Research Article

Journal on Cataract and Refractive Surgery

The Executives of Irritation After the Waterfall Medical Procedure

Hajo thermann,

Department of surgery

Corresponding author:
Hajo thermann,
Department of surgery

Received Date: 18 May 2024
Accepted Date: 03 June 2024
Published Date: 10 June 2024

Citation:
Hajo thermann. The executives of Irritation After the Waterfall Medical procedure. Journal on Cataract and Refractive Surgery 2024.

1. Dynamic

1.1. Reason for Audit: to look over the most recent research and clinical trials that have been done on the pathogenesis, treatment, and prevention of inflammation following cataract surgery.

1.2. Recent Results: FLACS gave an open door to assess fiery cytokines in the watery humor just after the laser strategy, which prompted recognizing the irritation pathogenesis during the phacoemulsification. When risk factors for PCME are present, NSAIDs are indicated and effective, despite the lack of evidence proving their long-term benefits. According to PREMED studies, the combination of NSAIDs and steroids following surgery is cost-effective for healthy subjects. The triamcinolone infusion along with effective steroids and NSAIDs for diabetic patients after the waterfall medical procedure was the most savvy in forestalling PCME as per the PREMED. Another emerging subject is dropless cataract surgery: As we await additional clinical trials with drug-loaded IOLs, dexamethasone implants and suspensions appear promising.

1.3. Summary: One of the most important aspects of the growing phacoemulsification rate is the prevention of inflammation following cataract surgery. Effective NSAIDs are savvy not just for patients with risk factors for PCME yet in addition for sound subjects. In the clinical setting, new dropless techniques are being successfully implemented.

2. Introduction

The world's leading cause of blindness is still cataracts: in 2020, it caused visual impairment for 15.2 million individuals and for 78.8 million individuals, it brought about moderate or extreme vision loss.[1] Right up to the present day, the main powerful treatment is waterfall medical procedure or phacoemulsification, which these days is less horrible yet can cause postoperative aggravation as ultrasonic as well as femtosecond laser energy is utilized. Normally, fiery cycle is viewed as flare in the foremost chamber, iritis, uveitis and pseudophakic cystoid macular oedema (PCME).[2-4] To forestall this, steroids are regularly recommended by clinicians however an inquiry with respect to nonsteroidal calming drops (NSAIDs) is remaining. Although nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) have been shown to be effective for patients who have risk factors, such as diabetes, cases of previous or chronic uveitis, and/or intraoperative complications,[5–7], there is no well-established strategy for preventing PCME. Inflammation During and After Cataract Surgery It is known that phacoemulsification damages the blood–aqueous barrier, which raises the levels of proteins, cytokines, and growth factors in the aqueous humor. However, no clear recommendations have been provided by the International Society of Ophthalmologists regarding the use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) following cataract surgery.[5] After the surgery, inflammatory processes can be evaluated using slit-lamp examination, laser flare and cell photometer, optical coherence tomography (OCT), and even inflammatory markers in aqueous humor.[2,3,8–13] However, there are some obstacles to properly evaluating the level of inflammation during the surgery: Because it is typically taken after the initial incision at the beginning of the procedure, aqueous humor is not entirely instructive. Because of the fluids used in phacoemulsification, a sample taken after surgery is also not objective. [3] The situation changed at least partially with the introduction of femtosecond lasers in cataract surgery: presently the degree of irritation markers after the laser system in the foremost chamber can be assessed by estimating aggravation markers.[14-16]

Starting from the presentation of femtosecond laser in the waterfall medical procedure in the 2010, concentrates on revealed its benefits when contrasted and regular phacoemulsification from which perhaps the main one while considering postoperative irritation was diminished phacoemulsification time and energy.[17-19] Aggregate scattered energy was fundamentally lower in the FLACS bunch when contrasted and traditional phacoemulsification in retrospective[20] and similar studies[21] as well as in randomized clinical trials.[22,23] Wang et al. carried out a study in which fluid samples from the anterior chamber were taken following paracentesis in the conventional phacoemulsification group and femtosecond laser treatment in the FLACS group. In a randomized study conducted by Liu and others, aqueous humour was collected not only after the laser treatment (FLACS group) or paracentesis (conventional phacoemulsification group) but also after the surgery. They discovered that the levels of interleukin (IL) 1, IL-6, and prostaglandin E2 (PGE2) were significantly higher in the FLACS group.[14] The levels of PGE2 in

the conventional phacoemulsification group were significantly higher after the laser treatment, but there was no difference between the groups after the surgery. Additionally, a third group received topical NSAID drops 24 hours prior to the FLACS: Similar to Schwarzenbacher et al., PGE2 levels were lower in this instance than in those who did not receive NSAIDs[15]. Results from a randomized clinical study [16]: The FLACS group had higher prostaglandin levels than the conventional phacoemulsification group. It is important to note that these results were significant even when low-energy FLACS was used in both trials.

