

Phacoemulsification versus Small Incision Cataract Surgery for Treatment of Cataract

Ragni Kumari¹, Vibha Kumari², Gaurav Dubey^{3*}, Nitesh Pradhan⁴, Jamshed Ali⁵, Dr. Jitendra Singh⁶, Aysworya Mohapatra⁷, Md Masihuzzaman⁸, Mrinal Ranjan Srivastava⁹, Rajiv Janardhanan¹⁰

¹Ph. D. Scholar, Amity Institute of Public Health, Amity University, Noida.

²Assistant Professor, Department of Paramedical Sciences, School of Nursing Sciences & Allied Health Jamia Hamdard New Delhi.

^{3*}Optometry Faculty, Department of Optometry, Faculty of Paramedical Sciences, UPUMS, Saifai Etawah.

⁴Assistant Professor, Department of Ophthalmology, Maharishi Markandeshwar Institute of Medical Science and Research, Mullana, Ambala.

⁵Assistant Professor, Department of Optometry, College of Allied Health Sciences, IIMT University Meerut India.

⁶Chief Optometrist, Indra Gandhi Eye Hospital and Research Centre, Gurugram, Haryana

⁷Internship In-charge, Laxmi Charitable Trust and Laxmi College of Optometry Panvel, Navi Mumbai.

⁸Assistant Professor, Department of Optometry, Amity Medical School, Haryana

⁹Assistant Professor, Department of Community Medicine, Dumka Medical College, Dumka.

¹⁰Professor & Head, Amity Institute of Public Health, Amity University, Noida, U. P., India

*Corresponding Author, Gaurav Dubey Email Id: gauravopto25@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Objectives: The study aimed to evaluate the effect of suture-less small incision cataract surgery (SICS) on the postoperative astigmatism refractive error compared to the effect of phacoemulsification. **Background:** Non-Phacoemulsification suture-less cataract extraction retains most of the advantages of phacoemulsification with the comparable visual outcome and is affordable. **Materials and methods:** Phacoemulsification and SICS were performed in 200 eyes of 200 patients. Both techniques were performed at the Department of Ophthalmology, Era University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh. The study was conducted between 1 January 2020 and 28 March 2021. The outcome was evaluated in both techniques in early visual rehabilitation, surgically induced astigmatism, and final best-corrected visual acuity. **Results:** Of the 200 patients who underwent phacoemulsification, 60% were male patients, and 40% were female patients. Of the 200 patients who underwent SICS, 45% were male patients, and 55% were female patients. Both surgical techniques achieved excellent visual outcomes with low complication rates. The initial visual recovery on the first postoperative day was better in the patients who underwent phacoemulsification, with the uncorrected visual acuity better than or equal to 6/18 in 75% of the patients. In contrast, the percentage was 60% in the SICS group. The initial difference was nearly equalized within four weeks. In the sixth month, 85% of the patients in the MSICS group had uncorrected visual acuity better than or equal to 6/18 versus 90% of the patients in the phacoemulsification group. The surgically induced astigmatism at the sixth month was comparable in both techniques, 1.18 ± 0.2 D in the phacoemulsification group versus 1.2 ± 0.23 D in the SICS group. **Conclusion:** Both phacoemulsification and SICS achieved excellent visual outcomes with low complication rates. SICS is less technology-dependent; hence, it is less expensive and more appropriate for treating advanced cataracts prevalent in the developing world.

Keywords: manual small incision cataract surgery, phacoemulsification, surgically induced astigmatism, visual acuity

INTRODUCTION

Cataract has been documented to be the most significant cause of bilateral blindness in India where vision $< 20/200$ in the better eye on presentation is defined as blindness.^[1-6] In India cataract has been reported to be responsible for 60-80% of the bilaterally blind in the country.^[1-6] Global agencies for eliminating avoidable blindness have pledged support to operationalize strategies to reduce the burden of cataract blindness by the "Vision 2020: The right to sight" initiative.^[7] Coordinated national efforts were supplemented by a World Health Organization-assisted cataract blindness control project launched in seven states of India in 1994.^[8] From around 1.2 million cataract surgeries per year in the 1980s,^[9] the cataract surgical output increased to 3.9 million per year by 2003.^[10] Recent data from the World Health Organization (WHO) shows a 35% decrease in blindness prevalence in India.^[11] This could be due to the increased cataract surgeries in the country. At the same time, the proportion of the aged has also increased significantly in the country. The 60+ population, which stood at 56 million in 1991, will double by 2016.^[12] This increase in population means that the number of people at-risk of blinding cataracts will also increase tremendously. India is committed to eliminating avoidable blindness by 2020 in line with the Global Vision 2020: the right to sight initiative. We used existing surveys, cataract surgical output, and population data to determine whether India can meet the Vision 2020: the right to sight cataract blindness goals.

