AYUSHDHARA
ISSN: 2393-9583 (P)/ 2393-9591 (O)
An International Journal of Research in AYUSH and Allied Systems

Review Article

A CRITICAL MODERN REVIEW ON BRVO (BRANCH RETINAL VEIN OCCLUSION)

Narender Chanchal[1]*, Smriti Kaul[2], Daya Shankar Singh[3], Munna Kumar[4]

*[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Shalakya Tantra, Kunwar Shekhar Vijendra Ayurveda Medical College & Research Centre, Shobhit University, Gangoh, Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh.

[2]MS Scholar, [3]Associate Professor, PG Department of Shalakya Tantra, Patanjali Bhartiya Ayurvigyan Evum Anusandhan Sansthan, Haridwar, Uttarakhand.

[4]Assistant Professor in Shalakya Tantra Department, Govt A S Ayurved College and Hospital Begusarai, Bihar, India.

Article info

Article History:

Received: 14-07-2021

Revised: 28-07-2021

Accepted: 15-11-2021

KEYWORDS:

Branch retinal vein occlusion (BRVO), Retinal vascular disease, Systemic vascular disease, Risk factors, pathogenesis, treatment, Anti-VEGF therapy, vitrectomy, sheathotomy

ABSTRACT

Branch Retinal Vein Occlusion (BRVO) may be a common reason behind retinal vascular disease. General vascular diseases corresponding to cardiovascular disease and induration of the arteries are risk issues for BRVO. Age is additionally a powerful risk factor for BRVO. And lots of epidemiological studies have confirmed that the prevalence will increase with increasing age. It happens most often between the ages of sixty and seventy years. Men and women are affected equally. Age, systemic hypertension and also the retinal artery changes related to it, together with blood vessel nicking and retinal arteriolar narrowing, are well-established risk factors for BRVO. Other risk factors, reminiscent of diabetes, smoking, hyperlipidemia, chamber fibrillation, urinary organ dysfunction, and atherosclerosis, have conjointly been related to an exaggerated risk of BRVO. The pathologic interruption of blood vessel flow in eyes with BRVO nearly always happens at a blood vessel crossing. Patients with BRVO gift with unexpected painless loss of vision or a visible field defect. Prognosis and we have a tendency to the effectiveness of various treatment choices. So it's necessary to grasp the explanation of BRVO. BRVO could be a common reason behind vision loss, however several treatment options are accessible and rising therapies are under investigation. Here, we gift a review of the chance factors, pathological process in BRVO, clinical features, natural history, clinical evaluation, diagnostic workup, clinical treatments for BRVO patients also as connected clinical trials also are reviewed.

INTRODUCTION

Branch retinal vein occlusion (BRVO) could be a common reason behind retinal vascular disease.[1] A recent meta-analysis of 50,000 participants from eleven studies found a prevalence of 4.42 per one thousand adults and calculable that 13.9 million adults worldwide are littered with BRVO.[2]

Access this article online	
Quick Response Code	
	https://doi.org/10.47070/ayushdhara.v8i6.854

General vascular diseases admire high blood pressure and induration of the arteries are risk issues for BRVO. Age is additionally a robust risk factor for BRVO, and lots of epidemiological studies have confirmed that the prevalence will increase with increasing age.

It happens most often between the ages of sixty and seventy years. Men and women are affected equally, and extra studies are required to see whether or not racial/ethnic variations exist or are secondary to a better prevalence of uncontrolled risk factors in at-risk populations.[2-4] The pathologic interruption of blood vessel flow in these eyes nearly always occurs at a retinal blood vessel intersection, wherever a retinal artery crosses over a retinal vein.

Risk Factors

In addition to age, general cardiovascular disease conjointly and the retinal arterial blood vessel changes related to it, as well as blood vessel nicking and retinal arteriolar narrowing, are well-established risk factors for BRVO.[3-7] Alternative cardiovascular risk factors, similar to diabetes, smoking, hyperlipidemia, chamber fibrillation, nephritic dysfunction, and atherosclerosis, have also been associated with an enlarged risk of BRVO.[3-8]

Rehak and associates rumored an increased prevalence of coagulation factor metropolis mutation in patients with RVO; however, a meta-analysis of thrombophilic risk factors by Janssen and colleagues found an association with hyperhomocysteinemia and anticardiolipin antibodies, however not with coagulation factor Leiden mutation.[9-10]

Another meta-analysis known elevated plasma homocysteine and lower liquid body substance vitamin B complex as risk factors.[11] Thus, whereas hypercoagulability might play a task in younger patients and in patients while not typical cardiovascular risk factors.[10] Thus, while hypercoagulability may play a role in younger patients and in patients without typical cardiovascular risk factors,[10] additional studies are required to produce a more definitive link.

In contrast, higher serum levels of high density conjugated protein and light-weight to moderate alcohol consumption additionally is also protective.[8] Studies have also advised a correlation between certain ocular risk factors and BRVO, as well as shorter axial length and a history of glaucoma.[3,8,12-15] Retinal and systemic vasculitides are related to the event of BRVO.[16-18]

Pathogenesis

The pathologic interruption of blood vessel flow in eyes with BRVO nearly always happens at associate blood vessel crossing.[19-22] In 99% of 106 eyes with BRVO, the artery was found to cross over the thrombosed vein.[20] This observation plus the sturdy association of BRVO with general cardiovascular disease and hardening of the arteries support the speculation that mechanical compression plays a task within the pathological process of BRVO.[20,21]