A randomized clinical study conducted by Liu et al.[25] demonstrated that FLACS causes greater intraocular inflammation than conventional phacoemulsification does. There was some evidence that FLACS might cause less flare and have fewer cells in the anterior chamber when measured one week later[24]. At the first postoperative day, anterior chamber flare was greater, and aqueous PGE2 (P 0.01), IL-6 (P = 0.03), IL-8 (P = 0.03), and interferon (IFN)- concentrations were found to be higher. It is yet obscure what clinical impact aggravation brought about by FLACS has on the grounds that it is accounted for that cases finished with femtosecond laser doesn't result in more noteworthy PCME when contrasted and traditional phacoemulsification.[26-28]

3. Pseudophakic Cystoid Macular Oedema

PCME or Irvine-Gass disorder is characterized as a presence of intraretinal liquid spaces or focal macular thickening, and it stays the most well-known reason for diminished visual sharpness after predictable waterfall surgery. [29,30] It is demonstrated that macular thickness increments after simple phacoemulsification when contrasted and solid contralateral eyes, as a rule without visual keenness disintegration, and following 6 two months from the activity it steadily declines.[31] The pathogenesis of PCME stays obscure yet it is speculated that it is a consequence of inflammation.[32] Although it is generally acknowledged that the incidence of PCME has decreased significantly as a result of the refinement of cataract surgical techniques, including the switch from extracapsular cataract surgery to phacoemulsification, the PCME rate was reported to be higher when the intracapsular or extracapsular cataract extraction technique was utilized[29]. PCME does not have a single, universally accepted definition. [33] In the past, it was defined angiographically, and its incidence ranged from 9 to 19 percent.[34] Since OCT largely replaced fluorescein angiography, its incidence varies from study to study: from 1 to 4% yet cystoid macular injuries could be analyzed up to 6.39% of the patients. [35] practically speaking, in any case, the term of clinically critical PCME is utilized, what implies some kind of visual weakening related with trademark morphologic changes introduced by OCT, and its frequency after ordinary phacoemulsification somewhat recently fluctuates from 0.02 to 4.2%.[34,36-41]

A few variables, notwithstanding, increment the conceivable gamble of PCME essentially (Table 1). Posterior capsule rupture with or without vitreous loss or any additional trauma, particularly to the iris, is one of the intraoperative factors [29,38,46]. Taipale et al. [45] reported that the risk of clinically significant PCME was more than five times greater in eyes with pupil expansion devices than in eyes without them (hazard ratio 5.41, 95% confidence interval (CI) 1.35–21.71, P = 0.017). The patient is also associated with other risk factors, such as being older and male. The majority of studies have demonstrated that diabetes raises the risk of PCME: in Chu et al.'s According to Schmier et al.[47] and Seth et al.[37], it also appears that poor glycaemic control for diabetic patients also increases the risk of PCME. On the other hand, a study that was carried out by Danni et al.[48] found that it was four times higher than that of healthy subjects. demonstrated that healthy patients' central retinal thickness (CRT) was greater following phacoemulsification than diabetes patients': CRT increased in nondiabetic eyes with steroid monotherapy by 38.1 72.8 m compared to 7.8 6.6 m in diabetic eyes (P = 0.010). In a randomized clinical trial of glaucoma patients treated with latanoprost who were randomly allocated to continuation or discontinuation of latanoprost after uneventful cataract surgery, Fakhraieet al.[52] found that the mean CRT did not differ significantly between the groups. However, there was no significant difference in CRT between diabetic and nondiabetic patients in the NSAID group or the combination (steroid with NSAIDs) group Another randomized clinical study conducted by Park et al.[53] also found no significant differences in CRT between the glaucoma group that stopped taking prostaglandin analogues, the glaucoma group that continued taking drops, and the nonglaucoma group after uncomplicated phacoemulsification.

Uveitis, which is already a risk factor for macular oedema, is another risk factor for PCME.[38] Uveitis is also a risk factor for macular oedema itself.[54] Retinal diseases like retinal vein occlusion, epiretinal membrane (ERM), vitreomacular traction, macular hole, and even previous retinal detachment repair may also predispose to PCME.[37 Hardin et al.[57] in their review study, showed that PCME created in 8.6% ERM eyes (95% CI 6.69-10.98) and 1.38% reference eyes (95% CI 1.32-1.45) (P < 0.001). According to Schaub et al.[57], 15.7% of eyes with preexisting ERM developed PCME, while only 5.9% of eyes without ERM did so. After phacoemulsification, Norton et al.[58] found that PCME was twice as likely in the secondary ERM group (16.5%) as it was in the primary ERM group (7.8%) (P = 0.0018). Chen and co. compared two ERM patients' surgical options: They compared subjects who underwent PPV first and then phacoemulsification, as well as those who underwent phacoemulsification first and then PPV. PCME incidence was significantly higher (29.40 vs. 16.30%, P = 0.008) in eyes with baseline CRT at least 500 m, despite the fact that PCME rates did not differ significantly between the groups (15.4 vs. 19.5%, P = 0.287).[59] This is actually comparable to the most recent study by Doncel-Fernandez et al. the results: focal macular thickness (CMT) more prominent than 260.5 µm estimated by OCT before waterfall medical procedure introduced 9.08 times greater likelihood to create macular intraretinal pimples after straightforward waterfall surgery.[60]

