



## REVIEW ARTICLE

# Circulatory Disorder of Branch Retinal Vein: Therapy Update

Svetlana Bakhshinova, Marianne Shahsuvaryan

Yerevan State Medical University, Yerevan, Armenia

E-mail: mar\_shah@hotmail.com

### ABSTRACT

Branch retinal vein occlusion (BRVO) as a circulatory 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. Previously, the only treatment for this retinal vascular disease was grid laser photocoagulation, which reduces edema very slowly and provides benefit in some, but not all patients. Lately, however, treatment paradigms have been changing. The availability of pharmacologic interventions, including intravitreal injection of vascular endothelial growth factor inhibitors has shown that other approaches to treatment can play a role in management of BRVO. The objective of this review is to evaluate the latest treatments commonly advocated, emphasizing evidence-based ones, in the light of our current scientific knowledge of retinal vein occlusion.

**Key words:** eye, circulatory disorder, branch retinal vein, occlusion, vascular endothelial growth factors inhibitors

Received 22/02/2013 Accepted 11/03/2013

© 2013 AEELS, INDIA

### INTRODUCTION

Branch retinal vein occlusion (BRVO) as a circulatory disorder of the retinal vein is the most common visually disabling disease affecting the retina after diabetic retinopathy [1,2], and is a frequent cause of vision loss and even blindness. BRVO is more common than central retinal vein occlusion (CRVO), with a 5-year incidence in 0.6% of the general population, compared with a 0.2% 5-year incidence of CRVO [3]. The first case of BRVO was reported by Leber in 1877. There are still gaps in understanding the aetiology and pathogenesis of circulatory disorders of the branches of central retinal vein. Possible causes of BRVO include external vascular compression, disease of the vein wall, or intravascular thrombus formation [4]. Hypertension and atherosclerosis are known risk factors for BRVO, and both cause thickening of arteriole walls. BRVO occurs at sites where retinal arterioles cross over veins and it appears that thickening of the arteriole wall compresses the vein, causes turbulent flow, damages endothelium, and promotes thrombosis. 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 [3].

The obstruction in venous outflow after BRVO increases intraluminal venous pressure and causes transudation of plasma and blood, resulting in edema, including macular edema and hemorrhages throughout the drainage area of a branch retinal vein. Severe edema appears to increase interstitial pressure and compromise arterial perfusion resulting in variable amounts of capillary occlusion and cotton wool patches. It is likely that differences in the amount of pre-existent arterial insufficiency from atherosclerosis determines differences in the amount of capillary nonperfusion. Extensive nonperfusion is associated with a poor prognosis. In some patients, ischemia increases over time and they are viewed as undergoing a transition from nonischemic to ischemic. Severe retinal ischemia can be complicated by retinal neovascularization, neovascular glaucoma, and a very poor visual outcome.

Previously, the only treatment for this retinal vascular disease was grid laser photocoagulation, which reduces edema very slowly and provides benefit in some, but not all patients. Lately, however, treatment paradigms have been changing. Branch retinal vein occlusion as was mentioned earlier leads to retinal ischaemia, which then induces upregulation of various inflammatory factors, including vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), which is also known to play a role in macular edema (ME) secondary to retinal vein occlusion [5]. Observations by Noma et al. [6] suggest that in patients with BRVO, vascular occlusion induces the expression of vascular endothelial growth factor

(VEGF) and Interleukin-6 (IL-6), resulting in blood-retinal barrier breakdown and increased vascular permeability. Thus, VEGF and IL-6 may contribute to the development and progression of vasogenic (ME) in BRVO.

The development of therapy with anti-angiogenics or vascular endothelial growth factor inhibitors (anti-VEGF) has marked the beginning of a new era in eye diseases treatment.

Application of vascular endothelial growth factor inhibitors represents a treatment option for

BRVO that targets the disease at the causal molecular level. Within the past year, clinical trials have demonstrated the effects of new pharmacologic treatments by different anti-VEGF drugs.

The objective of this review is to evaluate the latest treatments commonly advocated, emphasizing evidence-based ones, in the light of our current scientific knowledge of retinal vein occlusion.

