conjunctiva) may still, occasionally, be of value to the fellow eye at an unknown point in the future. These considerations need to be taken into account when deciding to remove an eye.

Andrew R. Pearson ✉
Department of Ophthalmology
Leicester Royal Infirmary
Leicester LE1 5WW, UK

John H. Sandford-Smith
(retired)

Sir,

I read with interest the article by R. Newsom *et al.* regarding diabetic retinopathy screening.[1] I note their comments that oral fluorescein angiography (OFA) is as effective as clinical examination in the detection of maculopathy and that OFA may be useful as a method of diabetic retinopathy (DR) screening.

I acknowledge that fundus fluorescein angiography (FFA) can be useful, for example, in the management of patients with subtle or with severe macular oedema. In some cases FFA can be useful by establishing that maculopathy is due to diabetic retinopathy rather than age-related macular degeneration or central serous chorioretinopathy.

However, OFA is an invasive procedure associated with risks including retinal phototoxicity, nausea, vomiting, yellow skin, photosensitivity, syncope, anaphylaxis and death.

OFA can be useful particularly in children. However, children with diabetes do not develop significant DR. Accordingly I question the purported role of OFA in DR screening.

Reference

1. Newsom R, Moate B, Casswell T. Screening for diabetic retinopathy using digital colour photography and oral fluorescein angiography. Eye 2000;14:579–82.

David Infeld, FRCSEd ✉
Birmingham and Midland Eye Centre
City Hospital NHS Trust
Dudley Road
Birmingham B18 7QU, UK

Sir,

We thank Mr Infeld for his interest in our paper and agree with him that oral fluorescein angiography (OFA) should be used only in selected cases. Type II diabetes accounts for 85–90% of cases of diabetes, and the incidence of type II diabetes is predicted to rise rapidly over the next 20 years. The majority of blindness in this population will be due to diabetic maculopathy.[1] As visual function improves in only a minority following laser treatment,[2] we aimed to detect maculopathy before visual loss using oral fluorescein angiography (OFA).

Intravenous fluorescein angiography is known to carry a certain risk. A study of 5000 patients undergoing intravenous angiography found 2.24% had nausea, 1.78% vomited, 0.34% had urticaria while 0.14% had syncope or dyspnoea (total = 4.82%).[3] Other surveys found respiratory and cardiac reactions occurred in 0.03% and 0.02% of cases respectively.[4] In contrast OFA is regarded as a safer technique: first used by Ehrlich in 1882,[5] there is a single reported case of an allergic reaction.[6] A recent series of 1787 cases found that 1.7% had minor side effects, such as nausea or mild itching, none of which required treatment. No respiratory, cardiac or anaphylactic reactions were noted, the oral route reducing the risk of anaphylactic and cardiovascular reactions.[7]

We regard OFA as a relatively safe technique and one that could be used as a second-line screening test in patients with suspicious maculas. A major finding of the paper was that non-stereo digital photography did not accurately detect diabetic maculopathy. Other methods should be sought to detect maculopathy prior to visual loss. Whether OFA is one of them remains to be seen.

References

1. The Wisconsin Epidemiologic Study of Diabetic Retinopathy. XV. The long-term incidence of macular edema. Ophthalmology 1995;102:7–16.
2. Early Treatment for Diabetic Retinopathy Study Group. Study 1. Photocoagulation for diabetic macular oedema. Arch Ophthalmol 1985;103:1796–806.
3. Butler RW, McPherson AR. Adverse reactions in intravenous fluorescein angiography. Ann Ophthalmol 1983;15:1084–6.
4. Karhunen U, Raitta C, Kala R. Adverse reactions to fluorescein angiography. Acta Ophthalmol 1986;64:282–6.
5. Ehrlich P. Ueber provocirte Fluorescenzerscheinungen am Auge. Dtsch Med Wochenschr 1882;8:35–6.
6. Kinsella FP, Mooney DJ. Anaphylaxis following oral fluorescein angiography. Am J Ophthalmol 1988;106:745–6.
7. Hara T, Inami M, Hara T. Efficacy and safety of fluorescein angiography with orally administered sodium fluorescein. Am J Ophthalmol 1998;126:560–4.

Richard Newsom ✉
Ben Moate
Tony Casswell
Moorfields Eye Hospital
City Road
London EC1V 2PD, UK
Tel: +44 (0)20 7253 3411

ADDENDUM

Sir,

Eye published last year (issue 14/3B) the papers that grew out of the Cambridge Symposium on Glaucoma. This was a truly outstanding symposium, and that issue of *Eye* constitutes an excellent general reference on the state of knowledge in the field of glaucoma at the present time. Professor Hitchings had asked me to comment on the concept of 'resetting' the intraocular pressure. In my report I commented on the idea that it was not just lowering of intraocular pressure which may have a role in preventing progressive glaucomatous deterioration, but also stabilisation of the intraocular pressure, regardless of the absolute level. I failed to include a paper published by Bergeå, Bodin and Svedbergh[1] dealing precisely with this issue and providing important support for the idea that the variability of intraocular pressure may be a factor in predisposing towards deterioration. This note is written in order to bring the readers' attention to this excellent study by these authors.

Reference

1. Bergeå B, Bodin L, Svedbergh B. Impact of intraocular pressure regulation on visual fields in open-angle glaucoma. Ophthalmology 1999;106:997–1005.

George L. Spaeth, MD ✉
Louis J. Esposito Research Professor
Wills Eye Hospital
900 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107-5598, USA