Irritation Control and Pseudophakic Cystoid Macular Oedema Avoidance After the Waterfall Medical procedure

It was shown that blend treatment made out of steroids and NSAIDs

decline the postsurgical aggravation, the gamble of PCME and works on the visual recuperation in patients with diabetes.[5-7] This is presumably additionally consistent with some degree for different problems expanding the gamble for PCME, albeit considerably less proof exists. This was embraced in the rules by numerous social orders, including AAO, Imperial School of Ophthalmologists and Canadian Culture of Ophthalmology. [5,61,62] Numerous prescriptions from steroid and NSAID class have been supported by Food and Medication Organization (FDA) and European Drugs Office (EMA) for the treatment of postoperative aggravation yet just nepafenac was endorsed by EMA for the counteraction of PCME after waterfall medical procedure in patients with diabetes,[63] as there is level I proof that NSAIDs decline the probability of PCME for diabetic patients (in regards to transient advantage and visual recovery].[5-7] In clinical practice, different postoperative drop systems are utilized yet some waterfall specialists favor consolidated steroid and NSAID treatment for 1 month[64] and the pace of recommended mix treatment is developing, for instance, in Sweden it expanded from 12% in 2010 to 60% in 2017.[65] In any case, mix treatment prompts greater expense for a waterfall patient as NSAIDs contributes up to 36% of all the postoperative treatment price. [66] In the population of otherwise healthy cataract patients, it is up for debate whether NSAIDs provide sufficient benefits to standard steroid therapy to offset the additional cost and instillation issues associated with the use of an additional drug by elderly patients. Lim et al. conducted a Cochrane systematic review in 2016 reasoned that there was proof of a decreased gamble of PCME with NSAIDs at 90 days after medical procedure, yet they judged this to be low-sureness due to take a chance of predisposition and distribution inclination. Additionally, there was low-certainty evidence that patients receiving topical NSAIDs and steroids may have a lower risk of PCME-related vision loss three months after cataract surgery [risk ratio (RR) 0.41, 95% CI 0.23–0.76; eyes = 1360; studies = 5; [67] In the Juthani et al. efficient survey, they have found low-conviction proof that members treated with a NSAID alone had a lower chance of creating PCME contrasted and those treated with a corticosteroid alone multi month after phacoemulsification (RR 0.26, 95% CI 0.17-0.41). They likewise have found low-conviction proof of a lower hazard of PCME in members getting a NSAID with a corticosteroid contrasted and those getting a corticosteroid alone (RR 0.50, 95% CI 0.23-1.06).[68]

There are a couple of huge issues of studies contrasting steroids and NSAIDs.

Steroid penetration into the anterior chamber is the first issue. In ophthalmology, four main kinds of steroids are used: The synthetic steroid prednisolone is active on both glucocorticoid and mineralocorticoid receptors, whereas the other three main ocular steroids, triamcinolone acetonide, dexamethasone acetonide, and fluocinolone acetonide, are primarily active against glucocorticoid receptors.[69] Their effectiveness is different; for instance, dexamethasone In many studies, NSAIDs are compared with 0.1% fluorometholone or 0.1% dexamethasone, which are not as potent, especially fluorometholone, which is similar to placebo in intraocular inflammation because it has lower aqueous concentrations than dexamethasone while it has similar potency to it.[72] The second issue is related to unbalanced dosing of NSAIDs and steroids in various studies, and the unexplain additive or synergistic Prostaglandins are the finished results of unsaturated fat digestion and are created by means of the COX pathway. The precursor for the production of prostaglandins is arachidonic acid. The COX pathway and the lipoxygenase (LOX) enzyme catalyze the conversion of free arachidonic acid into eicosanoids, which are lipid mediators, to a wide range of stimuli. The first step in the biosynthesis of prostaglandins and thromboxanes (TxA) is catalyzed by the two known COX isoforms (COX-1 and COX-2) in the COX pathway (Figure 1). Corticosteroids inhibit the metabolism of membrane phospholipids by phospholipase A2, resulting in downregulation of both prostaglandins and leukotrienes [72,73]. NSAIDs only inhibit the COX pathway, which results in a decrease in vasodilating prostaglandins (PGE2 and PGI2), which in turn reduces oedema and nociceptive responses in an indirect manner. In addition, they bind to cytosolic glucocorticoid receptors, which are then transported into the nucleus to regulate the transcription of inflammatory and anti-inflammatory proteins.[74] Typically, combined treatment of steroids (4 times per day) and NSAIDs (3 times per day) provides more volume of the anti-inflammatory drug (7 times per day) than single treatment of steroids (4 times per day); consequently, it is difficult to determine whether the outcome of the combination group is due to the addition In an ideal scenario, both groups would administer the same amount of the drug, such as seven times per day for the combination group (four times a day of steroid and three times a day of NSAID) as opposed to seven times a day for the steroid. Sadly, such examinations were not led yet.[67,68]

