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ABSTRACT

Objectives: The aim of this study is to systematically review the evidence for anti-vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) therapy in choroidal neovascularisation secondary to conditions other than age-related macular degeneration.

Data sources: MEDLINE, MEDLINE in-process, EMBASE and CENTRAL databases and conference abstracts were searched (from inception to Jan 2014).

Study eligibility criteria, participants and interventions: Randomised and non-randomised comparative studies with follow-up of at least 6 months were included and were used to assess clinical effectiveness.

Study appraisal and synthesis method: Risk of bias was assessed using the Cochrane risk of bias tool and modified Newcastle-Ottawa Scale. Meta-analysis was not possible due to methodological heterogeneity.

Results: 16 studies met the inclusion criteria (1091 eyes; 963 pathological myopia, 74 other conditions). There was large variation in risk of bias across studies. An improvement in best-corrected visual acuity in anti-VEGF arms over comparators was reported in all studies. The proportion of patients improving by at least 15 letters in anti-VEGF arms ranged from 27.3% to 70%. There were no significant differences between bevacizumab and ranibizumab.

Limitations: Owing to the rarity of choroidal neovascularisation secondary to conditions other than age-related macular degeneration or pathological myopia, there are unlikely to ever be sufficiently powered trials in these populations.

Conclusions: Bevacizumab and ranibizumab appear to be effective in improving visual acuity for patients with choroidal neovascularisation secondary to conditions other than age-related macular degeneration. The evidence base is strongest for pathological myopia, but based on current evidence and likely pharmacological pathways, clinicians should consider treatment with either bevacizumab or ranibizumab for rarer causes of choroidal neovascularisation.

INTRODUCTION

Choroidal neovascularisation (CNV) is a common and severe complication of a number of different diseases affecting the posterior segment of the eye, and has the potential to cause blindness. It has a significant impact on functioning and quality of life.1 It is characterised by neovascularisation originating from the choroid which grows through Bruch’s membrane and under the retinal pigment epithelium (RPE) or retina.2 Loss of vision usually results from haemorrhage and leakage, and ultimately fibrosis.3 Vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) is recognised as a key signalling molecule in this process. The most common disease associated with CNV is neovascular (wet) age-related macular degeneration (ARM).

Pathological myopia (PM) is the commonest non-ARM condition associated with CNV. It is estimated to affect up to 3% of the population, of which 5–11% may develop myopic CNV.4–6 Other conditions associated with CNV include angioid streaks, multifocal choroiditis, punctate inner choroidopathy, pseudoxanthoma elasticum and presumed ocular histoplasmosis. CNV may be associated with trauma and can be idiopathic. These conditions tend to affect younger patients leading to lifelong impairment.7 These conditions are relatively uncommon.
individually, but are more frequently seen as a combination. There is only limited evidence available about their treatment.

The use of anti-VEGF agents has emerged as an effective therapy for a number of ophthalmological conditions. They have been shown to be superior to photodynamic therapy (PDT) in ARMD in large randomised controlled trials (RCTs)\(^8\)–\(^10\) and in the treatment of macular oedema following retinal vein occlusion and diabetic macular oedema.\(^11\)–\(^12\) There are a number of trials that show the effectiveness of anti-VEGF antibodies in the treatment of CNV associated with PM.\(^13\)–\(^14\) Case reports and case series in the literature report improvement in vision and regression of CNV secondary to conditions other than ARMD with anti-VEGF therapy,\(^15\)–\(^18\) but there are few interventional studies.

The aim of this study is to systematically review the evidence for anti-VEGF therapy in CNV secondary to conditions other than ARMD.

METHODS

A systematic review was undertaken. The following electronic databases were searched from inception to January 2014: MEDLINE, MEDLINE In-process, EMBASE and CENTRAL. Conference abstracts from the annual meetings of the Association for Research in Vision and Ophthalmology, the Royal College of Ophthalmologists, and the American Academy of Ophthalmology for years 2011–2013 were searched using choroidal neovascularisation terms.

The search strategy for MEDLINE is shown in the online supplementary material. This was adapted for EMBASE and CENTRAL. Terms for ARMD were assessed using the Cochrane risk of bias tool.\(^22\) A modified Newcastle-Ottawa Scale was used to assess the risk of bias for non-RCT studies. It was not possible to assess publication bias using a funnel plot because of heterogeneity and a limited number of studies.

Data were assessed for suitability for meta-analysis, but this was not possible due to methodological heterogeneity.

Outcome measures

Outcome measures were: (A) best-corrected visual acuity (BCVA); mean change in, proportion of patients improving, and proportion of patients worsening; (B) mean change in central macular thickness (CMT) as determined by optical coherence tomography (OCT) and (C) adverse events. All BCVA data were converted to number of letters for consistency.

Screening and data extraction

Screening of titles and abstracts were undertaken independently by two authors (AS and SD). Differences were resolved through discussion with a third author (JAF). Data was extracted in a prespecified data extraction form. Non-English articles were translated.\(^19\)–\(^21\) Data extracted included baseline characteristics, mean change in BCVA, proportion of patients improving, proportion of patients worsening, mean change in CMT, and adverse events. Risk of bias for the RCTs was assessed using the Cochrane risk of bias tool.\(^22\) A modified Newcastle-Ottawa Scale was used to assess the risk of bias for non-RCT studies. It was not possible to assess publication bias using a funnel plot because of heterogeneity and a limited number of studies.

