

- Lacey J, Cate H, Broadway DC. Barriers to adherence with glaucoma medications: a qualitative research study. *Eye* 2009; **23**(4): 924–932.
- Shemesh G, Moisseiev E, Lazar M, Kurtz S. Intraocular pressure reduction of fixed combination timolol maleate 0.5% and dorzolamide 2% (Cosopt) administered three times a day. *Clin Ophthalmol* 2012; **6**: 283–287.
- Riedmann D, Jung M, Hackl WO, Stuhlinger W, van der Sijs H, Ammenwerth E. Development of a context model to prioritize drug safety alerts in CPOE systems. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* 2011; **11**: 35.

J Theodossiadis¹, S Shah¹ and I Murdoch^{1,2}

¹Glaucoma Service, Moorfields Eye Hospital, London, UK

²Institute of Ophthalmology, London, UK
E-mail: Julia.Theo@moorfields.nhs.uk

Eye (2014) **28**, 774–775; doi:10.1038/eye.2014.54;
published online 28 March 2014

Sir, Preventable eye injuries while fly fishing

The article by Morris *et al*¹ prompts me to bring to readers' attention the risks inherent in the fly-fishing technique known as Spey casting, when the fly line with attached 'fly', tied on a single, double, or treble hook, is cast first to the left, then the right, and then forwards, the line being all the time in front of the angler so that obstructions behind—such as trees—are not inadvertently hooked.

In June 2013, I was Spey casting on the Lower Oykel river, Highland, with a variable wind blowing sometimes up- and sometimes downstream. A sharp 'crack' caused the ghillie, sitting some 50 m away on the bank, to ask 'What was that?' It was the fly shattering my right spectacle lens, which fell into several pieces when removed from the frame. Had I not been wearing glasses, my eye would have been destroyed.

Some weeks later, two unsolicited catalogues advertising angling products arrived; both had in their fishing lines section photographs of men Spey casting without eye protection. I wrote to both angling companies enclosing the attached photo (Figure 1). One



Figure 1 Glasses damaged while Spey casting in a strong wind.

responded, indicating that they would bring the matter to the (subcontracted) advertiser's attention—the other did not reply.

Could our College have a role in promoting the use of safety glasses in this situation? For an example see: www.oveRxcast.com.

Conflict of interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Reference

- Morris DS, Willis S, Minassian D, Foot B, Desai P, MacEwen CJ. The incidence of serious eye injury in Scotland: a prospective study. *Eye (Lond)* 2014; **28**(1): 34–40.

RD Finlay

Eye Unit, Royal United Hospital, Bath, UK
E-mail: finlay@doctors.org.uk

Eye (2014) **28**, 775; doi:10.1038/eye.2014.57; published online 14 March 2014

Sir, Response to 'Preventable eye injuries while fly fishing'

We thank Mr Finlay¹ for drawing your readers attention to the inherent dangers of Spey casting while fly fishing, and indeed the general danger to the eye from any form of fishing, from his own personal experience. It is interesting to note that injuries from fishing accounted for 1% of all those reported injuries in the 2009 Scottish Ocular Trauma Study (unpublished data) and 1.7% in the 1992 Scottish Ocular Trauma Study.²

We are aware that the American Academy of Ophthalmology is involved in eye injury prevention with their 'EyeSmart' program (<http://www.geteyesmart.org/eyesmart/>), and acknowledge that similar campaigns in the UK (http://www.nib.org.uk/eyehealth/lookingafteryoureyes/Pages/safe_eyes.aspx) have had a prominent role in eye injury prevention, but we would urge caution on focusing on a specific area like fishing without gathering more evidence of the incidence of injury and risk involved.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Finlay RD. Preventable eye injuries while fly fishing. *Eye* 2014; **28**: 775.
- Desai P, MacEwen CJ, Baines P, Minassian DC. Incidence of cases of ocular trauma admitted to hospital and incidence of blinding outcome. *Br J Ophthalmol* 1996; **80**(7): 585.

DS Morris¹, P Desai² and CJ MacEwen³

¹Cardiff Eye Unit, University Hospital of Wales, Cardiff, UK

²Moorfields Eye Hospital, London, UK

³University Department of Ophthalmology, Ninewells Hospital, Dundee, UK

E-mail: dsm@doctors.org.uk

Eye (2014) **28**, 775–776; doi:10.1038/eye.2014.58; published online 14 March 2014

Sir,
Urrets-Zavalía syndrome as a complication of ocular hypotonia due to intravenous cidofovir treatment

Cidofovir (HPMPC) is widely used for the treatment of CMV retinitis and is also effective against VZV and HSV.¹