Histopathologically, the retinal artery and vein share a standard membrane sheath, and in some cases, a common medium.[23] The lumen of the vein could also be compressed up to 33% at a standard arteriovenous crossing site, and this could be any exacerbated by exaggerated rigidity and thickening of the blood vessel wall leads to arterioscelerosis.[22-24]

The vitreous can also play a task in compression of vulnerable blood vessel crossing web sites, as proved by studies demonstrating that eyes with weakened axial length and better probability of vitreomacular attachment at the arteriovenous crossing are at exaggerated risk of BRVO.[12,15,22]

Some have postulated that turbulent blood flow at the crossing site causes focal swelling of the epithelium and thicker vein wall tissue, resulting in venous obstruction.[22,23,25] Supported histopathologic studies, others have advised that venous clot formation at the purpose of occlusion is that the primary pathologic event.[26]

It's possible that the pathological process of BRVO is complex with contributions from mechanical obstruction, degeneration of the vessel wall, and haematological abnormalities, similar to inflammatory disorders and thrombophilia, in risk individuals.[24,27] The ensuing blood vessel obstruction results in elevation of blood pressure upstream of the crossing which will overload the collateral emptying capability leading to intraretinal hemorrhages, macular edema, and ischemia.[22,28]

Clinical Features

Symptoms

Patients with BRVO gift with sharp painless loss of vision or a visible field defect. Subclinical shows might occur if a tributary distal to the macula or a nasal retinal vein is involved. Rarely, patients with BRVO can present with floaters from a vitreous hemorrhage if the initial vein occlusion was unrecognized and retinal neovascularization has occurred.

Signs

Patients generally gift with a wedge-shaped distribution of intraretinal hemorrhage that's less marked if the occlusion is perfused (or nonischemic), and a lot of in depth if the occlusion is non-perfused (or ischemic) and related to retinal capillary non-perfusion. The Branch Vein Occlusion Study group (BVOS) outlined ischemic BRVO as those with larger than a complete of 5 disc diameters of nonperfusion on fluorescein angiography (FA).[1]

The placement of the blood vessel blockage determines the distribution of the intraretinal hemorrhage; if the venous obstruction is at the nervus opticus head, 2 quadrants of the complex body part could also be involved, whereas if the occlusion is peripheral to the disc, one quadrant or less could also be involved. If the blood vessel blockage is peripheral to tributary veins exhausting the macula, there may be no macular involvement and consequently marginal to no decrease in visual acuity. The most common location for BRVOs is within the superotemporal quadrant.[20,29]

Complications

There are 3 common vision-limiting complications of BRVO: (1) macular oedema; (2) macular ischaemia; and (3) sequelae of neovascularization. Throughout the acute phase, intensive intraretinal hemorrhages might result in macular ischemia and outpouring on the FA. Below these circumstances it's not possible to judge the introduction standing as a result of the hemorrhage itself blocks the view of the vasculature.

Natural History

In order to accurately counsel patients on prognosis and weigh the effectiveness of various treatment options, it's necessary to know the explanation of BRVO. to the present end, Rogers and associates performed a scientific review of all BRVO articles revealed through 2008 and located that, in 1608 eyes, sharp-sightedness typically improved while without treatment though improvement on the far side 20/40 was uncommon. Macular swelling developed in 5–15% of eyes over a amount of 1 year and of these presenting with macular edema, 18–41% resolved by 1 year.[2]

BRVO may additionally be sub-divided as a serious BRVO wherever one in all the four major branch retinal veins is affected or macular BRVO where solely a smaller, macular vein is occluded. Hayreh et al. found that retinal and blind spot neovascularization occurred only in major BRVO. though time to resolution of macular oedema was similar in each major and macular BRVO (20.8 months vs. 18.2, respectively), eyes with macular BRVO failed to show constant improvement in visual modality with resolution of macular edema as eyes with major BRVO (58% vs. 76% improved, respectively).[30-31]

Clinical Evaluation

Clinical Examination

A complete ophthalmic examination ought to be performed, paying specific attention to the history of eye disease and signs of intraocular inflammation, since these could also be risk factors for BRVO. Careful examination of the iris and angle should be performed in acceptable cases to observe for early signs of rubeosis or neovascular glaucoma. Initially, once the chance of macular dropsy and neovascularization is higher, patients should be followed each month. Once stable, and if visually important macular edema and different complications aren't present, follow-up may be extended.

Fluorescein Angiography

To help verify the identification and valuate for complications, FA ought to be obtained to delineate the retinal tube-shaped structure characteristics that will have prognostic significance: macular outflow and oedema, macular ischemia, and enormous segments of capillary nonperfusion that may forecast ultimate neovascularization.

FA is that the solely technique that may accurately outline the capillary abnormalities in BRVO. The characteristic finding on FA is delayed filling of the occluded retinal vein. Variable amounts of capillary nonperfusion, blockage from intraretinal hemorrhages, microaneurysms, telangiectatic collateral vessels, and dye extravasation from macular edema or retinal neovascularization are alternative options encountered.

Once FA demonstrates macular leakage and edema with cystoid involvement of the fovea, however no capillary nonperfusion, it's likely that the macular oedema is that the explanation for vision loss. Once macular edema is present ophthalmoscopically at intervals the primary six months once a BRVO and there's very little or no outpouring on FA, macular ischaemia is also the cause of the macular edema. In such circumstances, the edema nearly always impromptu resorbs within the first year after the occlusion, usually with improvement in visual acuity.[32]

Wide-Field Angiography

Ultrawide-field Fluorescein Angiography (UWFA) isn't nonetheless a normally used imaging modality for patients with BRVO; however, it's going to facilitate elucidate the role of peripheral retinal tube-shaped structure pathology within the pathological process of vision loss in eyes with RVOs. It's terribly helpful to delineate areas of peripheral nonperfusion and help categorise a patient supported insertion status.