Shorsteinet al.[75] included 62 700 patients who went through waterfall medical procedure and were recommended either with prednisolone or prednisolone with NSAIDs (diclofenac sodium, flurbiprofen sodium and ketorolac tromethamine), and they found no distinction between the gatherings when analyzed postoperative Visual sharpness (VA). Deka was the subject of a randomized controlled trial (RCT) in which patients were divided into three groups to receive treatment: 1, bromfenac recommended three times each day for multi month; 2, prednisolone acetic acid derivation 1% - four times each day for multi month; 3, prednisolone acetic acid derivation 1% - four times each day for a long time and bromfenac two times each day for multi month. The three groups did not statistically differ in the CDVA at one month, but the anterior chamber flare grade on postoperative days 1 and 7 was higher in group 1 than in groups 2 and 3.[76] patients were relegated to two gatherings: Nepafenac (0.01%) four times daily for four weeks and prednisolone acetate (1%) in decreasing doses for four weeks following surgery. When the inflammation in the anterior chamber was compared between the two groups, there was no difference in the postoperative BCVA, which was statistically insignificant. However, at day 30, the prednisolone group had a higher mean CMT (205.713 17.14 versus 220.984 32.83 in groups A and B, respectively, P 0.001)[77] CRT and BCVA were also compared between the following groups: 1, either 1% prednisolone and 0.5 percent ketorolac tromethamine administered prior to surgery (preoperative prednisolone plus NSAID [control] or postoperative prednisolone plus NSAID groups); 2, ketorolac monotherapy with or without initiation prior

to the procedure (the preoperative and postoperative NSAID groups), or 3, sub-Tenon depot dexamethasone phosphate (the sub-Tenon group). When compared to the preoperative prednisolone with NSAID group, BCVA improved in all groups three months after the procedure without any discernible differences. When CRT was compared between the groups, there was no significant difference, but 47 of 83 participants (56.6%) in the sub-Tenon group required additional anti-inflammatory treatment[78]. Three days after surgery, the same patients were examined, and anterior chamber flare was compared: it expanded fundamentally more in the dropless gathering contrasted and the benchmark group, yet none of different gatherings varied essentially from the control group.[79]

Pretreatment is one more system that can likewise be considered for prophylaxis of aggravation, yet it stays disputable. Donnenfeld et al.[80] found that pretreatment with ketorolac 0.4% resulted in a reduction in CME compared to pretreatment 1 h before cataract surgery and placebo, though this was not statistically significant. As we discussed earlier, some studies based on standard patients did not show any superiority of pretreatment regarding visual acuity, anterior chamber flare, or retinal thickening.[78,79] In contrast, Cagini et al.[81] reported that, 30 days after phacoemulsification, the group that received no preoperative drops had lower levels of anterior chamber flare than the group that received pretreatment with nepafenac for 3 days. The study groups did not differ in BCVA or CMT. The review was, in any case, reprimanded, and it was pointed that three patients who created PCME, regardless of being a clinically significant endpoint, were barred from the examination, as were patients with postoperative foremost intense uveitis, which prompts distortion of the data.[77] Dal et al. evaluated the effects of topical 0.5% ketorolac and topical steroids on macular thickness in cases with no risk factors and uneventful phacoemulsification, starting two days before surgery. However, pretreatment with NSAIDs prior to FLACS reduces inflammatory markers in the aqueous,[83–85], but unfortunately these studies did not evaluate flare or retinal thickness. The control group consisted of patients who received only steroids. The results showed that the increase in mean foveal thickness at the first week, first, and second months after surgery was significantly lower in the NSAIDs group. However, once again, the authors excluded all PCME cases from the statistical analysis.[82] While considering PCME, it was likewise demonstrated that 3 days of pretreatment with 0.45% ketorolac diminishes PGE2 by roughly 15% in the glassy cavity while a lot more significant levels of prostaglandin restraint were seen with 7 days of pretreatment with skin indomethacin, bromfenac and nepafenac.[86] as a matter of fact, a RCT with in any case sound waterfall patients completed by Şahin et al. showed that after three and six weeks after cataract surgery, patients who received a three-day regimen of NSAIDs (nepafenac, 0.1%) as pretreatment had a lower increase in macular volume in the central 1 mm area than those who received only steroids. However, this difference did not exist between patients who received a combination of steroids and NSAIDs after the surgery (without pretreatment). There were no progressions between every one of the three gatherings with respect to PCME and postoperative BCVA.[87]

NSAIDs are suggested after the waterfall medical procedure when there are at least two gamble factors for PCME, and diabetes is one of them.[88,89] In any case, there is an absence of investigations of PCME counteraction with pretreatment methodology for diabetics. Danni et al.[90] showed that 3 days of pretreatment with skin steroids and NSAIDs in a diabetic partner significantly affected postoperative infusion, bothering and CRT. Overall, pretreatment strategy is still one of the most important topics for both healthy patients and those who are at risk for postoperative inflammation. More research is needed on this topic.