## VASCULAR ENDOTHELIAL GROWTH FACTOR INHIBITORS

Anti-VEGF therapy has dramatically changed how eye care providers treat and manage sight-threatening retinal disease.

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

### Lucentis (Ranibizumab )

Ranibizumab is a humanized, affinity-matured VEGF antibody fragment that binds to and neutralizes all isoforms of VEGF. Lucentis ( Ranibizumab ) has first received FDA approval for the treatment of macular edema due to BRVO.

One phase III multicenter, prospective clinical trial assessing the safety, tolerability and efficacy of intravitreal ranibizumab injections in the treatment of macular edema secondary to BRVO was finished . It was called BRAVO (study of the efficacy and safety of ranibizumab injection compared with sham in patients with macular edema due to BRVO) [7].

In the BRAVO study, 397 patients with macular edema following branch retinal vein occlusion (BRVO) were randomized to receive monthly intraocular injections of 0.3 mg (n = 134) or 0.5 mg (n = 131) of ranibizumab or sham injections (n = 132). Patients were eligible if they had foveal-involved macular edema from a BRVO occurring within 12 months of study entry, best corrected visual acuity (BCVA) of 20/40 to 20/400, and center subfield thickness (CST)  $\geq 250$   $\mu\text{m}$  (Stratus OCT3). Patients were excluded if they had a brisk afferent pupil defect, had scatter laser photocoagulation within 3 months, an intraocular injection of steroid or a VEGF antagonist within 3 months, or had an improvement of  $\geq 10$  ETDRS letters in BCVA between screening and baseline. Baseline characteristics were well balanced among the three groups; mean BCVA was 20/80, the mean time from diagnosis of BRVO was 3.5 months, and the mean center point thickness (CPT) was 520  $\mu\text{m}$ . Starting at month 3, patients were eligible for grid laser treatment if hemorrhages had cleared sufficiently to allow safe application of laser and the following criteria were met: Snellen equivalent BCVA  $\leq 20/40$  or mean CST  $\geq 250$   $\mu\text{m}$ , and compared with the visit 3 months before the current visit, the patient had a gain of  $< 5$  letters in BCVA or a decrease of  $< 50$   $\mu\text{m}$  in mean CST. If rescue laser was not given at month 3, the same criteria were applied at month 4, and if rescue laser was not given at month 4, the criteria were applied at month 5.

At month 6, the primary endpoint, mean change from baseline BCVA letter score was 16.6 and 18.3 in the 0.3 mg and 0.5 mg ranibizumab groups and 7.3 in the sham group ( $P < 0.0001$ ). The percentage of patients who gained  $\geq 15$  letters in BCVA was 55.2% (0.3 mg) and 61.1% (0.5 mg) in the ranibizumab groups and 28.8% in the sham group ( $P < 0.0001$ ). The percentage of patients with a Snellen equivalent BCVA of 20/40 or better was 67.9% (0.3 mg) and 64.9% (0.5 mg) compared with 41.7% in the sham group ( $P < 0.0001$ ). The percentage of patients with a Snellen equivalent BCVA of 20/200 or worse was 1.5% (0.3 mg) and 0.8% (0.5 mg) compared with 9.1% in the sham group ( $P < 0.01$ ). Based upon the 25-item National Eye Institute Visual Function Questionnaire NEI VFQ-25 survey, patients who received ranibizumab felt they had greater improvement (improvement from baseline in NEI VFQ score: 9.3, 0.3 mg; 10.4, 0.5 mg; 5.4, sham). There was greater reduction of macular edema in the ranibizumab groups because CPT was reduced by 337.3  $\mu\text{m}$  (0.3 mg) and 345.2  $\mu\text{m}$  (0.5 mg) compared to 157.7  $\mu\text{m}$  in the sham group. The percentage of patients with CPT  $\leq 250$   $\mu\text{m}$  at month 6 was 91% (0.3 mg), 84.7% (0.5 mg), and 45.5% (sham,  $P < 0.0001$ ). More patients in the sham group (54.5%) received rescue grid laser therapy than in the 0.3