A retrospective study of patients with branch and hemiretinal vein occlusions mistreatment the Optos C200MA ultra widefield imaging system discovered that peripheral retinal nonperfusion is correlative with each macular oedema and retinal neovascularization.[33] Future studies are required to work out whether or not optical device surgical process targeted to areas of peripheral retinal nonperfusion decreases macular edema, reduces treatment burden, and regresses neovascularization in patients with BRVOs.

Optical Coherence Tomography

Optical Coherence Tomography (OCT) has arguably become the foremost vital imaging modality within the treatment of patients with BRVO and macular lump. Optical Coherence Tomography offers a noninvasive and speedy methodology of quantitatively mensuration macular edema and its response to treatment. The characteristic findings of BRVO on Optical Coherence Tomography B-scans are

cystoid macular edema, intraretinal hyper reflectivity from hemorrhages or exudates, shadowing from edema and hemorrhages, and sometimes subretinal fluid[34-35]

Cube or 3D scans are helpful to delineate the areas of retinal thickening and to observe for changes with treatment. Optical Coherence Tomography has been shown to be additional sensitive in detection macular edema and subretinal fluid in patients with BRVO than clinical examination or FA, and should be particularly useful within the acute setting once blockage from intraretinal hemorrhages limits the interpretation of FA.[34]

In chronic cases, photoreceptor ellipsoid zone and external limiting membrane abnormalities from long macular ischaemia and macula lump might also be seen. Integrity of the ellipsoid zone on baseline Optical Coherence Tomography in patients with macular edema from BRVO has been related to higher visual outcome when treatment of the macular edema.[36]

Diagnostic Workup

Young Patient

BRVO usually happens in patients on the far side their sixth decade of life.[2] Younger patients with BRVO could have a better prevalence of vessel risk factors than their age-matched counterparts, as well as hypertension, hyperlipidemia, associate degree and redoubled body mass index.[37]

However, if no cardiovascular risk factors are identified, it's necessary to rule out the other predisposing condition. Though the role of thrombophilic risk factors in retinal vein occlusion continues to be controversial, there are case series that counsel a higher risk of thrombophilic disorders, adore clotting factor urban center mutation, in younger patients presenting with RVO.[38-39]

In young patients while not cardiovascular risk factors or with systemic symptoms suggestive a coagulopathy, workup should embrace an entire blood count, factor II time/partial coagulation factor time/ international normalized ratio, lipoid panel, liquid body substance homocysteine, anticardiolipin antibodies, antinuclear antibodies with lupus anticoagulant, supermolecule C/S, antithrombin III, activated protein C resistance, and coagulation factor Leiden.[10,40]

Older Patient

In patients older than sixty years, further workup is sometimes not necessary since the bulk of those cases are disorder or because of cardiovascular disease or atherosclerosis.

Bilateral or Numerous BRVO Patients

In bilateral cases associate degree cases with a history of multiple BRVOs, finding out an infectious or inflammatory disorder or hypercoagulopathy could also be warranted. Though the overwhelming majority of those cases may be attributed to general hypertension, there are varied case reports of patients with bilateral vein occlusions and systemic inflammatory disorders or hypercoagulopathies.[41-43]

Treatment

Systemic Anticoagulation

In cases wherever a hypercoagulopathy has been identified, medical aid could also be thought about in consultation with associate degree internist. In most cases, however, anticoagulant therapy has not been shown to be helpful in either the bar or the management of BRVO.

Vitrectomy with Sheathotomy

The majority of the blood vessel lesions in BRVO occur downstream from the blood vessel crossing site. During a retrospective review of color pictures and FAs of patients with BRVO, Kumar and associates[22] known venous narrowing at the crossing site, and within the majority of cases, proof of downstream hemodynamic changes on angiogram, as well as venous-phase leakage, abnormal flow, and plausible thrombi.

The authors steered that removal of the compressive issue by sectioning the membrane sheath (sheathotomy) was a doubtless effective treatment for BRVO. Within the initial report of sheathotomy for BRVO, Osterloh and Charles[44] reported important visual improvement in the one case (20/200 to 20/25+ over eight months). Within the second report, Opremcak and Bruce[45] reported equal or improved sharp-sightedness in twelve of fifteen patients (80%).

10 of these patients (67%) had improved surgical visual acuities; with a mean gain of 4 lines of vision. 3 patients had a decline in visual acuity, with an average of 2 lines of vision lost. All patients had marked resolution of the intraretinal hemorrhage and edema. Mester and Dillinger reported forty three cases of BRVO treated with sheathotomy with similar results. In sixteen of the cases, removal of the inner limiting membrane in the space of the blood vessel crossing was conjointly performed.[46]

Treatment of Neovascularization and Vitreous Hemorrhage

Laser Treatment

The co-operative BVOS,[1] a multicenter irregular clinical test supported by the National Eye Institute, randomized patients with BRVO to receive panretinal scatter photocoagulation to forestall neovascular complications.[1] They reported that eyes with ischaemic BRVO that show giant areas (>5 disc diameters) of retinal capillary nonperfusion have more or less a 40% likelihood of developing neovascu-

larization (NV) whereas about 60% of these eyes with NV can expertise periodic vitreous hemorrhage.

If peripheral scatter laser photocoagulation is applied in eyes with large areas of nonperfusion, the incidence of neovascularization will be reduced from about 40% to 20%. However, if one have to treat prophylactically, several eyes (60%) that might never develop neovascularization would receive peripheral scatter laser photocoagulation conjointly and the ensuant side-effects of such treatment.