To deliver an effective cataract service, wherever it is based, it must be affordable. In more affluent areas of the world, phacoemulsification has become the primary method of performing cataract surgery in developed countries. There are, however, many areas where phacoemulsification is not appropriate. This possibly involves most of the cataract blindness today because of the density of cataracts involved besides the cost and maintenance demands of the equipment. To effectively address this increasing backlog, significant efforts are being undertaken to increase the output of cataract surgical services in many developing countries and make cataract surgery affordable to all people irrespective of their economic status.^[3]

The main objective in modern cataract surgery is to achieve a better unaided visual acuity with rapid post-surgical recovery and minimal surgery-related complications.^[4] Early visual rehabilitation and better unaided vision can be achieved mainly by reducing the incision size.^[5] Over the past several decades, the evolution of cataract surgical techniques has been associated with a progressive decrease in the size of the cataract surgical incision. Wound size has progressively decreased from 12.0 mm in intracapsular cataract surgery to about 10.5 mm in early extracapsular surgery, and 5.5–7.0 mm within phacoemulsification, the duration of surgery, Phacoemulsification power used, and even the incidence of intraocular complications varies with the nucleus density. In SICS, the time spent on nucleus delivery does not differ from patient to patient. Hence, manual small incision techniques are gaining popularity, as they are quick, relatively inexpensive techniques for large-scale cataract management in developing countries.^[11]

SICS is an up-and-coming technique, even in the developed countries. SICS is more and more looked upon, not as a 'poor man's phacoemulsification' but rather a viable technique. In some societies, it is a preferable alternative to phacoemulsification. In addition, a background in MSICS will ease the learning curve for phacoemulsification, as many steps are familiar. Mastering SICS will also help save a phacoemulsification surgery if one is forced to bail out and still come out with a respectable sutureless outcome to the surgery.^[12] The advent of phacoemulsification. The widespread use of foldable intraocular lens (IOL) has implanted the incision wound to decrease to 3.0 mm or smaller.^[6]

In intraoperative management, reduced wound size has several advantages. The smaller the incision, the more stable the anterior chamber with improved control during capsulorhexis and hydrodissection⁷. More minor wounds heal more rapidly during the postoperative period with less risk for haptic, iris prolapse, and a theoretically reduced risk for the infection as it Panophthalmitis and endophthalmitis.^[8]

Manual small incision cataract surgery (SICS), like the extracapsular cataract extraction (ECCE) technique but with its sutureless, relatively smaller incision, has similar advantages to phacoemulsification and is affordable. It has evolved as an effective alternative to phacoemulsification in the present times because it combines both sutures and the benefits of phacoemulsification with minimum investment.^[9] SICS has the advantages of small suture-less incisions regarding early wound stability, less postoperative inflammation, and no suture-related complications such as those in conventional ECCE. MSICS also has the advantage of being manual where no posterior segment (vitreous, choroid, retina) complications such as those in phacoemulsification are present.^[10] Moreover, SICS can be performed in almost all types of cataract in contrast to phacoemulsification where case selection is significant for an average surgeon; hence, it is a more appropriate surgical procedure for the treatment of advanced cataract in the Developing Countries.^[5]

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Both phacoemulsification and SICS were performed at the Department of Ophthalmology, Era University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh. The study was conducted between 1 January 2020 and 28 March 2021. The outcome was evaluated in both techniques in early visual rehabilitation, surgically induced astigmatism, and final best-corrected visual acuity. Two hundred eyes were assigned to phacoemulsification with a foldable IOL implantation, and the other 200 eyes were assigned to SICS. Ophthalmic history was taken regarding the onset, course, and duration of diminution of vision, history of drug intake for eye diseases, and history of previous eye surgery. Medical history was also taken regarding diabetes mellitus, hypertension, autoimmune disease (such as rheumatoid arthritis), cardiac diseases, and other relevant medical conditions. The preoperative examination included uncorrected visual acuity (UCVA), refraction, best-corrected visual acuity (BCVA), color vision testing, pupillary light reflex testing, slit-lamp assessment of the anterior segment, intraocular pressure measurement by the schiotz tonometer, and posterior segment examination done by Ophthalmoscope and OCT. A Keratometer was used to detect the steepest and flattest corneal meridian. The difference between them was the amount of corneal astigmatism, and its axis was the axis of the steepest meridian. The information reviewed and documented in this study included patients' sex, age, preoperative and postoperative UCVA, BCVA, preoperative clinical diagnosis, preoperative and postoperative corneal astigmatism, and astigmatic axis using keratometric readings, calculating surgically induced astigmatism (SIA), and intraoperative and postoperative complications. Each patient in both groups in this study was followed up on the first postoperative day and one week, 15 days, one month, and 1.5 months after the operation. BCVA data were categorized as better than, equal, or less than 6/18.

