Ahmed Valve Glaucoma Surgery Outcome in Young Children Less Than 2 Yeare
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Pediatric glaucoma is a challenging, potentially blinding disease ,which is often refractory to medical treatment. Morad et al 2003

Treatment is typically surgical ,unlike adult glaucoma management where medications are usually initiated before moving on to surgical treatment. Englert et al 1999

Goniotomy \& trabeculotomy have a $50 \%$ to $77 \%$ success rate. But many will require other forms of surgical therapy to achieve adequate control of the intraocular pressure. Coleman et al 1997

* Trabeculectomy, first described in 1967 , has met a limited success in pediatric glaucoma patients, with reported success rate varying widely from $37 \%$ to $85 \%$ depending on the patient population \& series. Englart et al 1999
- MMC was first introduced as an agent in 1983 , but its application was not popular until 1991. Since that time, it increased the success rate of trabeculectomy to about $67 \%$ to $100 \%$. Beck et al 2003

- Tube-shunt procedures have shown encouraging results in the treatment of refractory pediatric glaucoma, but have also been associated with a relatively high rate of complications.
* Hypotony, choroidal effusion, tube malposition, cataract \& retinal detachment are common complications of these procedures. Djodeyre et al 2001


## GDD



## Valved

Contain internal mechanism to control the outflow of the aqueous humor. They drain once threshold IOP is reached thus preventing hypotony. Each device had different flow restriction method.

## Non valved

Do not contain a mechanism within the device to restrict the aqueous outflow. They relay of fibrous bleb formation on the end plate which will provide sufficient resistance to outflow \& control of IOP is established.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Product} \& \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Material} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Model} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Image} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Surface area} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Valve/no n valve} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Single Quadrant} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Special featore} <br>
\hline \& Plate \& Tube \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Ahmed implant} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Polypropylene} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Silicone} \& S1
S2 \& \& 364 mm

184 mm \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Valved} \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Yes} \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Silicone elastomer membrane valve} <br>
\hline \& \& \& S3 \& \& 96 mm \& \& \& <br>
\hline \& Silicone \& \& FP7 \& \& 184 mm \& \& \& <br>
\hline Krupin \& Silicone \& Silastic \& \& \& 180 mm \& Valved \& Yes \& Slit-valve at tube distal end <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Molteno} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Polypropylene} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Silicone} \& Single plate \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} \& 135 mm \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Non Valved} \& Yes \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Single or double plate} <br>
\hline \& \& \& double plate \& \& 270 mm \& \& No \& <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Baerveldt} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Silicone} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Silicone} \& BG-103 \& \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{250 mm 350 mm} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Non Valved} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Yes} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Barium impregmated} <br>
\hline \& \& \& BG-101 \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

* The Ahmed glaucoma valve implant was approved by the FDA in November 1993 \& because of the potential advantages, it was used in children since 1992. Initial reports
 suggest that success rates in children were similar to that in adults \& it showed encouraging results in refractory pediatric glaucoma. Wilson et al 2000



## Polypropylene plate

- Rigid
- Less biocompatability .
- More inflammation
- Increase the thickness of the pseudocapsule
- $\uparrow$ IOP


## Silicone plate

- Flexible
- More biocompatability.
- Less inflammation
- Reduce the thickness of the pseudocapsule
- Lower long-term IOP
*The leaves of the valves are relatively long and indicated by number 2 . When the pressure in the anterior chamber is high, the valve leaves separate creating an open valve as depicted.

When the pressure the membrane have keeps them together.
 is low the leaves of natural elasticity that


## Purpose \& Design

Purpose: To evaluate the outcome of Ahmed glaucoma valve implant in young children less than 2 years.

Design: Retrospective study.

## Patients \& Methods

After obtaining permission from KKESH review board, we retrospectively review the charts of young children who underwent Ahmed glaucoma valve implant in KKESH from January 1995 through December 2005.

## Inclusion criteria were:

- Age 2 years or younger at time of surgery.
- Completed 24 months of regular follow-ups.
- No previous drainage device surgery.

42 eyes of 36 patients were analyzed in this study.

## Patients \& Methods

## Definitions:

## Success:

- IOP $\leq 22 \mathrm{mmHg}$ with or without antiglaucoma medications.
- No additional glaucoma surgeries.
- No visually devastating complications.


## Failure:

- IOP $>22 \mathrm{mmHg}$ for 2 follow-ups despite full antiglaucoma medications.
- AGVI explanted.
- Needed further glaucoma surgery.
- Developed visually devastating complications.
- Hypotony (IOP < 5mmHg).