RESULTS

Search results

Sixteen studies met the inclusion criteria after screening 1251 titles and abstracts (figure 1).\(^13\)–\(^19\)\(^–\)\(^21\)\(^23\)–\(^34\) The main reasons for exclusion at full text stage was the absence of a separate analysis of trial arms, ARMD as cause of CNV, absence of comparator, invalid comparator and condition not CNV.

Table 1 shows that 5 studies were RCTs and 11 were non-randomised comparative studies. Studies were from a range of different countries. Only one trial was multicentre and industry funded. Follow-up ranged from 6 to 24 months.

Across included studies, the total number of eyes was 1091 (426 in RCTs), of which 684 received an anti-VEGF. Study size ranged from 27 to 277 eyes. Mean age ranged between 35.2 and 67 years, and between 60% and 100% were female. Mean baseline BCVA was between 81 and 99 letters.

Thirteen of the studies (4 of the 5 RCTs, 1017 eyes) included participants with and without ARMD with reporting of subgroups were eligible.

Included interventions were intravitreal bevacizumab, ranibizumab, pegaptanib and aflibercept. Eligible comparators were placebo/sham treatments, other pharmacological interventions, usual care and observation. There were no language restrictions. Studies with length of follow-up of less than 6 months were excluded.
2.5. No studies assessing pegaptanib or aflibercept were found.

One study used a herbal agent, FXT. FXT is a Chinese herbal formula used in ophthalmological conditions, and consists of *Panax notoginseng*, *Salvia miltiorrhiza*, *Astragalus membranaceus* and *Scrophularia ningpoensis*. It is purported to have a vasodilatory effect, and has been studied in the treatment of diabetic retinopathy.

**Risk of bias**
Risk of bias was assessed separately for the RCTs and comparative studies, and detailed assessments are presented in tables 2 and 3, respectively.

Generally, the RCTs were of low or unclear risk of bias, except for binding of participants that was high or unclear in four studies (table 2). This reflects the difficulty of binding participants in these trials. The majority of studies used assessors who were blinded to the received interventions when evaluating visual acuity after treatment, but this was not discussed in one study. Sequence generation was not reported in two studies. Two studies used sequentially numbered envelopes, but it was unclear if these were opaque envelopes.

The comparative studies had low risk of bias for selecting participants from the same cohort, comparability of participants, incomplete data and selective reporting, but a high risk of bias for outcome assessment (table 3). No studies blinded assessors to the interventions received.

**Treatment regimes**
All studies using PDT reported using a standard regime as per the verteporfin in Photodynamic Therapy Study. After baseline treatment, all studies based re-treatment on fluorescein angiography (FA) findings at three monthly assessments. The mean number of treatments over the duration of follow-up ranged from 1.3 to 3.2.

All studies using anti-VEGFs reported standard doses of 0.5 mg of ranibizumab, and 1.25 mg bevacizumab intravitreally. Dosing regimens varied by study. Three studies used a three monthly loading regime followed by further treatment based on clinical assessment (see table 4). All other studies based re-treatment on the findings of FA and OCT at 1–3 monthly follow-up visits. Mean number of injections over the follow-up periods ranged from 1.6 to 4.72 injections.

