbate R, Prisco D.(2001). Thrombophilic risk factors in patients with central retinal vein occlusion. *Thromb Haemost* . 86: 772-6.
22. Boyd, S, Owens, D, Gin, T, Bunce, K, Sherafat, H, Perry, D, Hykin, PG.(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., Sener, EC.(2001). Is activated factor VII associated with retinal vein occlusion? *Br J Ophthalmol* . 85: 1174-8.
24. Green, WR, Chan, CC, Hutchins, GM, Terry JM.(1981). Central retinal vein occlusion: a prospective histopathologic study of 29 eyes in 28 cases. *Trans Am Ophthalmol Soc* . 79:371-422.
25. Rehak, J, Rehak M.(2008). Branch retinal vein occlusion: pathogenesis, visual prognosis and treatment modalities. *Curr Eye Res* .33:111-131.
26. Hayreh, SS.(1994). Retinal vein occlusion. *Indian J Ophthalmol* .42:109-32.
27. Hayreh, SS.(1998). Central retinal vein occlusion. *Ophthalmol Clin North Am* .11:559-90.
28. Shahsuvaryan, ML.(2004). Evaluation of pathogenetic therapy effect in central retinal vein occlusion. *Collection of Scientific articles of Russian Medical Academy. Modern possibilities in diagnosis and treatment of vitreoretinal pathology*. Moscow. 380-3.
29. Menna F. (1980). Therapeutic effects in ocular lesions, obtained by systemic and topical administration of an activator of the oxygen metabolism. *Ophthalmologica* .180 (Suppl. 1):1-50.
30. Wolfensberger, TJ.(1999). The role of carbonic anhydrase inhibitors in the management of macular edema. *Doc Ophthalmol* .97:387-97.
31. Natural history and clinical management of central retinal vein occlusion. The Central Vein Occlusion Study Group.(1997). *Arch Ophthalmol* .115:486-91.
32. Haller, JA, Bandello, F, Belfort, R. et al.(2010). OZURDEX GENEVA S study Group: Randomized, sham-controlled trial of dexamethasone intravitreal implant in patients with macular edema due to retinal vein occlusion. *Ophthalmology* . 117:1134-46.
33. London, NJ, Chiang, A, Haller, JA.(2011). The dexamethasone drug delivery system: indications and evidence. *Adv Ther* .28(5):351-66.
34. Pieramici, DJ, Rabena, M, Castellarin, AA, Nasir, M, See, R, Norton, T, Sanchez, A, Risard, S, Avery, RL.(2008). Ranibizumab for the treatment of macular edema associated with perfused central retinal vein occlusion. *Ophthalmology* .115:e47-e54.
35. Spaide, RF, Chang, LK, Klancnik, JM, Yannuzzi, LA, Sorenson, J, Slakter, JS, Freund KB, Klein R.(2009). Prospective study of ranibizumab as a treatment of decreased visual acuity secondary to central retinal vein occlusion. *Am J Ophthalmol* .147:298-306.
36. Rouvas A, Petrou P, Vergados I, Pectasides D, Liarakos V, Mitsopoulou M, Ladas I.(2009). Intravitreal ranibizumab (Lucentis) for treatment of central retinal vein occlusion: a prospective study. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol* .247:1609-1616.
37. Pieramici DJ.(2009). Intravitreal ranibizumab for treatment of macular edema secondary to retinal vein occlusion. *Retina Today* ,4:44-46.
38. Campochiaro, PA, Heier, JS, Feiner, L, Gray, S, Saroj, N, Rundle, AC, Murahashi, WY, Rubio, RG,(2010). BRAVO Investigators: Ranibizumab for macular edema following branch retinal vein occlusion six-month primary end point results of a phase III study. *Ophthalmology* ,117:1102-1112.
39. Brown, DM, Campochiaro, PA, Singh, RP, Li Z, Saroj, N, Rundle, AC, Rubio, RG, Murahashi WY.(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
40. Garnock-Jones KP.(2012). Ranibizumab: in macular oedema following retinal vein occlusion. *Drugs. Br J Ophthalmol* .96:862-6.
41. Brown DM.(2010) Clinical implications of the BRAVO and CRUISE trials. *Retina Today* ,5:38-40.
42. Heier JS, Campochiaro PA, Yau L, Li Z, Saroj N, Rubio RG, Lai P.(2012). Ranibizumab for Macular Edema Due to Retinal Vein Occlusions Long-term Follow-up in the HORIZON Trial. *Ophthalmology* ,11 (2):145- 57.
43. Iturralde D, Spaide RF, Meyerle CB, Klancnik JM, Yannuzzi LA, Fisher YL, Sorenson J, Slakter JS, Freund KB, Cooney M, Fine HF.(2006). Intravitreal bevacizumab (Avastin) treatment of macular edema in central retinal vein occlusion. A short-term study. *Retina* ,26:279-284.