## Resulis

## Variables

| Mean age SD (months) <br> At time of surgery | 11.83 (5.63) | Non-Glaucoma surgery ( $\mathrm{n}=6$ patients ) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | - Lens Aspiration with 5 | 5 (11.9\%) |
| Gender ( $\mathrm{n}=42$ eyes ) |  | Anterior vitrectomy |  |
| Male | 22 (52.4\%) | - PKP | 1 (2.4\%) |
| Female | 20 (47.6\%) |  |  |
| Diagnosis |  | Glaucoma surgery frequency |  |
| Congenital glaucoma | 28 (66.7\%) | - Goniotomy | 1 (2.4\%) |
| Aphakic glaucoma | 5 (11.9\%) | - Trabeculotomy | 10 (23.8\%) |
| Peter Anomaly | 5 (11.9\%) | - Trabeculectomy | 3 (7.1\%) |
| Sturge-Weber syndrome | 1 (2.4\%) | - Trabeculectomy + MMC | 15 (35.7\%) |
| Aniridia | 1 (2.4\%) | - Trabeculectomy + Trabeculotomy | 1 (2.4\%) |
| Congenital Rubella | 1 (2.4\%) | - CPC | 5 (11.9\%) |
| Steroid-induced glaucoma | 1 (2.4\%) | - Trabeculectomy + Trabeculotomy |  |
| Medications (preoperative) |  | + MMC | 17 (40.5\%) |
| 0 | 1 (2.4\%) |  |  |
| 1 | 1 (2.4\%) | No previous surgery | 3 (7.1\%) |
| 2 | 16 (38.1\%) | Preoperative: |  |
| 3 | 17 (40.5\%) | - IOP | $33.5( \pm 8.6)$ |
| 4 | 7 (16.7\%) | - Medications | $2.67( \pm 0.87)$ |



| Baseline preop <br> Postoperative: <br> One month | $33.52( \pm 8.62)$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 month | $12.62( \pm 6.64)$ | $59.80 \%(23)$ |
| 6 months | $19.33( \pm 8.73)$ | $39.56 \%(30)$ |
| 9 months | $17.79( \pm 8.04)$ | $44.32 \%(27.44)$ |
| 12 months | $17.90( \pm 8.98)$ | $43.36 \%(30.20)$ |
| 24 months | $19.52( \pm 8.17)$ | $38.33 \%(32.04)$ |
|  | $20.05( \pm 9.72)$ | $36.36 \%(34.90)$ |

## Baseline preop <br> $2.67(+0.87)$

## Postoperative:

One month
zero
3 months
0.21 (0.56)

6 months
1.02 (1.24)

9 months
1.14 (1.22)

12 months
1.29 (1.24)

24 months
1.45 (1.25)

| Complication | No (\%) | Group |  | Model Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AGVI+MMC | AGVI |  |
| Choroidal effusion | 2 (4.8) | 1 | 1 | S1-S2 |
| Corneal-tube contact | 2 (4.8) | 1 | 1 | S2-FP7 |
| Tenon cyst | 1 (2.4) | 1 | 0 | S2 |
| Tube exposure | 2 (4.8) | 1 | 1 | S2-S2 |
| Wound leak | 1 (2.4) | 0 | 1 | S2 |
| Lens opacity | 2 (4.8) | 1 | 1 | FP7-FP7 |
| Tube retraction | 3 (7.1) | 2 | 1 | S2-FP7-FP7 |
| Tube block by iris | 1 (2.4) | 0 | 1 | S2 |
| RD | 3 (7.1) | 1 | 2 | S2-S2-FP7 |
| Endophthalmitis | 3 (7.1) | 1 | 2 | S2-S2-FP7 |
| Hyphema | 2 (4.8) | 1 | 1 | S2-S2 |
| Fibrous ingrowth | 2 (4.8) | 2 | 0 | S1-S1 |
| Preceptal cellulites | 2 (4.8) | 1 | 1 | S2-S2 |
| Suprachoroidal hge | 1 (2.4) | 0 | 1 | S2 |
| AC shallowing |  |  |  |  |
| -Uniform | 1 (2.4) | 1 | 0 | FP7 |
| -Iridocorneal touch | 1 (2.4) | 0 | 1 | S2 |


*The IOP exceeded 22 MMHg in 37 eyes of 42 (88.1\%) at mean of 7 months ( $\mathrm{SD}_{ \pm} 7.2$, range $=1-24$ ) posoperatively.