**Clinical effectiveness**

**Anti-VEGF versus PDT**
Ten studies compared an anti-VEGF agent to PDT, of which two were RCTs.
| Study type and f/u | CNV cause | Patients | Total eyes | Treatment groups |
|-------------------|-----------|----------|------------|-----------------|
| Randomised, double-blind clinical trial, 18-month f/u | Pathological myopia | Mean age: IVR 65 years, IB 61 years | 48 | IVB (mean number of injections 4.72, eyes=25) |
| Randomised controlled trial, 12-month f/u | Pathological myopia | Mean age: Control group 45.1 years, treatment group 43.5 years | 42 | FXT only (oral capsule 1.5 g TDS, eyes=20) |
| Randomised controlled trial, 6-month f/u | Pathological myopia | Mean age: IVR 60.63 years, IB 59.06 years | 32 | IVB 1.25 mg (mean number of injections 2.44, eyes=16) |
| Randomised controlled trial, double blind, 12-month f/u | Pathological myopia | Mean age: DA 56.1 years, STAB 54.0 years | 277 | IVR 0.5 mg (mean number of injections 2.81, eyes=16) |
| Prospective comparative study, 12-month f/u | Pathological myopia | Mean age: PDT 53 years, IB 56.5 years | 159 | Controls (eyes=74) |
| Retrospective comparative, 12-month f/u | Myopic CNV | Mean age: PDT 53 years, IB 55.8 years | 80 | PDT (mean number of treatments 1.55, eyes=40) |
| Retrospective comparative study, 12-month f/u | Pathological myopia | Mean age: PDT 53 years, IB 55.8 years | 80 | PDT (mean number of treatments 1.55, eyes=40) |
| Study | Study type and f/u | CNV cause | Patients | Total eyes | Treatment groups |
|-------|------------------|-----------|----------|------------|-----------------|
| El Matri *et al* | Retrospective comparative study, 24-month f/u | High myopia | Mean age: PDT 57 years, IVB 56 years % female: 65% Baseline VA: mean letters; PDT 96±38.5, IVB 95±17.5 Ethnicity: NR (France) | 60 | PDT (mean number of treatments 2.4, eyes=30) IVB 1.25 mg (mean number of treatments 3.8, eyes=30) |
| Dethorey *et al* | Retrospective comparative study, median f/u; PDT group 53 months, IVR group 13.5 months | High myopia | Mean age: PDT 47 years, IVR 58 years % female: 83% Baseline VA: Snellen 20/80 (PDT), 20/160 (IVR) Ethnicity: NR (France) | 45 | PDT (mean number of treatments 2.5, eyes=27) IVR 0.5 mg (mean number of treatments 3, eyes=18) |
| Yoon *et al* | Retrospective comparative study, 12-month f/u | Myopia | Mean age: 48.9 years % female: 82.5% Baseline VA: 75±13.5 letters Ethnicity: NR (S Korea) | 40 | IVR (mean number of injections 3.1, eyes=14) IVB (mean number of injections 2.2, eyes=28) |
| Lai *et al* | Retrospective comparative study, 24-month f/u | Pathological myopia | Mean age: 57.3 years % female: 62% Baseline VA: mean letters: IVB 66±19.5, IVR 48±21.5 Ethnicity: Chinese | 37 | IVB 1.25 mg (mean number of injections 3.8, eyes=22) IVR 0.5 mg (mean number of injections 3.8, eyes=15) |
| Ikuno *et al* | Retrospective comparative study, 24-month f/u | High myopia | Mean age: 67 years % female: 100% Baseline VA: mean letters: PDT 63±10, IVB 66±14.5, Ethnicity: Japanese | 31 | PDT (mean number of treatments 2.3, eyes=20) IVB 1 mg (mean number of injections 2.9, eyes=11) |
| Baba *et al* | Retrospective comparative study, 24-month f/u | Myopic CNV | Mean age: 82.4 years % female: NR Baseline VA: mean letters 62±12.5 (IVB), 68±12.5 (PDT) Ethnicity: Japanese | 24 | PDT (mean number of treatments 1.3, eyes=12) IVB 1.25 mg (mean number of injections 1.6, eyes=12) |
| Non-pathological CNV studies | | | | | |
| Kang and Koh | Retrospective comparative study, 24-month f/u | Idiopathic | Mean age: 35.12 years % female: 60% Baseline VA: mean letters: PDT 72±19, anti-VEGF 77±29.5 Ethnicity: NR (S. Korea) | 29 | PDT (mean number of treatments 1.33, eyes=14) Anti-VEGF (IVR 0.05mg=2 eyes, IVB 1.25 mg=13 eyes, mean number of injections 3.71, total eyes=15) |
| Parodi *et al* | Randomised controlled trial, 12-month f/u | Multifocal choroiditis | Mean age: 39 years % female: 66% Baseline VA: mean letters: PDT 78±10, IVB 76±10 Ethnicity: NR (Italy) | 27 | PDT (mean number of treatments NR, eyes=13) IVB (Mean number of injections NR, ‘loading phase of 3 monthly injections + further re-treatments’, eyes=14) |
| Comish *et al* | Retrospective comparative study, average f/u 149 months | Punctate inner choroidopathy | Mean age: 34.4 years % female: 88% Baseline VA: 82±15.5 mean letters Ethnicity: NR (Scotland) | 18 | IVB 1.25 mg (6 patients, mean number of injections 2.34) IVR 0.5 mg (3 patients, mean 2.34 injections) |

*Additional information taken from unpublished thesis, accessed at: http://www.docin.com/p-160870110.html.

CNV, choroidal neovascularisation; f/u, follow-up; FXT, fufang xueshuantong; IVB, intravitreal bevacizumab; IVR, intravitreal ranibizumab; NR, not reported; PDT, verteporfin photodynamic therapy, standard protocol as per verteporfin in photodynamic therapy study; TDS, three times daily; VA, visual acuity; VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor.
Randomised controlled trials

Pathological myopia

In the RADIANCE trial (eyes=277), an RCT of ranibizumab for CNV secondary to pathological myopia, the results for the three separate treatment arms are presented from the 3-month end point, as the control group received ranibizumab thereafter. Treatment arms consisted of two IVR groups re-treated based on different criteria (on the basis of assessed disease activity (DA), and on the basis of assessed disease stabilisation (STAB)) and a PDT group. Mean change in BCVA was the same in both IVR groups, at a gain of 10.6 letters. The mean decrease in CMT was 77.5, 60.9 and 12 µm between IVR DA, IVR STAB and PDT arms, respectively (statistical significance not reported). At 12 months, all three arms reported improvements in BCVA.

Other CNV causes

Parodi et al. compared the effectiveness of PDT and IVB in patients with subfoveal CNV secondary to multifocal choroiditis (eyes=27). They reported a mean gain of 9 letters in the IVB group compared with 1 letter in the PDT group at 12 months. The difference was statistically significant. The proportion of patients with a gain of ≥15 letters was 36% in the IVB group compared with 0% in the PDT group; 8% of patients in the PDT group had a loss of >15 letters compared with none in the IVB group (statistical significance not reported). The mean CMT change was 44 and 55 µm in the PDT and IVB groups, respectively (statistical significance not reported).

Comparative studies

Pathological myopia

Seven of the eight comparative studies were in PM (eyes=541). The mean change in BCVA improved for all anti-VEGF arms compared with PDT. In studies in which the gain in BCVA in anti-VEGF arms over PDT was reported as statistically significant, the gain was 6 to 12.5 letters.