mg (18.7%) or 0.5 mg (19.8%) ranibizumab groups. There were no safety signals identified in this trial. After the primary endpoint in the BRAVO trial, patients were evaluated every month and if study eye Snellen equivalent BCVA was  $\leq 20/40$  or mean CST was  $\geq 250$   $\mu\text{m}$ , they received an injection of ranibizumab; patients in the ranibizumab groups received their assigned dose and patients in the sham group received 0.5 mg. In patients with BRVO, the mean number of ranibizumab injections during the observation period was 2.9, 2.8, and 3.8 in the 0.3 mg, 0.5 mg, and sham/0.5 mg groups; and the percentage of patients that did not receive any injections during the observation period was 17.2, 20.0, and 6.5, respectively. At month 12 in the ranibizumab groups, the improvement from baseline in ETDRS letter score was 16.4 (0.3 mg) and 18.3 (0.5 mg), very similar to the month 6 results, indicating that vision is well maintained when injections are given only if there is recurrent or residual macular edema. Patients in the sham group showed substantial improvement during the observation period when they were able to receive ranibizumab; improvement from baseline in letter score was 7.3 at month 6 and 12.1 at month 12. The percentage of patients who had an improvement from baseline BCVA letter score  $\geq 15$  at month 12 was 55.2% (0.3 mg) and 61.1% (0.5 mg) in the ranibizumab groups, almost identical to the month 6 results. In the sham group, 43.9% of patients improved from baseline  $\geq 15$  in letter score at month 12 compared to 28.8% at month 6. At month 12, 67.9% (0.3 mg) and 64.4% (0.5 mg) of patients in the ranibizumab groups had a Snellen equivalent BCVA of 20/40 compared to 56.8% in the sham/0.5 mg group. Thus, in BRAVO study, patients in the sham groups showed a substantial improvement in vision during the second 6 months when they were able to receive ranibizumab as needed, but their vision at month 12 was not as good as that in patients in the ranibizumab groups [8]. This raises a question as to whether delay in treatment carries a visual penalty.

The results from open-label extension trial of the 12-month Ranibizumab assessing long-term safety and efficacy in BRAVO trial [9] 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). 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 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. Results suggest that during the second year of ranibizumab treatment vision in branch RVO patients remained stable, follow-up and injections should be individualized. In addition, the subanalyses in BRAVO study [7,10] generally confirmed that patients with BRVO who were younger or who had worse vision and greater retinal thickness at baseline fared better. Patients with BRVO fared better if time from diagnosis to treatment was less than 3 months.

In general, then, in BRVO, patients who needed fewer therapies, such as laser or other previous treatments, probably had milder RVO requiring less treatment. Patients who were younger did better than those who were older [11].

### **Avastin (Bevacizumab)**

Bevacizumab is a recombinant humanized monoclonal antibody directed against VEGF.

Avastin is FDA-approved for the treatment of colorectal cancer. However, because the agent costs substantially less per dose than Lucentis, it has been widely used off-label since 2004 to treat several retinal diseases, including neovascular age-related macular degeneration (AMD) and retinal vein occlusion.

Few studies are available for BRVO patients alone [12-14]. Rabena et al. [12] reported a significantly increased VA and reduced macular thickness after treatment with 1.25 mg bevacizumab in a retrospective study of 27 patients with BRVO. Recurrent ME was observed in 6 (22%) patients an average of 2.1 months after the initial injection. These patients were reinjected and all showed moderate to complete reduction in ME. The limitations of this retrospective study are short follow-up and lack of control group. Additionally, most of the eyes in the study were previously treated and thus failed standard treatment, and perhaps represent a group unlikely to benefit from any treatment. All published reports provide evidence that this treatment is well tolerated. The most common adverse events were conjunctival hyperemia and subconjunctival hemorrhage at the

injection site. However, the duration of reduced ME after bevacizumab administration is currently unknown. Frequent repeated injections are required to prevent a rebound effect with no clearly defined endpoint [14].

