Response

Citation for published version (APA):

Document license:
TAVERNE

DOI:
10.1097/IJG.0000000000001244

Document status and date:
Published: 01/06/2019

Document Version:
Publisher’s PDF, also known as Version of Record (includes final page, issue and volume numbers)

Please check the document version of this publication:

• A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
• The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
• The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

Link to publication

General rights
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

• Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
• You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
• You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the “Taverne” license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:
www.tue.nl/taverne

Take down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:
openaccess@tue.nl
providing details and we will investigate your claim.
the treatment of Acute Angle Closure in patients with coexisting cataract. However, we have a few queries.

Firstly, the author mentioned that in 4 patients with very short axial length, phacoemulsification was combined with vitrectomy for the purpose of debulking. Our query is whether any of those cases were diagnosed with malignant glaucoma. Because to the best of our knowledge vitreous does not expand and does not contribute for expansion of those cases were diagnosed with malignant glaucoma.2,3

Secondly, there were no data regarding preoperative and postoperative gonioscopy findings. So, the information regarding changes in angle morphology following early phacoemulsification is lacking, which we feel would have been useful information.

Thirdly, we would like to know whether there were any intraoperative difficulties or postoperative complications in the management of the patients with Acute Angle Closure Attack in comparison with phacoemulsification in other normal patients as previous studies have shown that patients with shallow anterior chamber depth are at an increased risk of developing complications during cataract surgery such as posterior capsule rupture/zone dialysis, Iris prolapsed, corneal edema, descemet tears, etc.4
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In Reply: First we would like to thank Dr. Sengupta and colleagues for their keen interest in our study and we feel pleased to respond to their input.

The reason for performing vitrectomy before phacoemulsification was due to safety reasons and was not because of glaucoma treatment after acute angle closure. In these few cases, the anterior chamber was very shallow. Vitrectomy was performed to increase the anterior chamber depth and thus decrease the chance of complications during phacoemulsification (anterior capsular tear, endothelial damage despite soft-shell technique, descemet tears, iris prolapse, or even rupture of the posterior capsule).

As a retrospective study, we acknowledged that it had some potential limitations. Because of the retrospective nature of the study, no standard postoperative gonioscopy was performed. We agree with Dr. Sengupta’s suggestion that these gonioscopy findings would be of useful information and we reiterate the need for further research.

As mentioned in our Results and Discussion section in the manuscript,1 in 6 eyes, a capsular tension ring was inserted because of zonular weakness. Posterior synechialysis was performed in 9 patients. Rupture of the posterior capsule did not occur. There were no iris prolapses and no descemet tears. In our group, no corneal decompensation occurred after surgery; however, surgery was solely performed by highly experienced surgeons using a soft-shell technique with dispersive viscoelastics to protect the endothelium.
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