The proportions of patients improving by >15 letters in the anti-VEGF groups ranged from 27.3% to 70%, however, neither of these groups reported statistical testing. In those in which a statistically significant difference was found (p≤0.05), the gain was 41.9% and 39.7% compared with 20.4% and 17.7% in the PDT groups, respectively.

Six of the seven comparative studies reported the proportion of patients with worsening vision. In all studies, there was a greater proportion that deteriorated ≥15 letters in the PDT groups versus the anti-VEGF groups.
Other CNV causes
One study\textsuperscript{32} was in idiopathic CNV (eyes=29). The gain in the anti-VEGF group was 17.5 vs 14 letters in the PDT group. In total 53.5\% of patients in the anti-VEGF group compared with 42.9\% of patients in the PDT group had a gain of >15 letters. No patients had a loss of >15 letters in the anti-VEGF group, compared with 21.3\% in the PDT group. All differences were reported as statistically significant.

Ranibizumab versus bevacizumab
Five studies compared IVR with IVB, four in PM\textsuperscript{23 24 28 29} and one in punctate inner choroidopathy,\textsuperscript{34} two were RCTs.\textsuperscript{23 24}

Randomised controlled trials
Pathological myopia Iacono\textit{ et al}\textsuperscript{80} (eyes=48) reported no statistically significant difference in either mean letter gain, or proportion improving by at least 15 letters between IVR and IVB groups. Of those worsening, slightly more deteriorated in the IVB group at 24\% versus 17\% in the IVR; statistical significance was not reported.

Similarly, Gharbiya\textit{ et al}\textsuperscript{84} (eyes=32) reported no statistically significant difference in the number of letters gained, or proportion of participants gaining more than 15 letters.

Comparative studies
Pathological myopia Yoon\textit{ et al}\textsuperscript{86} (eyes=40; IVB=26, IVR=14) reported no statistically significant difference between intervention groups, with a mean gain of 13.5 and 14 letters in IVR and IVB groups, respectively.

Lai\textit{ et al}\textsuperscript{39} (eyes=37, IVB=22, IVR=15) also did not report a statistically significant difference, with a mean gain of 14 and 25.5 letters between IVB and IVR groups, respectively.

Other CNV causes
Cornish\textit{ et al}\textsuperscript{34} studied treatment of punctate inner choroidopathy (eyes=18; IVB=6, IVR=12). Mean gain in BCVA was 23 letters in the IVR group and 8.5 letters in the IVB group. Sixty-seven per cent of patients in the IVR group had a gain of at least 15 letters versus 83\% in the IVR group. Statistical testing was not reported.

Other agents
Liu\textit{ et al}\textsuperscript{19} (eyes=42) compared IVB with no IVB in patients with PM taking oral FXT. In the IVB + FXT group, there was a mean improvement of 21 letters, and in the FXT group there was a statistically significant mean improvement of 10 letters.

Adverse events
Twelve studies reported no adverse events occurring, and one study did not present adverse event data. Generally speaking, anti-VEGF therapy, compared with PDT, had fewer significant adverse events (eg, endophthalmitis, retinal detachment, systemic events). Adverse events in the RADIANCE trial were similar between IVR and PDT.\textsuperscript{13} El Matri\textit{ et al}\textsuperscript{87} reported two cases of endophthalmitis (6.6\%) and one vitreous haemorrhage (3.3\%) in the IVB group. Only one study that compared IVR with IVB reported on adverse events (worsening of cataract, increase in myopic foveoschisis, retinal detachment, macular hole, systemic events); there were similar adverse events in both groups (table 5).\textsuperscript{29}

DISCUSSION
Statement of principal findings
Evidence from RCTs and non-randomised comparative studies shows that anti-VEGF therapies show consistent benefit in non-ARMD CNV conditions. When compared with the previous ‘gold-standard’ (PDT), anti-VEGFs result in greater improvements in BCVA. There was no robust evidence to suggest superiority of ranibizumab or bevacizumab.

Strengths and limitations
The search strategy was robust and broad with no language restrictions, and included grey literature. Two reviewers screened titles and abstracts. Risk of bias in studies was assessed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias

| Study | Participants selected from same cohort | Comparability of participants | Assessment of outcome | Incomplete data | Selective reporting |
|-------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Yoon\textit{ et al}\textsuperscript{26} | Low risk | Low risk | High risk | Low risk | Low risk |
| Hayashi\textit{ et al}\textsuperscript{85} | Low risk | Low risk | High risk | Low risk | Low risk |
| El Matri\textit{ et al}\textsuperscript{20} | Low risk | Low risk | High risk | Low risk | Unclear |
| Dethorey\textit{ et al}\textsuperscript{81} | Low risk | Unclear | High risk | High risk | High risk |
| Yoon\textit{ et al}\textsuperscript{88} | Low risk | Low risk | Unclear | Low risk | Low risk |
| Lai\textit{ et al}\textsuperscript{39} | Low risk | Low risk | Unclear | Low risk | Low risk |
| Ikuno\textit{ et al}\textsuperscript{80} | High risk | Low risk | High risk | Low risk | Low risk |
| Baba\textit{ et al}\textsuperscript{41} | Low risk | Low risk | High risk | Low risk | Low risk |
| Kang and Koh\textsuperscript{32} | Low risk | Unclear | High risk | Low risk | Low risk |
| Cornish\textit{ et al}\textsuperscript{34} | Low risk | Unclear | High risk | Low risk | Low risk |