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 [15-21]. 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 [19]. By contrast, no statistically significant differences were found between the doses, when the group presented the results at 24 months [18]. In addition, Ach et al. [22] found that BRVO patients showed no predictive factors for effectiveness of bevacizumab therapy.

The International Intravitreal Bevacizumab Safety Survey gathered adverse events from doctors around the world via the internet [23] and showed all ocular and systemic side effects to be under 0.21% 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. Fung et al. [23] concluded that self-reporting of adverse events after intravitreal bevacizumab injections did not show an increased rate of potential drug-related ocular or systemic events and these short-term results suggest that intravitreal bevacizumab seems to be safe. Campbell et al. [24] assessing the risk of systemic adverse events associated with intravitreal injections of vascular endothelial growth factor inhibiting drugs in the nested case-control study have found that intravitreal injections of bevacizumab and ranibizumab were not associated with significant risks of ischaemic stroke, acute myocardial infarction, congestive heart failure, or venous thromboembolism.

The latest study [25] on the rate of serious adverse effects in a series of bevacizumab and ranibizumab injections revealed that subjects who received bevacizumab were 12 times more likely to develop severe intraocular inflammation following each injection than were those who received ranibizumab (OR = 11.71; 95% CI 1.5-93). The 1 case of acute intraocular inflammation following ranibizumab injection was mild and not associated with vision loss. No other serious ocular complications were noted. A trend was also noted toward an increased risk for arterial thromboembolic events in patients receiving bevacizumab, although the confidence interval was wide (OR = 4.26; 95% CI 0.44-41).

In conclusion, authors stated that significant concern still exists regarding the safety of off-label use of intravitreal bevacizumab. Patients receiving bevacizumab should be counselled regarding a possible increased risk for serious adverse events.

Inhibition on VEGF in Age-related Choroidal Neovascularization (IVAN) Study Investigators wrote a letter on August 2012 -Important statement on safety, and action required stated that there was no difference in arteriothrombotic adverse events (ATE) between the drugs. However, a slight excess of other serious adverse events (other SAE) was observed in the Avastin arm [26]. The combined Comparison of Age-related Macular degeneration Treatments Trials (CATT) and IVAN data on the numbers of patients who had experienced at least 1 other systemic SAE showed an excess of these events in patients who received Avastin compared to those who received Lucentis. The magnitude of the increase in risk was consistent with previous analyses and was statistically significant [27].

The worldwide use of intravitreal application of anti-vascular growth factor (a-VEGF) and the realisation that regular applications over long periods of time are necessary to maintain vision in these eyes, has revealed the problem of tolerance/tachyphylaxy [28]. In 2007, two papers suggested for the first time possible tachyphylaxis/tolerance with chronic ranibizumab [29] and bevacizumab treatment [30]. Binder S. [28] recommended different options to prevent tachyphylaxis/tolerance: (1) to increase the dosage or shorten treatment intervals if tolerance has developed; (2) to pause treatment if tachyphylaxis has occurred; (3) to combine drugs with different modes of action; or (4) to switch to a similar drug with different properties (bevacizumab and ranibizumab differ in molecular size, affinity and absorption).

**BEVACIZUMAB AND DEXAMETHASONE INTRAVITREAL IMPLANT**

To determine whether dexamethasone intravitreal implant 0.7 mg (Ozurdex; Allergan, Inc.) with bevacizumab (Avastin; Genentech, Inc.) therapy can be synergistic, providing further improvements in visual acuity, sustainability, and macular thickness when compared with dexamethasone intravitreal implant 0.7 mg alone the authors of the following prospective, interventional case series intended to monitor changes in visual acuity and macular thickness in patients diagnosed with retinal vein occlusion (RVO), after injection of bevacizumab followed by a scheduled dexamethasone intravitreal implant [31]. This prospective, interventional case series consisted of 34 eyes of 33 patients with ME associated with RVO who were injected with bevacizumab, followed by dexamethasone intravitreal implant injection 2 weeks later. These patients were reexamined monthly and retreated with bevacizumab when ME recurred during the 6-month study period. The primary outcome measure was the time to reinjection based on OCT and vision criteria.