This treatment can be responsible for two ocular side effects: anterior uveitis and severe and prolonged ocular hypotony.^{1,2} Ocular hypotony can be irreversible despite specific treatment with poor visual prognosis.^{1,2} The suspected physio-pathogenic mechanism of this complication is a direct toxicity of cidofovir on the ciliary body.^{2,3}

Case report

A 67-year-old female was referred for ophthalmologic monitoring while receiving intravenous cidofovir treatment initiated for extensive recurrent laryngotracheal papillomatosis diagnosed in 2003. Her past medical history included hyperthyroidism, asthma, hiatus hernia, and ovarian cysts. She had no history of diabetes mellitus and did not receive any ocular therapy. Between April 2004 and October 2005, she underwent three laser excisions with intralesional injections of 2 ml of cidofovir (75 mg/ml). She was greatly improved with a normal tracheal appearance for 5 years. A recurrence occurred requiring two laser excisions with intralesional injections in 2010. In December 2011, this laryngotracheal papillomatosis caused supraglottic respiratory signs. Due to the extension of the lesion, it was decided to treat this patient with intravenous (IV) cidofovir (dose: 4 mg/kg) every two weeks instead of intralesional injections or aerosol.

She was first examined in Ophthalmology two weeks after the second IV cidofovir injection. Her best corrected visual acuity (BCVA) was 20/20 RE and 20/25 LE. There was no uveitis at this time. Intraocular pressure (IOP) was 14 mm Hg both eyes. A week later, right BCVA was unchanged but the left eye had decreased to 20/50. Mild bilateral anterior uveitis was observed without iridocapsular synechiae. IOP was still normal and the posterior segment was unremarkable. Given the effectiveness of IV cidofovir on severe respiratory symptoms, this treatment was continued. Local treatment consisted of dexamethasone eye drops three times a day and atropine eye drops 1% twice a day. The patient returned for consultation two weeks later and complained of vision decrease. Her BCVA was 20/33 RE and 20/100 LE. Bilateral Descemet's folds were present.

But they were more noticeable on the left cornea. There was still bilateral anterior uveitis. IOP was 10 mm Hg RE and 8 mm Hg LE. Fundus examination of the right eye revealed macular folds. In the left eye, it found a large temporal choroidal detachment extending from the macular region to the temporal ora serrata and a left ciliary body edema of yellowish white appearance. Its extent was difficult to ascertain because of the choroidal detachment masking the periphery. Intravenous cidofovir was discontinued. Frequency of steroid therapy was increased (five times a day). However, IOP continued to decrease and stabilized at 8 mm Hg RE and 3 mm Hg LE after one week. One month later, it was possible to discontinue topical atropine therapy and to taper off topical dexamethasone as IOP improved and stabilized between 10 and 12 mm Hg both eyes. BCVA improves to 20/20 and the fundus appearance returned to normal in the right eye. In the left eye, BCVA remained reduced to 20/100 due to hypotony maculopathy. The right pupil became normally reactive when atropine was discontinued, but a mydriasis persisted on the left eye over one year. The left pupil was unresponsive to bright light, accommodation, or pilocarpine. Slit lamp examination did not reveal evidence of vermiform movement of the pupil margin and there was no area of iris transillumination or atrophy. There was no corneal anesthesia. Complete neurological examination including oculomotor testing was normal. General examination and blood testing ruled out systemic infectious disease. On the basis of these findings, the suspected diagnosis was Urrets-Zavalía syndrome (UZS).

Comment

When a unilateral fixed mydriasis appears in a patient with viral infection requiring cidofovir treatment, a neuro-ophthalmological complication should first be excluded. Other causes should be suspected, especially UZS. A fixed and dilated pupil associated with iris atrophy was initially described in 1963 by Urrets-Zavalía in patients treated with postoperative mydriatic after penetrating keratoplasty for keratoconus.⁴ Since its first description, UZS has been reported after penetrating keratoplasty regardless of indication, lamellar keratoplasty, trabeculectomy, peripheral iridoplasty, or phakic intraocular lens implantation.^{5,6} However, mydriatic treatments, postsurgical IOP rise, or iris atrophy are not all observed in reported cases of UZS in the literature.^{5,7} A pupil with abnormal light reaction seems to be the most important sign when considering this diagnosis. Thus, UZS can be considered although our patient did not undergo any surgery and had ocular hypotonia that was not previously reported.

The pathophysiology of this syndrome is still unclear. Injury of the radial nerve fibers of the parasympathetic nerves was suspected and could explain the slow recovery observed in some cases in the literature.⁵ However, currently, its most commonly accepted mechanism is iris ischemia.⁶ A compression of the iris between the lens and cornea during surgery leading to this ischemia was initially suspected. IOP rise as a cause of iris ischemia has been evoked with postoperative mydriatic treatment, iridocorneal synechiae due to