Table 3 Risk of bias of non-randomised comparative studies using modified Newcastle-Ottawa Scale
| Study                  | Study type and f/u | Interventions | Treatment regime                                                                 | Mean number of injections/treatments over f/u period |
|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| Iacono et al<sup>23</sup> | Randomised, double-blind clinical trial, 18-month f/u | IVR           | Re-treatment PRN, criteria not specified                                          | 2.56±1.61                                           |
| Liu et al<sup>19</sup>  | Randomised controlled trial, 12-month f/u            | IVB           | Three initial monthly loading injections.FA review at 3 months,re-treatment based on leakage | 4.23±2.02                                           |
|                       |                                                              | IVB+FXT      | Three initial monthly loading injections. FA review at 3 months, re-treatment based on leakage | 1.95±1.90                                           |
| Gharbiya et al<sup>24</sup> | Randomised controlled trial 6-month f/u | IVR           | Assessed for re-treatment monthly based on presence of fluorescein leakage on FA or subretinal fluid on OCT | 2.81                                               |
|                       |                                                              | IVB           | Assessed at 1 week, 1 month, and monthly after each additional injection. Re-treatment based on dye leakage on FA | 1.6±0.7                                            |
| Wolf et al<sup>13</sup> | Randomised controlled trial, double blind, 12-month f/u | IVR (DA group) | Day 1, thereafter based on DA criteria                                            | 2.0                                                |
|                       |                                                              | IVR (STAB group) | Day 1, month 1, thereafter based on STAB criteria                                | 4.0                                                |
|                      |                                                              | PDT           | Day 1, then treated with IVR or PDT at 3-month f/u based on investigator discretion | 2.0                                                |
| Hayashi et al<sup>25</sup> | Prospective comparative study, 12-month f/u | PDT           | At baseline, re-treatment as per VIP and TAP protocols                            | 1.43±0.78                                          |
|                       |                                                              | IVB           | Assessed at 1 week, 1 month and 3 monthly thereafter. Re-treatment based on dye leakage on FA | 1.6±0.7                                            |
| Yoon et al<sup>26</sup> | Retrospective comparative, 12 mth f/u                 | Controls      | NA                                                                                | N/A                                               |
|                       |                                                              | PDT           | Re-treatment 3 monthly if leakage on FA or subretinal fluid on OCT                 | 2.1±1.4                                            |
|                       |                                                              | Anti-VEGF (IVB/IVR) | Assessed at 1 week, 1 month and 3 monthly thereafter. Re-treatment based on leakage on FA or subretinal fluid on OCT | 2.2±2.0                                            |
|                       |                                                              | Combination tx | PDT, followed by IVB/IVR at one hour. Assessed at 1 week, month and 3 monthly thereafter. Re-treatment based on leakage on FA or subretinal fluid on OCT | PDT 1.9±1.3                                        |
| El Matri et al<sup>20</sup> | Retrospective comparative study, 12-month f/u         | PDT           | Assessed 3 monthly by FA, re-treatment based on presence of fluid on OCT or leakage on FA | 1.55                                               |
| El Matri et al<sup>27</sup> | Retrospective comparative study, 24-month f/u         | IVB           | Assessed monthly, re-treatment based on persistence of metamorphosia, decrease in BCVA or leakage/flow on fluid on FA | 1.8                                                |
| Dethorey et al<sup>11</sup> | Retrospective comparative study, median f/u; PDT group 53 months, IVR group 13.5 months | PDT           | Re-treatment based on clinical progression, leakage on FA, and fluid on OCT       | 3.0                                                |
| Yoon et al<sup>28</sup>  | Retrospective comparative study, 12-month f/u         | IVR           | Assessed at 1 week, 1 month, and monthly thereafter. Re-treatment based on decreased VA, increased metamorphosia or change of OCT FA findings | 3.1±2.4                                            |

Continued
| Study                  | Study type and f/u                                      | Interventions | Treatment regime                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Mean number of injections/treatments over f/u period |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Lai et al              | Retrospective comparative study, 24-month f/u          | IVB           | Three initial loading doses at 0, 1 and 2 months. Re-treatment with course of 3 injections at monthly intervals in eyes with new symptoms/recurrent angiographic leakage                                                                 | 3.8                                           |
|                       |                                                        | IVR           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 3.8                                           |
| Ikuno et al            | Retrospective comparative study, 24-month f/u          | PDT           | Assessed at 3 months with FA, re-treatment based on CNV persistence. Re-treatment interval 3 monthly                                                                                                                                   | 2.3±1.2                                       |
|                       |                                                        | IVB           | Assessed monthly by OCT, and injections repeated until resolution of subretinal fluid                                                                                                                                                      | 2.9±2.4                                       |
| Baba et al             | Retrospective comparative study, 24-month f/u          | PDT           | Assessed 3 monthly, treatments repeated if BCVA decreased by >2 lines, or retinal oedema on OCT                                                                                                                                           | 1.3                                           |
|                       |                                                        | IVB           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 1.6                                           |
| Other causes of CNV    | Retrospective comparative study, 24-month f/u          | PDT           | Assessed 3 monthly, Re-treatment based on leakage on FA/ subretinal fluid on OCT                                                                                                                                                    | 1.33±1.01                                     |
| Kang and Koh           | Retrospective comparative study, 24-month f/u          | Anti-VEGF     | Assessed at 1 week, 1 month, thereafter 3 monthly. Re-treatment based on leakage on FA or subretinal fluid on OCT—maximum monthly PRN                                                                                                      | 3.71±0.38                                     |
|                       |                                                        | (IVB/IVR)     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                               |
| Parodi et al           | Randomised controlled trial, 12-month f/u              | PDT           | Assessed 3 monthly by FA, re-treatment based on leakage                                                                                                                                                                                     | 1.7±0.7                                       |
|                       |                                                        | IVB           | Loading phase of 3 monthly injections, thereafter re-treatment based on fluid on OCT/leakage on FA at monthly assessment                                                                                                                   | 3.8±1.1                                       |
| Cornish et al          | Retrospective comparative study, average f/u 14.9 months| IVR           | n=2, 3 monthly loading course, monthly PRN thereafter n=1, variable dosing of single injections PRN                                                                                                                                       | 2.9±1.7                                       |
|                       |                                                        | IVB           | Single injections PRN at monthly intervals, based on presence of subretinal fluid on OCT                                                                                                                                                   |                                               |