44. Costa RA, Jorge R, Calucci D, Melo LA Jr, Cardillo JA, Scott IU.(2007). Intravitreal bevacizumab (Avastin) for central and retinal vein occlusions. IBeVo study. *Retina* ;27:141-149.
45. 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.
46. Rabena MD, Pieramici DJ, Castellarin AA, Nasir MA, Avery RL.(2007). Intravitreal bevacizumab (Avastin) in the treatment of macular edema secondary to branch retinal vein occlusion. *Retina* ,27:419-425.
47. Badalá F.(2008). The treatment of branch retinal vein occlusion with bevacizumab. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol* 2008;19:234-238.

48. Wu L, Arevalo JF, Roca JA, Maia M, Berrocal MH, Rodriguez FJ, Evans T, Costa RA, Cardillo J.(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.
49. Chung EJ, Hong YT, Lee SC, Kwon OW, Koh HJ.(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.
50. Ahmadi AA, Chou JY, Banashkevich A, Ma PE, Maberley DA.(2009). The effects of intravitreals bevacizumab on patients with macular edema secondary to branch retinal vein occlusion. *Can J Ophthalmol* .,44:154-159.
51. Prager F, Michels S, Kriechbaum K, Georgopoulos M, Funk M, Geitzenauer W, Polak K, Schmidt-Erfurth U.(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.
52. Kondo M, Kondo N, Ito Y, Achi S, Kikuchi M, Yasuma TR, Ota I, Miyake K, Terasaki H.(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.
53. Wu L, Arevalo JF, Berrocal MH, Maia M, Roca JA, Morales-Cantón V, Alezzandrini AA, Díaz-Llopis MJ.(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.
54. Ach T, Hoeh AE, Schaal KB, Scheuerle AF, Dithmar S.(2010). Predictive factors for changes in macular edema in intravitreal bevacizumab therapy of retinal vein occlusion. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol* ,248:155-159.
55. Ghayoor I, Bokhari SA, Kamil Z, Shakir M, Zafar S, Khan MA.(2012). To assess the effect of intravitreal Bevacizumab (Avastin) in the treatment of macular edema secondary to retinal vein occlusion. *Ophthalmology Update*;;10(1):7-13.
56. Epstein DL, Algvere PV, von Wendt G, Seregard S, Kvanta A.(2012) Bevacizumab for Macular Edema in Central Retinal Vein Occlusion: A Prospective, Randomized, Double-Masked Clinical Study. *Ophthalmology*, Mar .
57. Bennet MD.(2009).Pegaptanib for the treatment of ischemic retinopathy in patients with diabetes and retinal vascular occlusive disorders. *Retina Today* ,4:63-66.
58. Wroblewski JJ, Wells JA 3rd, Gonzales CR.(2010). Pegaptanib sodium for macular edema secondary to branch retinal vein occlusion. *Am J Ophthalmol* .,149:147-154.
59. Pieramici DJ, Rabena MD.(2008). Anti-VEGF therapy: comparison of current and future agents. *Eye* ;22:1330-1336
60. Boyer D, Heier J, Brown DM, Clark WL, Vitt R, Berliner AJ, Groetzbach G, Zeitz O, Sandbrink R, Zhu X, Beckmann K, Haller JA.(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.
61. 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
62. Jonas J, Paques M, Mones J, Glacet-Bernard A.(2010). Retinal vein occlusions. *Dev Ophthalmol* ,47:111-35.
63. Rehak M, Wiedemann P.(2010). Retinal vein thrombosis: pathogenesis and management. *J Thromb Haemost.* , 8(9):1886-94.
64. Scott IU.(2010). Macular edema associated with retinal vein occlusion. *Retina today* , 4:54-5.
65. Ehlers JP, Fekrat S.(2011). Retinal vein occlusion: beyond the acute event. *Surv Ophthalmol* .,56(4):281-99.
66. Laouri M, Chen E, Looman M, Gallagher M.(2011). The burden of disease of retinal vein occlusion: review of the *Eye*,25(8):981-8.
67. London NJ, Brown G.(2011). Update and review of central retinal vein occlusion. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol* . 22(3):159-65.
68. Wells JA.(2011). The Paradigm Shifts in the Management of Retinal Vein Occlusion. *Retinal physician*,November.
69. Lattanzio R, Torres Gimeno A, Battaglia Parodi M, Bandello F.(2011). Retinal vein occlusion: current treatment.*Ophthalmologica*,225(3):135-43.
70. Hahn P, Fekrat S.(2012). Best practices for treatment of retinal vein occlusion.*Curr Opin Ophthalmol* . 23.
71. Lynch SS, Cheng CM.(2007). Bevacizumab for neovascular ocular diseases. *Ann Pharmacother* 2007; 41(4): 614- 25.
72. Simunovic MP, Rush RB, Hunyor AP, Chang AA.(2012). Endophthalmitis following intravitreal injection versus endophthalmitis following cataract surgery: clinical features, causative organisms and post-treatment outcomes. *Br J Ophthalmol* .,96:862-6.