* 36 eyes of $42(85.7 \%)$ required resumption of antiglaucoma medications at mean of 7.2 months $\left(\mathrm{SD}_{ \pm} 6.8\right)$ postoperatively.
- $2.08\left(\mathrm{SD}_{ \pm} 0.81\right)$ medications were needed to control the IOP.
* Tube revision was done in 11 eyes of $42(26.2 \%)$ postoperatively \& it was explanted in 6 eyes of 42 ( $14.3 \%$ ).
- 7 eyes of 42 ( $16.7 \%$ ) needed a second implant to control the IOP, while 7 eyes of 42 ( $16.7 \%$ ) needed CPC to control the IOP.

| Diagnosis | Sex | Used <br> MMC | Age at surgery (month) | Time to failure (months) | Reason for failure | Patch graft | Model |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peter anomaly | F | Yes | 10 | 7 | Endophthalmitis + preceptal cellulites | Dura | S2 |
| Peter anomaly | F | Yes | 3 | 7 | $\mathrm{IOP}>22+$ needed $2^{\text {nd }}$ implant | Dura | S2 |
| Aphakic glaucoma | M | Yes | 19 | 24 | $\mathrm{IOP}>22 \mathrm{MMHg}$ | Dura | S2 |
| Congenital rubella | M | Yes | 15 | 3 | $\mathrm{IOP}>22 \mathrm{MMHg}$ | Sclera | S1 |
| Congenital glaucoma | M | Yes | 5 | 9 | RD | Pericardium | S2 |
| Aphakic glaucoma | M | No | 11 | 0.25 | Suprachoroidal Hge | Dura | S2 |
| Congenital glaucoma | F | Yes | 21 | 24 | $\mathrm{IOP}>22 \mathrm{MMHg}$ | Dura | S2 |
| Peter anomaly | F | No | 20 | 24 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{IOP}>\underset{\mathrm{CPC}}{22 \mathrm{MMHg}}+\text { needed } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Dura | S2 |
| Congenital glaucoma | M | No | 11 | 8 | Endophthalmitis + RD + Preceptal cellulitis | Pericardium | S2 |
| Congenital glaucoma | F | No | 15 | 7 | Endophthalmitis + RD | Pericardium | FP7 |
| Aniridia | M | Yes | 12 | 9 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{IOP}>22 \mathrm{MMHg}+\text { needed } \\ \mathrm{CPC} \end{gathered}$ | Pericardium | S2 |
| Congenital glaucoma | M | Yes | 14 | 11 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{IOP}>22 \mathrm{MMHg}+\text { needed } \\ \mathrm{CPC} \end{gathered}$ | Dura | S2 |
| Aphakic glaucoma | M | Yes | 8 | 9 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{IOP}>22 \mathrm{MMHg}+\text { needed } \\ \mathrm{CPC} \end{gathered}$ | Dura | S1 |
| Aphakic glaucoma | M | Yes | 8 | 9 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{IOP}>22 \mathrm{MMHg}+\text { needed } \\ \mathrm{CPC} \end{gathered}$ | Dura | S1 |
| Peter anomaly | F | Yes | 52 | 23 | $\text { IOP > } 22 \mathrm{MMHg}+\text { needed }$ <br> $2^{\text {nd }}$ implant | Sclera | S2 |



The cumulative probabilities of success according to the Kaplan-Meier method were $73.8 \%$ \& $64.3 \% 12$ months \& 24 months respectively.


The Kaplan-Meier survival analysis showed that the cumulative probability of success for the AGVI+MMC group is $60 \% \& 45 \%$ at $12 \& 24$ months respectively \& the mean survival time was 18 months compared with the AGVI group where the cumulative probability of success was $86.36 \%$ \& $81.82 \%$ at $12 \& 24$ months respectively \& in which the mean survival time was 21.3 months.

|  | AGVI+MMC | AGVI | $P$ value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Preop Baseline <br> IOP <br> Medications <br> Previous Glaucoma Surgery $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34.35 \\ 2.65 \\ 12 \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32.77 \\ 2.68 \\ \\ 13 \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.419 \\ & 0.642 \end{aligned}$ |
| Postoperative <br> One month <br> IOP <br> \% Of reduction <br> Medications <br> 3 months <br> IOP <br> \% Of reduction <br> Medications <br> 6 months <br> IOP <br> \% Of reduction <br> Medications <br> 9 months <br> IOP <br> \% Of reduction <br> Medications <br> 12 months <br> IOP <br> \% Of reduction <br> Medications <br> 24 months <br> IOP <br> \% Of reduction <br> Medications <br> Survival time | 11.25 $64.6 \%$ 0 20.65 $35.6 \%$ 0.4 19.4 $39.6 \%$ 1.7 17.85 $44.16 \%$ 1.9 20.3 $37.64 \%$ 1.85 21.6 $30.97 \%$ 1.85 17.6 | 13.86 $55.4 \%$ Zero 18.14 $43.14 \%$ $4.55 \mathrm{E}-02$ 16.32 $48.6 \%$ 0.41 17.95 $42.6 \%$ 0.45 18.82 $39 \%$ 0.77 18.64 $41.3 \%$ 1.09 21 | $\begin{gathered} 0.801 \\ \text { Zero } \\ 0.256 \\ 0.00 \\ 0.877 \\ 0.001 \\ 0.67 \\ 0.078 \\ 0.70 \\ 0.2 \\ 0.307 \\ 0.403 \\ 0.012 \end{gathered}$ |