The BVOS information also powerfully counsel that photocoagulation when the event of neovascularization is as effective in preventing vitreous hemorrhage as is photocoagulation before the development of neovascularization.[1] Once neovascularization is unambiguously confirmed by FA or UWFA, peripheral scatter laser photocoagulation will scale back the chance of vitreous hemorrhage from concerning 60% to 30%.[1]

Treatment of Macular Edema

Laser Treatment

A separate cluster of patients within the BVOS were irregular to work out whether or not argon laser photocoagulation could cut back visual loss from macular hydrops. Vital eligibility criteria enclosed fluorescein-proven, perfused macular edema involving the fovea centralis center, clearing of intraretinal hemorrhage from the foveal center, recent BRVO (usually 3–18 months duration), no diabetic retinopathy, and vision reduced to 20/40 or worse once best corrected refraction.[47]

Argon laser photocoagulation was applied in a very grid pattern throughout the leaky space incontestible by FA. Laser treatment extended no nearer to the fovea than the sting of the capillary-free zone and no more into the boundary than the most important tube-shaped structure arcade. Counselled treatment parameters enclosed a period of 0.1 second, a 100-μm diameter spot size, and an influence setting sufficient to supply a "medium" white burn.

FA was perennial 2–4 months once the treatment and extra photocoagulation was applied to residual areas of outpouring if reduced visual modality persisted. Improvement in visual acuity was assessed in many ways.[47] When improvement was outlined as reading 2 or additional Snellen lines higher than baseline at two consecutive visits, treated eyes showed visual improvement more typically than untreated eyes.

Once three years of follow-up, 63% of treated eyes gained two or more lines of vision, compared to 36% of untreated eyes. Before laser photocoagulation is performed, it's vital to get high-quality FA of the macula; the FA should demonstrate that the macular hydrops involves the middle of the fovea centralis where there's not an oversized quantity of capillary nonperfusion adjacent to the capillary-free zone that might justify the visual loss.

Within the application of grid pattern optical device photocoagulation, it's crucial to get sensible definition of landmarks in order that the middle of the fovea centralis will be known and avoided. Since landmarks of times could also be obscured in the macula once BRVO, such cases can be managed effectively and safely by treating well peripheral to the capillary-free zone in the 1st sitting.

When the patient returns in two months for follow-up evaluation, a repeat FA might determine clearly the quantity of additional treatment that has to be applied nearer to the sting of the capillary-free zone, as a result of the pigmentation of the previous treatment is then visible. Consequently, treatment during this next sitting is also advanced closer to the edge of the capillary-free zone, if that's deemed necessary attributable to persistent foveal dropsy and vision loss.

The position of grid optical maser treatment in this repetitively staged fashion may be safer and seems to be even as effective as one treatment. For the grid treatment employed in the BVOS, the chemical element blue-green wavelength was employed.[47] This is often the sole wavelength that has been proved effective and its unknown whether or not argon inexperienced and inert gas red surgical process are equally effective.

Steroid Treatment

Macular oedema in BRVO results from multiplied tube-shaped structure permeableness mediate a minimum of partially by upregulation of VEGF.[48] Intravitreal steroids are shown in animal models to inhibit the expression of VEGF and so scale back macular edema in retinal vascular disease.[49-50]

Triamcinolone

In the Standard Care vs. Corticosteroid for Retinal Vein Occlusion (SCORE) BRVO study, the effectiveness and safety of intravitreal triamcinolone acetate (IVTA) for the treatment of macular oedema from BRVO were evaluated.[51] During this multicenter, randomised controlled study, 411 patients were randomized to receive macular grid laser, 1mg IVTA, or 4mg IVTA. Retreatment was allowed each 4 months for every cluster unless the treatment was successful, futile, or contraindicated.

There was no important distinction in vision or the reduction of macular edema measured by Optical Coherence Tomography at the tip of twelve months between each group. Respectively, 29%, 26%, and 27% of eyes within the laser, 1mg IVTA, and 4mg IVTA teams gained a visible acuity score of ≥15 ETDRS

letters. Subgroup analysis of pseudophakic eyes additionally didn't demonstrate a big distinction in vision. Three-year results from 128 patients recommended that the laser cluster maintained a considerably larger average increase in vision (12.9 letters) compared with the 2 IVTA teams (4.4 letters, 1mg and 8.0 letters, 4mg).

Vital side-effects from IVTA enclosed cataract formation and elevation of intraocular pressure (IOP) requiring treatment. Each side-effect was dose dependent.[51] As results of this study, IVTA isn't recommended as first-line medical care for macular puffiness in BRVO. However, it is often thought-about in patients wherever anti-VEGF injections or macular grid laser are ineffective, because the treatment was found to be comparatively safe, particularly in pseudophakic eyes.

Dexamethasone Implant

The Global Evaluation of Implantable dexamethasone in Retinal Vein Occlusion with Macular edema (GENEVA) study evaluated a sustained-release, perishable, dexamethasone intravitreal implant (Ozurdex, Allergan, Irvine, CA) for the treatment of macular edema in central retinal vein occlusion (CRVO) and BRVO patients.[52] Ozurdex could be a biodegradable polymer of poly (d,llactide-co-glycolide) acid (PLGA) containing micronized dexamethasone.