BCVA, best-corrected visual acuity; CNV, choroidal neovascularisation; DA, disease activity; f/u, Follow-up; FA, fluoroscein angiography; FXT, futang xueshuantong; IVB, intravitreal bevacizumab; IVR, intravitreal ranibizumab; NA, not applicable; OCT, optical coherence tomography; PDT, verteporfin photodynamic therapy, standard protocol as per verteporfin in photodynamic therapy study; PRN, as required; TAP, treatment of age-related macular degeneration; TDS, three times daily; VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor; VIP, verteporfin in photodynamic therapy.
| Study                        | Study type and f/u                      | Interventions | Numbers | Change in mean BCVA | Proportion improving | Proportion worsening | Decrease in mean CMT (µm) | Adverse events |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------|---------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Results: pathological myopia group | Iacono et al. (2004) | Randomised, double-blind clinical trial, 18-month f/u | IVR: 23 | +9±1.3 letters | 30% (at least 15 letters) | 17% (≥5 letters) | NR | None |
|                             |                                        | IVB: 25       |         | +8.5±1.25 letters* | 40% (at least 15 letters) | 24% (≥5 letters)† | NR | None |
|                             | Liu et al. (2003)                      | Randomised controlled trial, 12-month f/u | IVR+FXT: 22 | +21±10 letters | NR | NR | 43.41 | None |
|                             |                                        | IVR: 25       |         | +9.75±9.5 letters† | 56.2% (≥15 letters) | None | 45 | None |
|                             | Gharbiya et al. (2004)                 | Randomised controlled trial 6-month f/u | IVR: 16 | +17.31±11.10 letters | NR | NR | 52* | None |
|                             |                                        | IVB: 16       |         | +15.87±8.41 letters* | 62.5% (≥15 letters) | None | 52* | None |
|                             | Wolf et al. (2003)                     | Randomised controlled trial, double blind, 12-month f/u | IVR (DA group): 116 | +10.6 letters | 43.1% (gain of ≥15 letters) | NR | 77.5 | Retinopathy: 1 (0.85%) |
|                             |                                        | IVR (STAB group): 106 |         | +10.6 letters | 38.1% (gain of ≥15 letters) | NR | 60.9 | Vitreous detachment: 1 (0.94%) |
|                             |                                        | PDT: 55       |         | +2.2 letters† | 14.5% (gain of ≥15 letters)† | NR | 12† | Cataract: 1 (6.67%) |
|                             | Yoon et al. (2004)                     | Retrospective comparative study, 12-month f/u | PDT: 51 | −3.1 letters | 17.7% (gain of ≥15 letters)† | NR | NR | None |
|                             | Anti-VEGF (IVB/IVR): 63               |             |         | +12.2 letters | 39.7% (gain of ≥15 letters) | NR | NR | None |
|                             | Combination tx: 28                    |             |         | +4.6 letters† | 21.4% (gain of ≥15 letters)† | NR | NR | None |
|                             | Hayashi et al. (2004)                  | Prospective comparative study, 12-month f/u | PDT: 44 | +4 letters | 20.4% (gain of ≥15 letters) | 9.1% (>15 letter loss) | NR | None |
|                             | IVR: 43                               |             |         | +11.5 letters | 41.9% (gain of ≥15 letters) | 4.7% (>15 letter loss)† | NR | None |
|                             | Controls: 74                          |             |         | +14.5 letters† | 22.5% (≥15 letters) | 30% (≥15 letters) | 41 | None |
|                             | PDT: 40                               |             |         | +15 letters† | 70% (≥15 letters)† | 10% (≥15 letters)† | 115.5‡ | None |
|                             | El Matri et al. (2004)                 | Retrospective comparative study, 12-month f/u | PDT: 30 | NR | 6.6% (≥15 letters) | 13.3% (≥15 letters) | 45.5 | None |
|                             | IVR: 30                               |             |         | NR (But reports statistically significant improvement in BCVA in IVB group over PDT group at 24 months) | 36.6% (≥15 letters)* | 10% (≥15 letters)† | 121.7 | Endophthalmitis: Two eyes (6.6%) |
|                             | El Matri et al. (2004)                 | Retrospective comparative study, 24-month f/u | PDT: 30 | NR | 6.6% (≥15 letters) | 13.3% (≥15 letters) | 45.5 | None |
|                             | IVR: 30                               |             |         | NR (But reports statistically significant improvement in BCVA in IVB group over PDT group at 24 months) | 36.6% (≥15 letters)* | 10% (≥15 letters)† | 121.7 | Endophthalmitis: Two eyes (6.6%) |
|                             | Dethorey et al. (2004)                 | Retrospective comparative study, median f/u; PDT group 53 months, IVR group 13.5 months | PDT: (27) | No change | 23.1% (≥15 letters) | 34.6% (≥15 letters) | NR | None |
|                             |                                        | At 12 months, eyes=26 |         | +15 letters* | 27.3% (≥15 letters)† | 9.1% (≥15 letters)† | 59† | None |
|                             | IVR: (18)                             |             |         | At 12 months, eyes=11 | 23.1% (≥15 letters) | 34.6% (≥15 letters) | NR | None |
|                             | Dethorey et al. (2004)                 | Retrospective comparative study, median f/u; PDT group 53 months, IVR group 13.5 months | IVR: (18) | No change | 23.1% (≥15 letters) | 34.6% (≥15 letters) | NR | None |