4. Conclusion

Irritation after the waterfall medical procedure and its avoidance is perhaps of the most significant point in front portion a medical procedure. Despite the fact that blend treatment of steroids with NSAIDs limit the postoperative irritation in both solid and high-risk waterfall patients, and may speed visual recuperation, there is no proof in view of randomized preliminary that NSAIDs work on visual keenness following a month and a half from the activity. The determination of whether a NSAID provides a synergistic effect to steroid when used in combination is prevented by methodological issues in published reports, such as ignoring the differences in intraocular penetration of individual steroids and unbalanced dosing. The anti-inflammatory dropless delivery method is a new and promising idea that improves control and compliance. Some studies showed that it was effective and well tolerated, but more research is needed for wider use.

References

1. van Rensburg. Janse E, David M. Astute and safe use of topical ocular corticosteroids in general practice: practical guidelines. Continuing Med Educ 2013; 31:396–398.
2. Cunningham ET, Wender JD. Practical approach to the use of corticosteroids in patients with uveitis. Can J Ophthalmol 2010; 45:352–358.
3. Taubenslag KJ, Kim SJ, Grzybowski A. Anti-inflammatory pharmacotherapy for the prevention of cystoid macular edema after cataract surgery. Am J Ophthalmol 2021; 232:1–8.
4. Bacchi S, Palumbo P, Sponta A, Coppolino MF. Clinical pharmacology of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs: a review. Antiinflamm Antiallergy Agents Med Chem 2012; 11:52–64.
5. Timmermans S, Souffriau J, Libert C. A general introduction to glucocorticoid biology. Front Immunol 2019; 10:1545.
6. Shorstein NH, Carolan J, Liu L, et al. Visual outcomes after cataract surgery: topical nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug prophylaxis compared with prednisolone. J Cataract Refract Surg 2021; 47:870–877.
7. Deka A. Comparative study of topical steroids vs nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs to control postcataract surgery inflammation. J Cataract Refract Surg 2020; 46:1397–1401.
8. Sarkar S, Bardoloi N, Deb AK. Comparison between 0.1% nepafenac and 1% prednisolone eye drop in postoperative management following microincisional cataract surgery. Korean J Ophthalmol

2021; 35:188–197.