Thirty-five percent of patients had central RVO (CRVO) and 65% had branch RVO (BRVO); 82% (28 of 34) needed at least 1 more injection before month 6, while 18% (6 of 34) did not need an additional injection of bevacizumab. 97% of patients gained vision during the study, and mean visual acuity improved from initially 11 letters to a maximum of 25 letters during the study period. OCT showed macular thickness decreased with the combination treatment, and the effect continued an average of 126 days from the initial bevacizumab treatment. Eighteen percent (6 of 34) of patients had an IOP of 23 mmHg or greater. Five of these 6 subjects were controlled with drops alone, while one required an additional selective laser trabeculoplasty. This study demonstrates efficacy and the duration of effect using a combination of bevacizumab and dexamethasone vs dexamethasone alone. The combination is synergistic, increasing visual acuity and prolonging the time between injections, compared with either medication alone. Therefore, the combination of a VEGF inhibitor and a dexamethasone implant may be a valuable option for RVO treatment.

**PEGAPTANIB SODIUM**

The pegaptanib sodium is a selective anti-VEGF and it is still not well studied in RVO. Bennet [32] 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. [33] 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.

**CONCLUSION**

Medical management of retinal diseases has arguably come to dominate clinical practice and, to some experts, has resulted in better delivery of patient care. It appears that VEGF production can be a long-term problem in many patients with branch retinal vein occlusion. Vascular endothelial growth factor inhibitors are a clear breakthrough with exciting potential in the BRVO management. A period of aggressive pharmacologic blockade of VEGF may be one key to reducing the need for repeated injections. It is to be hoped that, as we gain more long-term experience with the use of anti-VEGF agents and other interventions for the treatment of BRVO, we can identify regimens that will reduce edema and restore good vision to our patients relatively quickly.

**REFERENCES**

1. Cugati S, Wang JJ, Rochtchina E, Mitchell P. (2006). Ten-year incidence of retinal vein occlusion in an older population: the Blue Mountains Eye Study. *Arch Ophthalmol.* 124(5):726-732.
2. Klein R, Moss SE, Meuer SM, Klein BE. (2008). The 15-year cumulative incidence of retinal vein occlusion: the Beaver Dam Eye Study. *Arch Ophthalmol.* 126(4):513-518.
3. Rehak J, Rehak M. (2008). Branch retinal vein occlusion: pathogenesis, visual prognosis, and treatment modalities. *Current Eye Res.* 33(2):111-131.
4. Klein R, Klein BE, Moss SE, Meuer SM. (2000). The epidemiology of retinal vein occlusion: the Beaver Dam Eye Study. *Trans Am Ophthalmol Soc.* 98:133-141.
5. Campochiaro PA, Hafiz G, Shah SM, et al. (2008). Ranibizumab for macular edema due to retinal vein occlusions: implication of VEGF as a critical stimulator. *Mol Ther.* ;16(4):791-799.