In this multicenter, randomised controlled study, the first outcome of a rise in best corrected visual modality (BCVA) of ≥15 ETDRS letters was achieved in 30% of the Ozurdex 0.7mg cluster (n=291), 26% of the 0.35mg group (n=260), and 13% of the sham group (n=279) sixty days when injection (peak response) in patients with BRVO (p<.001) for every group versus sham). A statistically significant distinction between each Ozurdex teams and sham was seen up to ninety days after injection.

At 90 days after injection, there was a major improvement (p<.001) in central retinal thickness measured by Optical Coherence Tomography in both Ozurdex groups, compared with the sham group. The mean SD decrease in central retinal thickness at ninety days was 208±201µm, 177±197µm, and 85±173µm within the 0.7mg, 0.35mg and sham groups, respectively. The Optical Coherence Tomography results are from pooled information as well as each BRVO and CRVO patients.

Anti-VEGF Treatment

In patients with BRVO, retinal ischaemia ends up in the secretion of VEGF, that leads to accrued vascular permeability, vasodilation, migration of epithelium cells, and neovascularization.[48,53-54] There are many anti-VEGF agents presently employed in the treatment of RVOs. We are going to discuss the employment of ranibizumab (Lucentis), bevacizumab (Avastin), and aflibercept (Eylea).

Ranibizumab could be an affinity-matured, humanized antibody fragment (Fab) that binds all VEGF-A isoforms. Aflibercept is a fusion supermolecule composed of key binding domains from VEGF receptors one and a pair of amalgamated to the Fc portion of human IgG that binds all isoforms of VEGF-A, VEGF-B, VEGF-C, and placental growth factor (PlGF). Bevacizumab could be a full-length, humanized antibody that binds all VEGF-A isoforms and is FDA-approved for large intestine cancer, however is employed off-label within the eye. At this time, ranibizumab and aflibercept are each FDA-approved for the treatment of macular oedema secondary to RVO.

Ranibizumab

The Branch Retinal Vein Occlusion (BRVO) study was a prospective, multicenter, irregular controlled study to gauge the effectualness and safety of ranibizumab within the treatment of macular oedema from BRVO.55 Patients were randomized into 3 groups: (1) sham injection (n=132); (2) 0.3mg ranibizumab (n=134); and (3) 0.5mg ranibizumab (n=131). Within the initial six months, injections got monthly.

A 28-day screening amount excluded patients with spontaneous and fast improvement in vision of >10 ETDRS letters. At month 3, a patient was eligible for rescue laser if a gain of <5 ETDRS letters, or improvement of <50µm in central subfield thickness, was discovered compared with the visit three months prior.

The percentage of patients who improved bigger than fifteen ETDRS letters was 55.2% and 61.1% (0.3mg and 0.5mg cluster, various compared with 28.8% within the management group (p<.0001) for every group versus sham). Throughout the primary 6 months, 54.5% of the control group needed rescue laser therapy compared with 18.7% in the 0.3mg and 19.8% in the 0.5mg ranibizumab teams.[55]

During the first 6 months, all 3 groups were allowed to receive “as needed” (PRN) intravitreal ranibizumab (0.5mg for sham group, ranibizumab groups continuing to receive their respective doses) at monthly intervals if they'd vision ≤20/40 or mean central foveal thickness ≥250 µm. Despite receiving solely PRN treatments, patients in each ranibizumab teams maintained their vision gain at twelve months. Though the management cluster showed a pleasure in the PRN treatment regimen, the ultimate vision gained at 12 months didn’t resemble that achieved within the eyes started on prompt ranibizumab treatment.[56]

Aflibercept

The VIBRANT study was a double-masked, active-controlled, irregular, multicenter phase III trial comparison the security and efficaciousness of intravitreal aflibercept versus macular grid laser within the treatment of macular swelling from BRVO. Eyes were randomized to 2mg intravitreal aflibercept (IAI) each four weeks (for a series of six injections, n=91) or grid laser (with rescue if needed, n=92).

The first outcome was share of eyes that gained ≥15 ETDRS letters at week 24. Within the IAI cluster, 52.7% of eyes achieved the primary outcome versus 26.7% of eyes in the laser group. The IAI group gained a mean of 17.0 ETDRS letters compared to 6.9 letters (p=.0003) within the laser cluster and achieved a mean reduction of 280.5μm in central retinal thickness compared to 128μm in the laser group (p<.0001) vibrant was the primary trial to check anti-VEGF medical care directly with laser and also the results were powerfully in favour of aflibercept with similar side-effect profiles in each groups.[57]

Bevacizumab

Bevacizumab is presently used off-label for the treatment of macular oedema concerning BRVO and is a lovely therapeutic choice leads to its comparatively low value compared to alternative anti-VEGF agents. Though there are no multicenter, randomized controlled trials evaluating the protection and effectiveness of bevacizumab in treating macular edema from BRVO, there have been various case series and little prospective studies showing that bevacizumab is effective at rising acuity and decreasing macular edema, as measured by OCT.[58-62]

Recently, the MARVEL study cluster printed a prospective, randomized, noninferiority trial scrutiny PRN bevacizumab to ranibizumab for the treatment of macular edema secondary to BRVO. Though the study was underpowered to indicate non-inferiority, it did show an identical increase in BCVA (15.6 vs. 18.1 ETDRS letters) and reduce in central retinal thickness (−201.7 vs. −177.1 μm) within the bevacizumab and ranibizumab groups, respectively.[63]

A retrospective study scrutiny bevacizumab to ranibizumab for macular oedema secondary to RVO (CRVO and BRVO) additionally showed similar effectiveness with relevance anatomic and visual outcomes.[64] Thus, bevacizumab may be a viable treatment choice for macular edema secondary to BRVO.