|                             |                                        | At 12 months, eyes=11 |         | +15 letters* | 27.3% (≥15 letters)† | 9.1% (≥15 letters)† | 59† | None |
| Study                | Study type and f/u                  | Interventions | Numbers | Change in mean BCVA                  | Proportion improving | Proportion worsening | Decrease in mean CMT (µm) | Adverse events                      |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|---------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Yoon et al<sup>28</sup> | Retrospective comparative study, 12-month f/u | IVR           | 14      | +13±11.5 letters                     | NR                   | NR                   | NR                        | None                               |
|                     |                                    | IVB           | 26      | +14±12 letters*                      | NR                   | NR                   | NR                        | Worsening of cataract: 2 (9%)       |
|                     |                                    |               |         |                                      |                      |                      |                           | Increase in myopic foveoschisis: 1 (4.5%) |
|                     |                                    |               |         |                                      |                      |                      |                           | Retinal detachment: 1 (4.5%)        |
|                     |                                    |               |         |                                      |                      |                      |                           | Macular hole: 1 (4.5%)            |
|                     |                                    |               |         |                                      |                      |                      |                           | Systemic events: None              |
| Lai et al<sup>29</sup> | Retrospective comparative study, 24-month f/u | IVB           | 22      | +14 letters                          | NR                   | NR                   | NR                        | Worsening of cataract: 1 (6.6%)     |
|                     |                                    |               |         |                                      |                      |                      |                           | Increase in myopic foveoschisis: 1 (6.6%) |
|                     |                                    |               |         |                                      |                      |                      |                           | Cellophane maculopathy: 1 (6.6%)   |
|                     |                                    |               |         |                                      |                      |                      |                           | Systemic events: None              |
|                     |                                    |               |         |                                      |                      |                      |                           | Subretinal haemorrhage: 1 (9%)    |
|                     |                                    |               |         |                                      |                      |                      |                           | None                               |
| Ikuno et al<sup>30</sup> | Retrospective comparative study, 24-month f/u | PDT           | 20      | 9 letter loss                        | 0% (≥15 letters)     | 20% (≥15 letters)    | NR                        | None                               |
|                     |                                    | IVB           | 11      | +6 letters‡                         | 36% (≥15 letters)†    | 18% (≥15 letters)†   | NR                        | None                               |
| Baba et al<sup>31</sup> | Retrospective comparative study, 24-month f/u | PDT           | 12      | +0.5 letters‡                       | 41.7% (>5 letters)‡   | NR                   | 107                       | None                               |
|                     |                                    | IVB           | 12      | +12.5 letters‡                      | 66.7% (>5 letters)‡   | NR                   | 93*                       | None                               |
| Non-pathological myopia group | Retrospective comparative study, 24-month f/u (idiopathic) | PDT           | 14      | +7 letters                          | 42.9% (15 letters)   | 21.3% (15 letters)    | NR                        | None                               |
| Kang and Koh<sup>32</sup> | Retrospective comparative study, 24-month f/u (idiopathic) | Anti-VEGF (IVR/IVB) | 15 | +17.5 letters‡                      | 53.5% (15 letters)‡   | 0%‡                     | NR                         | None                               |
| Parodi et al<sup>33</sup> | Randomised controlled trial, 12-month f/u (Multifocal choroiditis) | PDT           | 13      | +1 letter                          | 0% (gain of >15 letters) | 8% (loss of >15 letters) | 44                       | None                               |
| Comish, et al<sup>34</sup> | Retrospective comparative study, average f/u 14.9 months (punctate inner choroidopathy) | IVR           | 3       | +23 letters                         | 36% (gain of >15 letters)‡ | 0% (loss of >15 letters)‡ | 55†                       | None                               |
|                     |                                    | IVB           | 6       | +8.5 letters†                       | 67% (15 letters)‡     | 33% (15 letters)      | 16% (15 letters)†         | None                               |