9. Erichsen JH, Holm LM, Forslund Jacobsen M, et al. Prednisolone and ketorolac vs ketorolac monotherapy or sub-tenon prophylaxis for macular thickening in cataract surgery: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA Ophthalmol 2021; 139:1062–1070.
10. Erichsen JH, Forman JL, Holm LM, Kessel L. Effect of anti-inflammatory regimen on early postoperative inflammation after cataract surgery. J Cataract Refract Surg 2021; 47:323–330.
11. Donnenfeld ED, Perry HD, Wittpenn JR, et al. Preoperative ketorolac tromethamine 0.4% in phacoemulsification outcomes: pharmacokinetic-response curve. J Cataract Refract Surg 2006; 32:1474–1482.
12. Cagini C, Cerquaglia A, Pellegrino A, et al. Effect of preoperative topical nepafenac 0.1% on inflammatory response after uncomplicated cataract surgery in healthy subjects. Acta Ophthalmol 2021; 99:e70–e73.
13. Dal D, Sarac O, Toklu Y, et al. The effect of perioperative topical ketorolac 0.5% on macular thickness after uneventful phacoemulsification. J Ophthalmol 2017; 2017:4271671.
14. Lee JH, Chung HS, Moon SY, et al. Effect of preoperative eyedrops on cytokine concentrations in aqueous humor of patients undergoing femtosecond laser-assisted cataract surgery. Graefe's Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol 2022; 260:885–891.
15. Diakonis VF, Anagnostopoulos AG, Moutsiopoulou A, et al. The effect of NSAID pretreatment on aqueous humor prostaglandin E2 concentration in eyes undergoing femtosecond laser-assisted capsulotomy. J Ophthalmol 2018; 2018:1891249.
16. Kiss HJ, Takacs AI, Kranitz K, et al. One-day use of preoperative topical nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug prevents intraoperative prostaglandin level elevation during femtosecond laser-assisted cataract surgery. Curr Eye Res 2016; 41:1064–1067.
17. Chu CJ, Johnston RL, Buscombe C, et al. Risk factors and incidence of macular edema after cataract surgery: a database study of 81984 eyes. Ophthalmology 2016; 123:316–323.
18. Bellocq D, Pierre-Kahn V, Matonti F, et al. Effectiveness and safety of dexamethasone implants for postsurgical macular oedema including Irvine-Gass syndrome: the EPISODIC-2 study. Br J Ophthalmol 2017; 101:333– 341.
19. McCafferty S, Harris A, Kew C, et al. Pseudophakic cystoid macular edema prevention and risk factors; prospective study with adjunctive once daily topical nepafenac 0.3% versus placebo. BMC Ophthalmol 2017; 17:16.
20. Wielders LHP, Schouten JSAG, Winkens B, et al., ESCRS PREMED study group. Randomized controlled European multicenter trial on the prevention of cystoid macular edema after cataract surgery in diabetics: ESCRS PREMED Study Report 2. J Cataract Refract Surg 2018; 44:836–847.
21. Henderson BA, Kim JY, Ament CS, et al. Clinical pseudophakic cystoid macular edema. Risk factors for development and duration after treatment. J Cataract Refract Surg 2007; 33:1550–1558.
22. Lee KM, Lee EJ, Kim TW, Kim H. Pseudophakic macular edema in primary open-angle glaucoma: a prospective study using spectral-domain optical coherence tomography. Am J Ophthalmol 2017; 179:97–109.
23. Wendel C, Zakrzewski H, Carleton B, et al. Association of postoperative topical prostaglandin analog or beta-blocker use and incidence of pseudophakic cystoid macular edema. J Glaucoma 2018; 27:402–406.
24. Taipale C, Holmström EJ, Ilveskoski L, Tuuminen R. Incidence of pseudophakic cystoid macular edema in eyes with and without pupil expansion device. Acta Ophthalmol 2019; 97:688–694.
25. Williams ER, Patnaik JL, Miller DC, et al. Iris manipulation during phacoemulsification: intraoperative and postoperative complications. Int J Ophthalmol 2021; 14:676–683.
26. Schmier JK, Halpern MT, Covert DW, Matthews GP. Evaluation of costs for cystoid macular edema among patients after cataract surgery. Retina 2007; 27:621–628.
27. Ylinen P, Laine I, Lindholm JM, Tuuminen R. Poor glycemic control as a risk factor for pseudophakic cystoid macular edema in patients with diabetes. J Cataract Refract Surg 2017; 43:1376–1382.
28. Danni R, Taipale C, Ilveskoski L, Tuuminen R. Diabetes alone does not impair recovery from uneventful cataract surgery. Am J Ophthalmol 2019; 198:37–44.
29. Danni R, Taipale C, Holmström EJ, et al. Systemic use of calcium channel blockers associated with less increase in central retinal thickness after uncomplicated cataract surgery. Acta Ophthalmol 2019; 97:178–184.
30. Holló G, Aung T, Cantor LB, Aihara M. Cystoid macular edema related to cataract surgery and topical prostaglandin analogs: Mechanism, diagnosis, and management. SurvOphthalmol 2020; 65:496–512.
31. Fakhraie G, Mirghorbani M, Katz LJ, et al. Cystoid macular edema with prostaglandin analogue use after uneventful cataract surgery in glaucoma patients. J Cataract Refract Surg 2019; 45:1436–1445.
32. Park KS, Kim KN, Kim KM, et al. Effects of topical prostaglandin analog on macular thickness following cataract surgery with postoperative topical bromfenac treatment. J Clin Med 2020; 9:1–12.
33. Accorinti M, Okada AA, Smith JR, Gilardi M. Epidemiology of macular edema in uveitis. Ocul Immunol Inflamm 2019; 27:169–180.
34. Cho HJ, Hwang HJ, Kim HS, et al. Macular edema after cataract surgery in eyes with preoperative retinal vein occlusion. Retina 2018; 38:1180–1186.
35. Schaub F, Adler W, Enders P, et al. Preexisting epiretinal membrane is associated with pseudophakic cystoid macular edema. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol 2018; 256:909–917.
36. Hardin JS, Gauldin DW, Soliman MK, et al. Cataract surgery outcomes in eyes with primary epiretinal membrane. JAMA Ophthalmol 2018; 136:148–154.
37. Norton JC, Soliman MK, Yang YC, et al. Visual outcomes of primary versus secondary epiretinal membrane following vitrectomy and cataract surgery. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol 2022; 260:817–825.
38. Chen YC, Chen SJ, Li AF, Huang YM. Visual outcomes and incidence

of pseudophakic cystoid macular oedema in eyes with cataract and idiopathic epiretinal membrane after two-step sequential surgery. Eye (Lond) 2022; 36:1597–1603.