Vitrectomy without Sheathotomy

There is proof that vitreomacular attachment itself could contribute to the event of macular oedema in BRVO.[65] Saika and coworkers reported reduction in macular edema and restoration of traditional foveal contour in ten of nineteen eyes once vitrectomy, posterior clear separation, and intraocular gas tamponade.[66] During a prospective comparison study, vitrectomy with separation of the posterior hyaloid while not sheathotomy was found to be as effective in reducing macular edema and rising visual modality as combined vitrectomy with posterior hyaloid removal and sheathotomy.[67]

Follow-Up

The major complications which will cause vision loss in patients with BRVO embody macular oedema, macular ischemia, and neovascularization. Treatment is out there for macular edema and neovascularization and follow-up ought to be tailored to observe the event of those complications adequately.

Initially, patients should be followed closely each month for the development of macular edema and/or neovascularization. Anti-VEGF medical care should be initiated for patients with macular edema while not spontaneous improvement. Grid optical maser and/or steroids are also thought-about in patients once anti-VEGF therapy isn't showing enough therapeutic efficacies.

CONCLUSION

BRVO could be a common reason for vision loss, however many treatment choices are accessible and rising therapies are beneath investigation. With the arrival of such a lot of new treatment options over the past decade, future studies are required to determine evidence-based pointers for the treatment of the vision-limiting complications of BRVO. The BRVO and spirited trials established that intravitreal anti-VEGF therapy leads to higher visual and anatomical outcomes than macular grid laser, that had been the quality of take care of macular oedema related to BRVO for over twenty five years. Currently, there are 3 available anti-VEGF therapies utilized in clinical practice. Whereas there are many studies showing similar effectualness between ranibizumab and bevacizumab, there has been no multicenter, randomised trial examination the efficacy of the 3 agents for the treatment of macular oedema related to BRVO. Future studies also are required to determine the acceptable treatment regimen. In each the vibrant and BRVO trials, patients received monthly injections for the primary six months. Currently, steroid injections are second-line medical care attributable to side-effects as well as redoubled IOP and cataract. Finally, pilot studies recommend that combination therapy could have a synergistic treatment result still as scale back treatment burden. Another cluster found that dexamethasone implant and grid optical laser resulted in higher anatomic and visual outcomes than

anti-inflammatory drug alone. Irregular controlled trials are required to determine the role and overall arrangement of combination medical care with regards to the presently available treatment modalities.

REFERENCES

1. Branch Vein Occlusion Study Group. Argon laser scatter photocoagulation for prevention of neovascularization and vitreous hemorrhage in branch vein occlusion. A randomized clinical trial. Arch Ophthalmol. 1986; 104: 34–41.
2. Rogers SL, McIntosh RL, Lim L, et al. Natural history of branch retinal vein occlusion: an evidence-based systematic review. Ophthalmology. 2010; 117: 1094–1101.
3. Klein R, Moss SE, Meuer SM, et al. The 15-year cumulative incidence of retinal vein occlusion: the Beaver Dam Eye Study. Arch Ophthalmol. 2008; 126: 513–518.
4. Cheung N, et al. Traditional and novel cardiovascular risk factors for retinal vein occlusion: the multiethnic study of atherosclerosis. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2008; 49: 4297–4302.
5. Wong TY, Marino Larsen EK, Klein R, et al. Cardiovascular risk factors for retinal vein occlusion and arteriolar emboli: the Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities and Cardiovascular Health Studies. Ophthalmology. 2005; 112: 540–547.
6. Mitchell P, Smith W, Chang A. Prevalence and associations of retinal vein occlusion in Australia: the Blue Mountains Eye Study. Arch Ophthalmol. 1996; 114: 1243–1247.
7. Ponto KA, Elbaz H, Peto T, et al. Prevalence and risk factors of retinal vein occlusion: the Gutenberg Health Study. J Thromb Haemost. 2015; 13:1–10.
8. Eye Disease Case-control Study Group. Risk factors for branch retinal vein occlusion. Am J Ophthalmol. 1993; 116: 286–296.
9. Janssen MCH, den Heijer M, Cruysberg JRM, et al. Retinal vein occlusion: a form of venous thrombosis or a complication of atherosclerosis? A meta-analysis of thrombophilic factors. Thromb Haemost. 2005; 93: 1021–1026.
10. Rehak M, Rehak J, Muller M, et al. The prevalence of activated protein C (APC) resistance and factor V Leiden is significantly higher in patients with retinal vein occlusion without general risk factors: case–control study and metaanalysis. Thromb Haemost. 2008; 99: 925–929.
11. Cahill MT, Stinnett SS, Fekrat S. Meta-analysis of plasma homocysteine, serum folate, serum vitamin B(12), and thermolabile MTHFR genotype as risk factors for retinal vascular occlusive disease. Am J Ophthalmol. 2003; 136: 1136– 1150.
12. Ariturk N, Oge Y, Erkan D, et al. Relation between retinalvein occlusions and axial length. Br J Ophthalmol. 1996; 80: 633–636.
13. Majji AB, Janarthanan M, Naduvilath TJ. Significance of refractive status in branch retinal vein occlusion. A case control study. Retina. 1997; 17: 200–204.
14. Simons BD, Brucker AJ. Branch retinal vein occlusion. Axial length and other risk factors. Retina. 1997; 17: 191–195.
15. Timmerman EA, de Lavalette VW, van den Brom HJ. Axial length as a risk factor to branch retinal vein occlusion. Retina. 1997; 17: 196–199.
16. Jaulim A, Ahmed B, Khanam T, et al. Branch retinal vein occlusion: epidemiology, pathogenesis, risk factors, clinical features, diagnosis, and complications. An update of the literature. Retina. 2013; 33: 901–910.
17. Sungur G, Hazirolan D, Hekimoglu E, et al. Late-onset Behcet's disease: demographic, clinical, and ocular features. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol. 2010; 248: 1325–1330.
18. Salvo G, Li Calzi C, Anastasi M, et al. Branch retinal vein occlusion followed by central retinal artery occlusion in Churg–Strauss syndrome: unusual ocular manifestations in allergic granulomatous angiitis. Eur J Ophthalmol. 2009; 19: 314–317.
19. Weinberg D, Dodwell DG, Fern SA. Anatomy of arteriovenous crossings in branch retinal vein occlusion. Am J Ophthalmol. 1990; 109: 298–302.
20. Zhao J, Sastry SM, Sperduto RD, et al. Arteriovenous crossing patterns in branch retinal vein occlusion. The Eye Disease Case–Control Study Group. Ophthalmology. 1993; 100: 423–428.
21. Duker JS, Brown GC. Anterior location of the crossing artery in branch retinal vein obstruction. Arch Ophthalmol. 1989; 107: 998–107:9.
22. Kumar B, Yu DY, Morgan WH, et al. The distribution of angio architectural changes within the vicinity of the arteriovenous crossing in branch retinal vein occlusion. Ophthalmology. 1998; 105: 424–427.
23. Seitz R. The retinal vessels. CV Mosby: St. Louis; 1964:20–74.
24. Rehak J, Rehak M. Branch retinal vein occlusion: pathogenesis, visual prognosis, and treatment modalities. Curr Eye Res. 2008; 33: 111–131.
25. Clemett RS. Retinal branch vein occlusion: changes at the site of obstruction. Br J Ophthalmol. 1974; 58: 548–554.

