



Infographic: the Pneumatic Retinopexy versus Vitrectomy for the Management of Primary Rhegmatogenous Retinal Detachment Outcomes Randomized Trial (PIVOT)

Declan C. Murphy¹ · Nikolaos Tzoumas¹ · Alex Mehta¹ · Islam Mostafa¹ · Salman N. Sadiq¹ · Anna Song¹ · Mo Al-Zubaidy¹ · Ali E. Ghareeb¹ · David H. Steel¹

Received: 19 March 2021 / Revised: 2 May 2021 / Accepted: 5 May 2021 / Published online: 30 June 2021
 © The Author(s) 2021. This article is published with open access

Pneumatic Retinopexy (PR) versus Pars Plana Vitrectomy (PPV) for the Management of Primary Rhegmatogenous Retinal Detachments




Fig. 1 The Pneumatic Retinopexy versus Vitrectomy for the Management of Primary Rhegmatogenous Retinal Detachment Outcomes Randomized Trial (PIVOT) showed that at 1 year following surgery, pneumatic retinopexy achieved superior outcomes in terms of visual acuity and vertical metamorphopsia. There was no significant difference in patient-reported subjective visual

function between the two surgical interventions. Abbreviations: ETDRS Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study, NEI VFQ-25 questionnaire National Eye Institute Visual Function Questionnaire, PPV pars plana vitrectomy, PR pneumatic retinopexy, Va visual acuity.

✉ David H. Steel
 david.steel@ncl.ac.uk

¹ Biosciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

Reference: Hillier RJ, Felfeli T, Berger AR, Wong DT, Altomare F, Dai D, et al. The Pneumatic Retinopexy versus Vitrectomy for the Management of Primary Rhegmatogenous Retinal Detachment Outcomes Randomized Trial (PIVOT). *Ophthalmology*. 2019;126:531–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ophtha.2018.11.014>.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest The authors declare no competing interests.

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.