6. Noma H, Minamoto A, Funatsu H, Tsukamoto H, Nakano K, Yamashita H, Mishima HK. Intravitreal levels of vascular endothelial growth factor and interleukin-6 are correlated with macular edema in branch retinal vein occlusion. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol.* 2006;244:309–315.
7. Campochiaro PA, Heier JS, Feiner L, Gray S, Saroj N, Rundle AC, Murahashi WY, Rubio RG. BRAVO Investigators: (2010). Ranibizumab for macular edema following branch retinal vein occlusion six-month primary end point results of a phase III study. *Ophthalmology*; 117:1102–1112.
8. Varma R, Bressler NM, Suñer I, Lee P, Dolan CM, Ward J, Colman S, Rubio RG; (2012).BRAVO and CRUISE Study Groups. Improved Vision-Related Function after Ranibizumab for Macular Edema after Retinal Vein Occlusion: Results from the BRAVO and CRUISE Trials. *Ophthalmology* ;119(10):2108-2118.
9. 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):145-157.
10. Ho AC. (2010).Subgroup analyses of month 12 visual acuity outcomes in the BRAVO study. Proceedings of the Retina Society Annual Meeting; September 23-26, San Francisco, CA.
11. Fung AE. (2011).Influence of Baseline Characteristics and Dosing on Outcomes of Anti-VEGF Therapy for Retinal Vein Occlusions.*Retina today.*
12. 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.
13. Spandau U, Wickenhauser A, Rensch F, Jonas J. (2007). Intravitreal bevacizumab for branch retinal vein occlusion. *Acta Ophthalmol Scand.* 85:118–119.
14. Matsumoto Y, Freund KB, Peiretti E, Cooney MJ, Ferrara DC, Yannuzzi LA.(2007). Rebound macular edema following bevacizumab (Avastin) therapy for retinal venous occlusive disease. *Retina.* 27:426–431.
15. 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.
16. 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.
17. Badalá F. (2008) The treatment of branch retinal vein occlusion with bevacizumab. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol* ;19:234–238.
18. 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.
19. 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.
20. Ahmadi AA, Chou JY, Banashkevich A, Ma PE, Maberley DA. (2009). The effects of intravitreal bevacizumab on patients with macular edema secondary to branch retinal vein occlusion. *Can J Ophthalmol* ;44:154–159.
21. 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.
22. 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.
23. Fung AE, Rosenfeld PJ, Reichel E. (2006). The International Intravitreal Bevacizumab Safety Survey: using the internet to assess drug safety worldwide. *Br J Ophthalmol* ;90:1344–1349.
24. Campbell RJ, Gill SS, E Bronskill SE, Paterson JM, Whitehead M, Bell CM. (2012). Adverse events with intravitreal injection of vascular endothelial growth factor inhibitors: nested case-control study. *BMJ* ;345:e4203
25. Sharma S, Johnson D, Abouammoh M, Hollands S, Brissette A. (2012). Rate of serious adverse effects in a series of bevacizumab and ranibizumab injections. *Can J Ophthalmol.* ;47(3):275-279.
26. Chakravarthy U, Harding SP, Rogers CA, Downes SM, Lotery AJ, Wordsworth S, Reeves BC. (2012). IVAN Study Investigators, Ranibizumab versus bevacizumab to treat neovascular age-related macular degeneration: one-year findings from the IVAN randomized trial. *Ophthalmology* 2012 Jul;119(7):1399-1411.
27. Martin DF, Maguire MG, Fine SL, Ying GS, Jaffe GJ, Grunwald JE, Toth C, Redford M, Ferris FL 3rd. (2012). Comparison of Age-related Macular Degeneration Treatments Trials (CATT) Research Group, Ranibizumab and bevacizumab for treatment of neovascular age-related macular degeneration: two-year results. *Ophthalmology* ;119(7):1388-1398.
28. Binder S. (2012). Loss of reactivity in intravitreal anti-VEGF therapy: tachyphylaxis or tolerance? *Br J Ophthalmol* ;96:1-2.
29. Keane PA, Liakopoulos S, Onhchin SC. (2008). Quantitative subanalysis of optical coherence tomography after treatment with ranibizumab for neovascular age-related macular degeneration. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* ;49:3115-120.
30. Schaal S, Kaplan HJ, Tetzl TH. (2008). Is there tachyphylaxis to intravitreal anti-vascular endothelial growth factor pharmacotherapy in age-related macular degeneration ? *Ophthalmology* ;115:2199-205.
31. Singer MA, Bell DJ, Woods P, et al. (2012). Effect of combination therapy with bevacizumab and dexamethasone intravitreal implant in patients with retinal vein occlusion. *Retina.* ;32(7):1289-1294.
32. Bennet MD. (2009). Pegaptanib for the treatment of ischemic retinopathy in patients with diabetes and retinal vascular occlusive disorders. *Retina Today* ;4:63–66.

33. 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.



I S S N 2 2 7 7 1 8 0 8

**HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE:** S. Bakhshinova, M. Shahsuvaryan. Circulatory Disorder of Branch Retinal Vein: Therapy Update. *Bull. Env. Pharmacol. Life Sci.* 2 [3] February 2013: 10-16

---