26. Frangieh GT, Green WR, Barraquer-Somers E, et al. Histopathologic study of nine branch retinal vein occlusions. Arch Ophthalmol. 1982; 100: 1132–1140.
27. Ehlers JP, Fekrat S. Retinal vein occlusion: beyond the acute event. Surv Ophthalmol. 2011; 56: 281–299.
28. Cristoffersen NL, Larsen M. Pathophysiology and hemodynamics of branch retinal vein occlusion. Opthalmology. 1999; 106: 2054–2062.
29. Klein R, Klein BE, Moss SE, et al. The epidemiology of retinal vein occlusion: the Beaver Dam Eye Study. Trans Am Ophthalmol Soc. 2000; 98: 133–141 [discussion 141–3].
30. Hayreh SS, Zimmerman MB. Fundus changes in branch retinal vein occlusion. Retina. 2015; 35: 1016–1027.
31. Hayreh SS, Zimmerman MB. Branch retinal vein occlusion natural history of visual outcome. JAMA Ophthalmol. 2014; 132: 13–22.
32. Finkelstein D. Ischemic macular edema: recognition and favorable natural history in branch vein occlusion. Arch Ophthalmol. 1992; 11: 1427–1434.
33. Prasad PS, Oliver SC, Coffee RE, et al. Ultra wide-field angiographic characteristics of branch retinal and hemicentral retinal vein occlusion. Ophthalmology. 2010; 117: 780–784.
34. Spaide RF, Lee JK, Klancnik JK Jr, et al. Optical coherence tomography of branch retinal vein occlusion. Retina. 2003; 23: 343–347.
35. Lerche RC, Schaudig U, Scholz F, et al. Structural changes of the retina in retinal vein occlusion-imaging and quantification with optical coherence tomography. Ophthalmic Surg Lasers. 2001; 32: 272-280.
36. Kang HM, Chung EJ, Kim YM, et al. Spectral-domain optical coherence tomography (SD-OCT) patterns and response to intravitreal bevacizumab therapy in macular edema associated with branch retinal vein occlusion. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol. 2013; 251: 501-508.
37. Lam HD, Lahey JM, Kearney JJ, et al. Young patients with branch retinal vein occlusion: a review of 60 cases. Retina. 2010; 30: 1520-1523.
38. Arsene S, Delahousse B, Regina S, et al. Increased prevalence of factor V Leiden in patients with retinal vein occlusion and under 60 years of age. Thromb Haemost. 2005; 94: 101-106.
39. Kuhli C, Hattenbach LO, Scharrer I, et al. High prevalence of resistance to APC in young patients with retinal vein occlusion. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol. 2002; 240: 163-168.
40. Lahey M, Tunc M, Kearney J, et al. Laboratory evaluation of hypercoagulable states in patients with central retinal vein occlusion who are less than 56 years of age. Ophthalmology. 2002; 109: 126–131.
41. Chai SM, Mathur R, Ong SG. Retinal vasculopathy in Fanconi anemia. Ophthalmic Surg Lasers Imaging. 2009; 40: 498–40:4.
42. Patricio MS, Portelinha J, Passarinho MP, et al. Tubercular retinal vasculitis. BMJ Case Rep. 2013; 2013 [pii: bcr2013008924].
43. Tewari HK, Khosla A, Khosla PK, et al. Bilateral branch vein occlusion. Acta Ophthalmol. 1992; 70: 278–280.
44. Osterloh MD, Charles S. Surgical decompression of branch retinal vein occlusions. Arch Ophthalmol. 1988; 106: 1469-1471.
45. Opremcak EM, Bruce RA. Surgical decompression of branch retinal vein occlusion via arteriovenous crossing sheathotomy: a prospective review of 15 cases. Retina. 1999; 19: 1-19.
46. Mester U, Dillinger P. Vitrectomy with arteriovenous decompression and internal limiting membrane dissection in branch retinal vein occlusion. Retina. 2002; 22:740-746.
47. Branch Vein Occlusion Study Group. Argon laser photocoagulation for macular edema in branch vein occlusion. Am J Ophthalmol.1984; 98: 271-298.
48. Noma H, Minamoto A, Funatsu H, et al. 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.
49. Zhang X, Bao S, Lai D, et al. Intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide inhibits breakdown of the blood–retinal barrier through differential regulation of VEGF-A and its receptors in early diabetic rat retinas. Diabetes. 2008;57:1026-1033.
50. McAllister IL, Vijayasekaran S, Chen SD, et al. Effect of triamcinolone acetonide on vascular endothelial growth factor and occludin levels in branch retinal vein occlusion. Am J Ophthalmol. 2009; 147: 838-846.
51. Scott IU, Ip MS, VanVeldhuisen PC, et al. A randomized trial comparing the efficacy and safety of intravitreal triamcinolone with standard care to treat vision loss associated with macular edema secondary to branch retinal vein occlusion: the Standard Care vs Corticosteroid for Retinal Vein Occlusion (SCORE) study report 6. Arch Ophthalmol. 2009; 127: 1115-1127.