39. Doncel-Fernández CJ, Alferez-Asenjo ML, Quereda-Castañeda A, Castro-Luna G. Preoperative central macular thickness as a risk factor for pseudophakic macular edema. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol 2021; 259:1681.
40. Bellan L, Ahmed IIK, MacInnis B, et al. Canadian Ophthalmological Society evidence-based clinical practice guidelines for cataract surgery in the adult eye. Can J Ophthalmol 2008; 43(Suppl 1):S7–33.
41. Day AC, Wormald R, Coronini-Cronberg S, et al. The Royal College of Ophthalmologists' Cataract Surgery Commissioning Guidance: executive summary. Eye 2016; 30:498.
42. Nevanac: a summary of the European public assessment report (EPAR) for Nevanac. European Medicines Agency.
43. Aptel F, Colin C, Kaderli S, et al., OSIRIS group. Management of postoperative inflammation after cataract and complex ocular surgeries: a systematic review and Delphi survey. Br J Ophthalmol 2017; 101:1451–1460.
44. Samadi B, Lundstrom M, Zetterberg M, et al. Original research: Anti-inflammatory treatment after cataract surgery in Sweden: changes in prescribing patterns from 2010 to 2017. BMJ Open Ophthalmol 2021; 6:e000635.
45. Zafar S, Wang P, Schein OD, et al. Prescribing patterns and costs associated with postoperative eye drop use in medicare beneficiaries undergoing cataract surgery. Ophthalmology 2020; 127:573–581.
46. Lim BX, Lim CHL, Lim DK, et al. Prophylactic nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs for the prevention of macular oedema after cataract surgery. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2016; (11):CD006683.
47. Juthani VV, Clearfield E, Chuck RS. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs versus corticosteroids for controlling inflammation after uncomplicated cataract surgery. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2017; (7):CD010516.
48. Fung AT, Tran T, Lim LL, et al. Local delivery of corticosteroids in clinical ophthalmology: a review. Clin Experiment Ophthalmol 2020; 48:366–401.
49. Schoenberger SD, Kim SJ, Sheng J, Calcutt MW. Reduction of vitreous prostaglandin E2 levels after topical administration of ketorolac 0.45% JAMA Ophthalmol 2014; 132:150–154.
50. ahin AK, Kükner A, Ulaş F, Doğan Ü. Effect of nepafenac 0.1% on retinal thickness after cataract surgery in patients without risk factors for cystoid macular edema. Int J Ophthalmol 2020; 13:1901–1907.
51. Yüksel B, Karti Ö, Kusbeci T. Topical nepafenac for prevention of postcataract surgery macular edema in diabetic patients: patient selection and perspectives. Clin Ophthalmol 2017; 11:2183–2190.
52. Zhang R, Dong L, Yang Q, et al. Prophylactic interventions for preventing macular edema after cataract surgery in patients with diabetes: a Bayesian network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. eClinicalMedicine 2022; 49:101463.
53. Danni R, Viljanen A, Aaronson A, Tuuminen R. Preoperative anti-inflammatory treatment of diabetic patients does not improve recovery from cataract surgery when postoperatively treated with a combination of prednisolone acetate and nepafenac. Acta Ophthalmol 2019; 97:589–595.
54. Pesudovs K, Lansingh VC, Kempen JH, et al. Cataract-related blindness and vision impairment in 2020 and trends over time in relation to VISION 2020: the right to sight: an analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2021; 62:3523–13523.
55. Matsumura T, Iwasaki K, Arimura S, et al. Topical bromfenac reduces multiple inflammatory cytokines in the aqueous humour of pseudophakic patients. Sci Rep 2021; 11:6018.
56. De Maria M, Iannetta D, Cimino L, et al. Measuring anterior chamber inflammation after cataract surgery: a review of the literature focusing on the correlation with cystoid macular edema. Clin Ophthalmol 2020; 14:41.
57. Taravati P, Lam DL, Leveque T, Van Gelder RN. Postcataract surgical inflammation. Curr OpinOphthalmol 2012; 23:12–18.
58. American Academy of Ophthalmology Preferred Practice Pattern Cataract and Anterior Segment Committee. Cataract in the adult eye preferred practice pattern 2021. Available at: https://www.aao.org/preferred-practice-pattern/cataract-in-adult-eyeppp. 2021. [in press] [Accessed 10 August 2022].
59. Laursen SB, Erichsen JH, Holm LM, Kessel L. Prevention of macular edema in patients with diabetes after cataract surgery. J Cataract Refract Surg 2019; 45:854–869.
60. Liu L, Herrinton LJ, Alexeeff S, et al. Visual outcomes after cataract surgery in patients with type 2 diabetes. J Cataract Refract Surg 2019; 45:404–413.
61. Zhao Y, Deng X, Chang P, et al. Expression profiles of inflammatory cytokines in the aqueous humor of children after congenital cataract extraction. Transl Vis Sci Technol 2020; 9:3.
62. Hwang HS, Ahn YJ, Lee HJ, et al. Comparison of macular thickness and inflammatory cytokine levels after microincision versus small incision coaxial cataract surgery. Acta Ophthalmol 2016; 94:e189–e194.
63. ong N, Xu B, Wang B, et al. Aqueous cytokines as predictors of macular edema in patients with diabetes following uncomplicated phacoemulsification cataract surgery. Biomed Res Int 2015; 2015:126984.
64. Coassin M, De Maria M, Mastrofilippo V, et al. Anterior chamber inflammation after cataract surgery: a randomized clinical trial comparing bromfenac 0.09% to dexamethasone 0.1. Adv Ther 2019; 36:2712–2722.
65. De Maria M, Coassin M, Iannetta D, Fontana L. Laser flare and cell photometry to measure inflammation after cataract surgery: a tool to predict the risk of cystoid macular edema. Int Ophthalmol 2021; 41:2293–2300.
66. De Maria M, Coassin M, Mastrofilippo V, et al. Persistence of inflammation after uncomplicated cataract surgery: a 6-month laser flare photometry analysis. Adv Ther 2020; 37:3223–3233.
67. Wang L, Zhang Z, Koch DD, et al. Anterior chamber interleukin 1β, interleukin 6 and prostaglandin E2 in patients undergoing femtosecond laser-assisted cataract surgery. Br J Ophthalmol 2016;

100:579–582.