In phacoemulsification, after sterilization and topical anesthetic drug and application of a wire or universal speculum, a corneal tunnel using disposable ophthalmic 3.0-mm keratome was made in the upper temporal quadrant of about 2 mm length and 3 mm width. After that, side ports were made using a 20-G disposable ophthalmic microvitreoretinal blade. An adequate amount of ophthalmic viscoelastic was then injected to fill the anterior chamber and flatten the anterior capsule of the lens for a proper subsequent capsulorhexis procedure. Continuous curvilinear capsulorhexis was performed with a self-fashioned cystotome using a bent 24-G needle; if needed, a capsulorhexis forceps was used to complete the process, ending with 6 mm wide capsulorhexis. Hydro dissection was then performed using a 27-G flat tip hydro dissection cannula. Standard tips with 15° bevel fitted on phacoemulsification handpiece were used in all patients in phacoemulsification systems. The divide and conquer technique was applied to perform nucleus disassembly under specific parameters.

In SICS, after sterilization and draping and applying a wire speculum, peritomy was performed superiorly with scissors where the conjunctiva and the Tenon's capsule were dissected separately, and bleeding was cleared with a wet-field cautery. For wound construction, a frown incision was made with the tip of a crescent blade at about 1.5–2 mm distance from the limbus. The external width of the incision was about 6–6.5 mm, according to the expected size of the nucleus. The incision was dissected forward for 1–1.5 mm into a clear cornea with a bevel-up crescent blade.

RESULTS

There was a mean age of 60 years with 1.84 SD in the phacoemulsification group versus a mean age of 61 years with 1.25 SD in the SICS group concerning the age. Concerning the sex, there were more male patients 120 (60%) as compared with female patients 80 (40%) in the phacoemulsification group, but there were more female patients 110 (55%) as compared with male patients 90 (45%) in the SICS group.

Table 1 Age distribution among the study groups

	Group A	Group B	p-Value
Mean Age	60±1.84	61±1.25	0.42

Table 2 Sex distribution among the study groups

	Male (%)	Female (%)
Group A	120 (60)	80 (40)
Group B	90 (45)	110 (55)

Both surgical techniques achieved excellent surgical and visual outcomes with low complication rates. The initial visual recovery on the first postoperative day was better in the patients who underwent phacoemulsification, with UCVA better than or equal to 6/18 in 75% of the patients. In contrast, the percentage was 60% in the SICS group. The initial difference was nearly equalized within four weeks. In the sixth month, 85% of the patients in the SICS group had better than or equal to 6/18 UCVA versus 90% of the patients in the phacoemulsification group. The mean SIA was comparable in the two groups at 3 and 6 months postoperatively.

Table 3 Postoperative uncorrected visual acuity on the first day and at six months

	Day 1 (%)	6 months (%)
Group A (UCVA≥6/18)	75	90
Group B (UCVA≥6/18)	60	85

UCVA- uncorrected visual acuity

Table 4 Comparison between the mean preoperative and postoperative corneal cylinder at 6 months in each group

	Mean preoperative cylinder	Mean postoperative cylinder at 6 months	P value
Group A	0.9 ± 0.44	1.1 ± 0.36	>0.05
Group B	0.73 ± 0.48	0.94 ± 0.34	>0.05

The mean SIA in the phacoemulsification group was 1.23 ± 0.32 D at three months and 1.18 ± 0.2 D at six months. In the SICS group, the mean SIA was 1.27 ± 0.22 D at three months and 1.2 ± 0.23 D at six months. There was no significant statistical difference between both groups regarding the mean SIA. The mean age of the patients was about 60 years in group A and almost 61 years in group B; hence, the mean age is nearly similar in both groups. This was important when comparing the astigmatic effect between the two groups, as the relaxing effect of an incision varies with the patient's age.

