

Supplementary Material

Foveal eversion is associated with high persistence of macular edema and visual acuity deterioration in retinal vein occlusion

Alessandro Arrigo MD,PhD, Emanuela Aragona MD,PhD, Alessio Antropoli MD, Lorenzo Bianco MD, Andrea Rosolia MD, Andrea Saladino MD, Francesco Bandello MD,FEBO, Maurizio Battaglia Parodi MD.

Department of Ophthalmology, IRCCS San Raffaele Scientific Institute, Milan, Italy

Corresponding Author

Alessandro Arrigo MD,PhD, Department of Ophthalmology, IRCCS San Raffaele Scientific Institute, via Olgettina 60, Milan, 20132, Italy

Tel: +390226432648

Fax: +390226432648

Email: alessandro.arrigo@hotmail.com

Table 1: Clinical data of CRVO eyes with and without foveal eversion.

Table 1			
Parameter	CRVO FE	CRVO No FE	p Value
Number of eyes	64	104	
Months of follow-up	48 ± 25	34 ± 23	
Gender (M/F)	40/24 (63%/37%)	72/32 (69%/31%)	>0.05
Age (Years)	70 ± 12	65 ± 16	>0.05
Cataract surgery	23 (36%)	30 (29%)	>0.05
LogMAR BCVA baseline	0.6 ± 0.4	0.6 ± 0.4	>0.05
LogMAR BCVA after 12 months	0.5 ± 0.4	0.4 ± 0.5	>0.05
LogMAR BVCA last	0.7 ± 0.4	0.5 ± 0.5	<0.01
p Value BCVA baseline vs last	>0.05	>0.05	
CMT baseline	636 ± 217	514 ± 220	<0.01
CMT after 12 months	465 ± 222	356 ± 249	<0.01
CMT last	443 ± 248	277 ± 90	<0.01
p Value CMT baseline vs last	<0.01	<0.01	
Laser (Y/N)	20 (31%)	31 (30%)	>0.05
iRVO (Y/N)	20 (31%)	37 (35%)	>0.05
N. of Intravitreal Injections	12 ± 8	6 ± 7	

Table 2: Clinical and imaging data among different foveal eversion patterns in CRVO. For simplicity, considering the lower number of eyes, the statistical comparison has been done considering FE pattern 1a + 1b vs FE pattern 2.

Table 2				
Parameter	CRVO FE Pattern 1a	CRVO FE Pattern 1b	CRVO FE Pattern 2	p Value (1a+1b vs 2)
Number of eyes	6	17	41	
Gender (M/F)	3/3 (50%/50%)	12/5 (70%/30%)	25/16 (61%/39%)	>0.05
Age (Years)	64 ± 11	70 ± 10	70 ± 13	>0.05
Cataract surgery	3 (50%)	5 (30%)	15 (36%)	>0.05
LogMAR BCVA baseline	0.5 ± 0.3	0.5 ± 0.3	0.6 ± 0.4	>0.05
LogMAR BCVA after 12 months	0.4 ± 0.3	0.4 ± 0.4	0.6 ± 0.4	>0.05
LogMAR BVCA last	0.6 ± 0.5	0.6 ± 0.4	0.8 ± 0.3	<0.01
p Value BCVA baseline vs last	>0.05	>0.05	<0.05	
CMT baseline	650 ± 200	650 ± 215	630 ± 224	>0.05
CMT after 12 months	493 ± 254	400 ± 154	487 ± 240	>0.05
CMT last	304 ± 163	457 ± 267	458 ± 248	>0.05
p Value CMT baseline vs last	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	
Laser (Y/N)	2/4 (33%/66%)	6/11 (35%/65%)	12/29 (29%/71%)	>0.05
iRVO (Y/N)	1/5 (20%/80%)	2/15 (13%/87%)	17/24 (41%/59%)	<0.01
N. of Injections	13 ± 8	11 ± 8	12 ± 9	

Table 3: Clinical data of BRVO eyes with and without foveal eversion.

Table 3 Parameter	BRVO FE	BRVO No FE	p Value
Number of eyes	25	91	
Months of follow-up	44 ± 25	34 ± 23	
Gender (M/F)	9/16 (36%/64%)	47/44 (52%/48%)	>0.05
Age (Years)	72±11	71±11	>0.05
Cataract surgery	9 (36%)	30 (33%)	>0.05
LogMAR BCVA baseline	0.6 ± 0.3	0.4 ± 0.3	<0.01
LogMAR BCVA after 12 months	0.5 ± 0.3	0.3 ± 0.3	<0.01
LogMAR BVCA last	0.5 ± 0.4	0.3 ± 0.4	<0.01
p Value BCVA baseline vs last	>0.05	>0.05	
CMT baseline	567 ± 190	485 ± 160	<0.01
CMT after 12 months	438 ± 151	350 ± 94	<0.01
CMT last	417 ± 152	278 ± 77	<0.01
p Value CMT baseline vs last	<0.01	<0.01	
Laser (Y/N)	9/16 (36%/64%)	41/50 (45%/55%)	>0.05
iRVO (Y/N)	9/16 (36%/64%)	41/50 (45%/55%)	>0.05
N. of Injections	10 ± 9	5 ± 5	

Table 4: Clinical and imaging data among different foveal eversion patterns in BRVO. For simplicity, considering the lower number of eyes, the statistical comparison has been done considering FE pattern 1a + 1b vs FE pattern 2.

Table 4 Parameter	BRVO FE pattern 1a + 1b	BRVO FE pattern 2	p Value (1a+1b vs 2)
Number of eyes	8	17	
Gender (M/F)	4/4 (50%/50%)	5/12 (29%/71%)	>0.05
Age (Years)	67 ± 14	74 ± 10	>0.05
Cataract surgery	3 (37%)	6 (35 %)	>0.05
LogMAR BCVA baseline	0.5 ± 0.2	0.6 ± 0.3	>0.05
LogMAR BCVA after 12 months	0.3 ± 0.2	0.5 ± 0.3	<0.05
LogMAR BVCA last	0.3 ± 0.3	0.6 ± 0.4	<0.05
p Value BCVA baseline vs last	>0.05	>0.05	
CMT baseline	537 ± 112	581 ± 219	>0.05
CMT after 12 months	422 ± 115	446 ± 168	>0.05
CMT last	415 ± 177	418 ± 161	>0.05
p Value CMT baseline vs last	<0.05	<0.05	
Laser (Y/N)	2/6 (25%/75%)	7/10 (41%/59%)	<0.05
iRVO (Y/N)	2/6 (25%/75%)	7/10 (41%/59%)	<0.05
N. of Injections	8 ± 7	11 ± 9	

Table 5: Resumed distribution of resolved, recurrent and persistent macular edema in CRVO and BRVO eyes with and without foveal eversion. For simplicity, for BRVO eyes, considering the lower number of eyes, the statistical comparison has been done considering FE pattern 1a + 1b vs FE pattern 2.

Table 5	Macular Edema		
	Resolved	Recurrent	Persistent
CRVO FE Pattern 1a	3 (50%)	2 (34%)	1 (16%)
CRVO FE Pattern 1b	8 (48%)	5 (29%)	4 (23%)
CRVO FE Pattern 2	8 (19%)	9 (22%)	24 (59%)
CRVO No FE	65 (63%)	30 (29%)	9 (8%)
<hr/>			
BRVO FE Pattern 1a + 1b	4 (50%)	2 (25%)	2 (25%)
BRVO FE Pattern 2	4 (23.5%)	4 (23.5%)	9 (53%)
BRVO No FE	56 (61%)	28 (31%)	7 (8%)