| Study | Year | No. of eyes | Population | Mean Age | Mean follow-up | Cumulative probabilty of sucess |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 months | 24 months |
| Coleman et al | 1997 | 24 | Children $(<18 y)$ | $6.6 \pm 5.7$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.3 \pm 11.2 \\ \text { months } \end{gathered}$ | $77.9 \% \pm 5.8$ | $60.6 \% \pm 13.7$ |
| Englert et al | 1999 | 27 | Children $(<18 y)$ | $6.4 \pm 5.9$ | $12.6 \pm 8$ <br> months | 90.6\% | 58.3\% |
| Djodeyre et al | 2001 | 35 | Children $(<15 y)$ | $4.4 \pm 4.7$ | $\begin{gathered} 12.6 \pm 10.8 \\ \text { months } \end{gathered}$ | $70.1 \% \pm 8.5$ | $63.7 \% \pm 9.9$ |
| Morad et al | 2003 | 60 | Children | $\begin{gathered} 6 \pm 4.9 \\ y \end{gathered}$ | $24.3 \pm 16$ <br> months | 93\% | 86\% |
| Chen et al | 2005 | 52 | Children $(<18 y)$ | $4.9 \pm 6.5$ | $2.2 \pm 1.8$ <br> years | 85.1\% | 63.2\% |
| Current study | 2008 | 42 | Children $(<2 y)$ | $\underset{m}{11.8 \pm 5.6}$ |  | 73.8\% | 64.3\% |

## Factors predictors to outcome

| Implant Type | Survival | Difference in <br> survival |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOLTENO | Lee et al. Ophthalmology 1997 | No difference |
| MOLTENO | Cantor et al. J Glaucoma 1998 | No difference |
| AGV | Kurnaz et al. Eur J Ophthalmol 2005 | No difference |
| AGV | Costa et al. Ophthalmology 2004 | No difference |
| AGVI MODEL <br> Silicon (FP7) <br> Polydropylene | $22.45 \pm 5.1$ |  |


| Complication <br> Study |  |  |  |  |  |  | 문 |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ㅁ } \\ & \text { O} \\ & \text { O } \\ & \text { © } \\ & \text { I } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coleman et al 1997 |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 12 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 4.2 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 4.2 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Englert et al 1999 | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 33 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 7.4 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 3.7 \% \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 3.7 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 3.7 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 11 \% \end{gathered}$ |
| Djodeyre et al 2001 |  | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 17 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 17 \% \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 2.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ 11 \% \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 2.9 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 25 \% \end{gathered}$ |
| Morad et al 2003 | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ 18 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ 12 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 2 \% \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 5 \% \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 5 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 4 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 15 \% \end{gathered}$ |
| Wilson et al 2003 |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 5 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 3.4 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ 17 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 15 \% \end{gathered}$ |
| Beck et al 2003 | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ 35 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 4.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 2.2 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 11 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 2.2 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 6.5 \% \end{gathered}$ |
| Chen et al 2005 | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 7.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 1.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 3.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 5.8 \% \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 3.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 1.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 1.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 1.9 \% \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ 14 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 17 \% \end{gathered}$ |
| Pakravan et al 2007 |  | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 13 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 13 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 13 \% \end{gathered}$ |
| Current study 2008 | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 4.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 4.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 2.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 4.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 2.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 4.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 4.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 2.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 4.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 4.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 2.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 4.8 \% \end{gathered}$ |

Exploratory cox-regression analysis was conducted \& showed the following:

- Previous non glaucoma surgery had a shortening effect on survival \& is a risk factor for failure.
- Previous glaucoma surgery increase the survival. However, the frequency of previous surgery does not make a difference in survival.
- Congenital glaucoma is not a risk factor for failure.
- Conjunctival flap configuration \& the type of patch graft did not influence the survival.
- Polypropylen implants had a significantly shorter survival.


## Conclusion

\% In conclusion, Ahmed glaucoma valve implant in children less than
2 years of age have a probability of success similar to that of older children \& adults \& comparable to other treatment modalities.

- Using AGVI alone without MMC have more probability of success, requires less number of postoperative medications \& increase the overall success rate.

Complications that had occurred were comparable to those in older children. Most of these complication occurred in the first year postoperatively especially after 6 months. This make close ongoing follow-up essential.