*No statistically significant difference between intervention groups.
†Statistically significant difference not reported.
‡Statistically significant difference between intervention groups (p≤0.05).

BCVA, best-corrected visual acuity; CMT, central macular thickness; DA, disease activity; f/u, follow-up; FXT, fufang xuehuantong; IVB, intravitreal bevacizumab; IVR, intravitreal ranibizumab; NR, not reported; PDT, verteporfin photodynamic therapy, standard protocol as per verteporfin in photodynamic therapy study; VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor.
Tool for RCTs and a modified Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for comparative studies. Only studies with at least 6 months of follow-up were included to increase meaningfulness of outcomes.

A major limitation of this review was that the majority of evidence pertains to CNV caused by PM, however, this reflects the available evidence base in the literature. The included non-PM CNV conditions such as PIC, and POHS are of such rarity that it is unlikely there will ever be large RCTs of their treatment. Many of the non-randomised comparative studies were small and of low quality. There was one large industry-funded trial assessing ranibizumab, but none assessing bevacizumab.

Methodological heterogeneity between studies was too high to allow meta-analysis. Baseline BCVA varied considerably between studies, as did treatment regimes. No study reported on vision-related quality of life as an outcome measure, arguably the most important. Studies were powered for clinical efficacy, not to detect adverse events.

The largest RCT included in our review (RADIANCE) was limited by the fact that although the entire follow-up period was 12 months, after 3 months, patients were eligible to cross over into other arms of the study. We therefore have presented only 3-month data, as the relevance of the data after this point is questionable.

**Context of these results**

This is the first systematic review to include all causes of CNV except ARMD. Wang et al. undertook a systematic review of anti-VEGFs in CNV secondary to only PM. It did not include the RADIANCE study or undertake as broad a search. The authors concluded that the evidence supported anti-VEGF agents as first-line treatment, which supports our findings.

Bevacizumab is considerably cheaper. However, due to commercial reasons, it is unlikely ever to be licensed for intravitreal use. The CATT study demonstrated that bevacizumab and ranibizumab have equivalent effects on visual acuity in neovascular ARMD.

A recent systematic review of the treatments for macular oedema secondary to central retinal vein occlusion examined anti-VEGF agents, including bevacizumab and ranibizumab, and concluded that they were similar in improving visual acuity, and there was no evidence of difference in adverse events.

Anti-VEGF agents are used off-label for the treatment of CNV secondary to conditions other than ARMD or PM. There are multiple case series that support their effectiveness. All case series are subject to several methodological weaknesses, most importantly, publication bias and lack of comparator groups. Troutbeck et al. reported on the use of IVR in 41 patients with a range of conditions complicated by CNV, including multifocal choroiditis, peripapillary CNV, angioid streaks, central serous chorioretinopathy, macular telangiectasia and idiopathic CNV. They reported that 25–43% of patients experienced 15 letter or greater improvement in vision. Chang et al. used bevacizumab in 39 eyes in the treatment of CNV associated with either multifocal choroiditis, angioid streaks, myopic and also idiopathic CNV. Median BCVA improved from 76 letters at baseline, to 85 letters at mean follow-up of 58.8 weeks, and there were no adverse events.

**What do these results mean for clinical practice?**

The evidence for the use of anti-VEGF in the treatment of CNV associated with ARMD and, recently, PM is well established. The evidence for the use of these agents in the treatment of CNV complicating other diseases is mixed. This represents a heterogeneous group of conditions, often found in younger people and frequently with devastating visual outcomes. Despite a limited evidence base, the use of anti-VEGF therapy is likely to provide the best outcomes for patients. Patients expect and demand treatment in advance of best evidence being available, and healthcare planners and commissioners need to make decisions about the use of anti-VEGF molecules in these circumstances with limited evidence base for the relatively rare cases. Marginal cost–benefit analysis is often used in these circumstances, and this is likely to be favourable if it takes account of the overall costs to society and the individual patient in the event of a devastating loss of vision. Given that anti-VEGFs are superior to PDT and its use is off-label in treatment of CNV secondary to conditions other that ARMD and PM, considering the cheapest drug (sourced and administered) would prove to be the most cost effective and affordable option for clinical commissioners.

**Further research**

While the use of anti-VEGFs in ARMD and, recently, PM has been investigated in a number of large robustly conducted RCTs, there is a corresponding lack of high-quality, long-term evidence for the use of these drugs in CNV of other causes.
Large RCTs with head-to-head comparison of anti-VEGFs and other standard treatments are unlikely to be conducted in CNV secondary to conditions other than ARMD or PM, because of the heterogeneous and rare nature of these conditions. It may also be unethical to randomise participants to PDT considering the evidence that currently exists, and that the scientific equipoise is more in favour of anti-VEGFs. High-quality multicentre comparative studies which compare different anti-VEGFs are needed, especially considering the cost difference. This will become more important with the advent of aflibercept which has recently been licensed for choroidal neovascularisation secondary to pathological myopia.41

Further, small case series are unlikely to change clinical practice. Further studies are needed to establish the place of each anti-VEGF in the treatment pathway, and the frequency of injection.

CONCLUSIONS
Bevacizumab and ranibizumab appear to be more effective in improving visual acuity in patients with CNV secondary to pathological myopia. Based on the current knowledge of the condition, small RCTs, non-randomised comparative studies and robust RCT data from other conditions, clinicians should consider bevacicu- zumab or ranibizumab as an option for treating patients with CNV secondary to other rarer causes. There is no evidence of difference in outcomes between bevacizu- mab and ranibizumab.
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