68. Liu YC, Setiawan M, Ang M, et al. Changes in aqueous oxidative stress, prostaglandins, and cytokines: comparisons of low-energy femtosecond laser-assisted cataract surgery versus conventional phacoemulsification. J Cataract Refract Surg 2019; 45:196–203.
69. Schwarzenbacher L, Schartmüller D, Leydolt C, Menapace R. Intraindividual comparison of cytokine and prostaglandin levels with and without low-energy, high-frequency femtosecond laser cataract pretreatment after single-dose topical NSAID application. J Cataract Refract Surg 2020; 46:1086– 1091.
70. Daya SM, Nanavaty MA, Espinosa-Lagana MM. Translenticularhydrodissection, lens fragmentation, and influence on ultrasound power in femtosecond laser-assisted cataract surgery and refractive lens exchange. J Cataract Refract Surg 2014; 40:37–43.
71. Hatch KM, Schultz T, Talamo JH, Dick HB. Femtosecond laser-assisted compared with standard cataract surgery for removal of advanced cataracts. J Cataract Refract Surg 2015; 41:1833–1838.
72. Abell RG, Kerr NM, Vote BJ. Toward zero effective phacoemulsification time using femtosecond laser pretreatment. Ophthalmology 2013; 120:942–948.
73. Lin HY, Kao ST, Chuang YJ, et al. Comparison of cumulative dispersed energy between conventional phacoemulsification and femtosecond laser-assisted cataract surgery with two different lens fragmentation patterns. Lasers Med Sci 2022; 37:843.
74. Saeedi OJ, Chang LY, Ong SR, et al. Comparison of cumulative dispersed energy (CDE) in femtosecond laser-assisted cataract surgery (FLACS) and conventional phacoemulsification. Int Ophthalmol 2019; 39:1761–1766.
75. Bascaran L, Alberdi T, Martinez-Soroa I, et al. Differences in energy and corneal endothelium between femtosecond laser-assisted and conventional cataract surgeries: prospective, intraindividual, randomized controlled trial. Int J Ophthalmol 2018; 11:1308–1316.
76. Oka Y, Sasaki N, Injev VP. Comparison of femtosecond laser-assisted cataract surgery and conventional phacoemulsification on endothelial cell density when using torsional modality. Clin Ophthalmol 2021; 15:4227–4237.
77. Ang RET, Quinto MMS, Cruz EM, et al. Comparison of clinical outcomes between femtosecond laser-assisted versus conventional phacoemulsification. Eye Vis (Lond) 2018; 5:8.
78. Liu YC, Setiawan M, Chin JY, et al. Randomized controlled trial comparing 1-year outcomes of low-energy femtosecond laser-assisted cataract surgery versus conventional phacoemulsification. Front Med 2021; 8:811093.
79. Van Nuffel S, Claeys MF, Claeys MH. Cystoid macular edema following cataract surgery with low-energy femtosecond laser versus conventional phacoemulsification. Clin Ophthalmol 2020; 14:2873–2878.
80. Menapace R, Schartmüller D, Röggla V, et al. Ultrasound energy consumption and macular changes with manual and femtolaser-assisted high-fluidics cataract surgery: a prospective randomized comparison. Acta Ophthalmol 2022; 100:e414–e422.
81. Chen L, Hu C, Lin X, et al. Clinical outcomes and complications between FLACS and conventional phacoemulsification cataract surgery: a PRISMA-compliant Meta-analysis of 25 randomized controlled trials. Int J Ophthalmol 2021; 14:1081.
82. Grzybowski A, Sikorski BL, Ascaso FJ, Huerva V. Pseudophakic cystoid macular edema: update. Clin Interv Aging 2016; 11:1221.
83. Orski M, Gawęcki M. Current management options in Irvine–Gass syndrome: a systemized review. J Clin Med 2021; 10:4375.
84. Gharbiya M, Cruciani F, Cuozzo G, et al. Macular thickness changes evaluated with spectral domain optical coherence tomography after uncomplicated phacoemulsification. Eye (Lond) 2013; 27:605–611.
85. Aaronson A, Taipale C, Achiron A, et al. Relationship between prolonged intraocular inflammation and macular edema after cataract surgery. Transl Vis Sci Technol 2021; 10:15.
86. Guo S, Patel S, Baumrind B, et al. Management of pseudophakic cystoid macular edema. SurvOphthalmol 2015; 60:123–137.
87. Kim SJ, Schoenberger SD, Thorne JE, et al. Topical nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and cataract surgery: a report by the American Academy of Ophthalmology. Ophthalmology 2015; 122:2159–2168.
88. Yoon DH, Kang DJ, Kim MJ, Kim HK. New observation of microcystic macular edema as a mild form of cystoid macular lesions after standard phacoemulsification: Prevalence and risk factors. Medicine (Baltimore) 2018; 97:e0355.
89. Erikitola OO, Siempis T, Foot B, Lockington D. The incidence and management of persistent cystoid macular oedema following uncomplicated cataract surgery—a Scottish Ophthalmological Surveillance Unit study. Eye 2021; 35:584.
90. Seth I, Bulloch G, Tan A, et al. Incidence of pseudophakic cystoid macular oedema post-cataract surgery in Illawarra Shoalhaven Local Health District, Australia. Biomed Hub 2022; 7:1–10.