52. Haller JA, Bandello F, Belfort R Jr, et al. Randomized, sham controlled trial of dexamethasone intravitreal implant in patients with macular edema due to retinal vein occlusion. Ophthalmology. 2010; 117: 1134-1146.
53. Aiello LP, Avery RL, Arrigg PG, et al. Vascular endothelial growth factor in ocular fluid of patients with diabetic retinopathy and other retinal disorders. N Engl J Med. 1994; 331: 1480-1487.
54. Bates DO. Vascular endothelial growth factors and vascular permeability. Cardiovasc Res. 2010; 87: 262–287.
55. Campochiaro PA, Heier JS, Feiner L, et al. Ranibizumab for macular edema following branch retinal vein occlusion: sixmonth primary end point results of a phase III study. Ophthalmology. 2010; 117: 1102-1112.
56. Brown DM, Campochiaro PA, Bhisitkul RB, et al. Sustained benefits from Ranibizumab for macular edema following branch retinal vein occlusion: 12-month outcomes of a Phase III study. Ophthalmology. 2011; 118: 1594-1602.
57. Campochiaro PA, Clark WL, Boyer DS, et al. Intravitreal aflibercept for macular edema following branch retinal vein occlusion: the 24-week results of the vibrant study. Ophthalmology. 2015; 122: 538-544.
58. Jaissle GB, Leitritz M, Gelisken F, et al. One-year results after intravitreal bevacizumab therapy for macular edema secondary to branch retinal vein occlusion. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol. 2009; 247: 27-33.
59. Gregori NZ, Rattan GH, Rosenfeld PJ, et al. Safety and efficacy of intravitreal bevacizumab (avastin) for the management of branch and hemiretinal vein occlusion. Retina. 2009; 29: 913-925.
60. Ehlers JP, Decroos FC, Fekrat S. Intravitreal bevacizumab for macular edema secondary to branch retinal vein occlusion. Retina. 2011; 31: 1856-1862.
61. Hikichi T, Higuchi M, Matsushita T, et al. Two-year outcomes of intravitreal bevacizumab therapy for macular oedema secondary to branch retinal vein occlusion. Br J Ophthalmol. 2014; 98: 195-199.
62. Prager F, Michels S, Kriechbaum K, et al. Intravitreal bevacizumab (Avastin) for macular oedema secondary to retinal vein occlusion: 12-month results of a prospective clinical trial. Br J Ophthalmol. 2009; 93: 452-456.
63. Narayanan R, Panchal B, Das T, et al. A randomized, double-masked, controlled study of the efficacy and safety of intravitreal bevacizumab versus ranibizumab in the treatment of macular oedema due to branch retinal vein occlusion: MARVEL Report No. 1. Br J Ophthalmol. 2015; 99: 954-959.
64. Yuan A, Ahmad BU, Xu D, et al. Comparison of intravitreal ranibizumab and bevacizumab for the treatment of macular edema secondary to retinal vein occlusion. Int J Ophthalmol. 2014;7(1): 86-91.
65. Takahashi MK, Hikichi T, Akiba J, et al. Role of the vitreous and macular edema in branch retinal vein occlusion. Ophthalmic Surg Lasers.1997; 28: 294-299.
66. Saika S, Tanaka T, Miyamoto T, et al. Surgical posterior vitreous detachment combined with gas/air tamponade for treating macular edema associated with branch retinal vein occlusion: retinal tomography and visual outcome. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol. 2001; 239: 729-732.
67. Figueroa MS, Torres R, Alvarez MT. Comparative study of vitrectomy with and without vein decompression for branch retinal vein occlusion: a pilot study. Eur J Ophthalmol. 2004; 14(1): 40-47.

Cite this article as:
Narender Chanchal, Smriti Kaul, Daya Shankar Singh, Munna Kumar. A Critical Modern Review on BRVO (Branch Retinal Vein Occlusion). AYUSHDHARA, 2021;8(6):3690-3699.
https://doi.org/10.47070/ayushdhara.v8i6.854
Source of support: Nil, Conflict of interest: None Declared

***Address for correspondence**
Dr. Narender Chanchal
Assistant Professor,
Department of Shalakya Tantra,
Kunwar Shekhar Vijendra Ayurveda Medical College & Research Centre,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Saharanpur,
Uttar Pradesh India.
Email:
drnarenderchanchal02051993@gmail.com
Ph: 8219475089