Table 5 Comparison between the mean preoperative and postoperative axis at six months within each group

	Mean preoperative axis (deg.)	Mean postoperative axis (deg.)	P value
Group A	90 ± 48.96	92.5 ± 49.6	>0.05
Group B	93 ± 52.38	90.25 ± 50.33	>0.05

Table 6 Mean surgically induced astigmatism at 3 and 6 months postoperatively in both groups

	SIA at three months	SIA at six months
Group A	1.23 ± 0.32	1.18 ± 0.2
Group B	1.27 ± 0.22	1.2 ± 0.23
P value	>0.05	>0.05

SIA- Surgically Induced Astigmatism.

Concerning the preoperative visual acuity in this study, it was almost similar in both groups. The visual outcome achieved on the first postoperative day was better in group A. The patients underwent phacoemulsification, where the percentage of patients who achieved UCVA of 6/18 or better was 75%. In contrast, it was 60% in group B. Both groups achieved good visual results after six months, and the difference in UCVA and BCVA between both groups was statistically insignificant. Concerning the SIA in this study, the mean SIA in group A was 1.23 ± 0.32 D at three months after the operation and 1.18 ± 0.2 D at six months, whereas, in group B, it was 1.27 ± 0.22 D at three months after the operation and 1.2 ± 0.23 D at six months. There was no significant statistical difference between both groups regarding the mean SIA.

DISCUSSION

Phacoemulsification is now the preferred technique among most eye surgeons all over the world. Another alternative to phacoemulsification – SICS – was shown to get popularity because of its comparable surgical and postoperative outcomes similar to phacoemulsification. Furthermore, SICS has added benefit of being a cheap and affordable technique; hence, it can be used in overcrowded poor communities. Many cataract surgeries are needed to be performed to overcome the increasing incidence of blindness in those communities. In this study, the two techniques of cataract surgery were compared from their effect on the SIA and subsequently the postoperative visual acuity. This means that both methods have changed the corneal cylinder, but the effect was minimal in both groups. Gogate *et al.*^[14] compared phacoemulsification and SICS concerning postoperative astigmatism. Average astigmatism for the phacoemulsification group was 1.1 D (0.9 SD), and for the small incision group, it was 1.2 D (0.8 SD). 49.2% of patients in the phacoemulsification group and 73 of the 39.0% patients in the small incision group had astigmatism up to 0.75 D. Thus, a significantly smaller number of patients in the phacoemulsification

group had astigmatism of less than 1D. Khan *et al.*^[15] studied the visual outcome and complications of sutureless MSICS. The aim was to determine the SIA and difficulties of sutureless SICS. In all, 150 eyes of 134 patients were included in this study. Cataract surgery was performed in all patients as a manual sutureless small incision technique. Final BCVA 6 months postoperatively was 6/18 or greater in 86.8% of patients. Astigmatism was noted to be significant or high in 50% of patients, which is a large percentage. Still, the study proved that the course of time has no significant effect on the final amount of postoperative astigmatism in eyes operated by SICS. Other complications included hyphema noted in 17 (11.3%) patients, posterior capsule rupture in five (3.3%) patients, endophthalmitis in two (1.3%) patients on the first postoperative day. They concluded that SICS is a safe and effective procedure with rapid visual rehabilitation; the amount of postoperative astigmatism was high in significant patients, and the final best-corrected visual outcome was good in most patients. Imtiyaz *et al.*^[16] conducted a study on 115 patients concerned with visual rehabilitation after MSICS. They found that 70 (60.8%) patients improved to a UCVA of 6/12 or better in the third week only, and 88 (76.52%) patients had a UCVA of 6/12 or better by the end of the 12th week. They found that the most typical cause of an uncorrected vision of less than 6/12 was astigmatism. Of the 27 patients with a visual acuity of less than 6/12 at 12th week, 20 (74%) patients had postoperative against-the-rule astigmatism, and seven (26%) patients had postoperative with-the-rule astigmatism. From the above observation, they concluded that patients undergoing MSICS have an early visual rehabilitation. This quick visual restoration is attributed to minor inflammation and less SIA.

CONCLUSION

The phacoemulsification technique has the advantage of early visual rehabilitation after cataract surgery, and this is mainly attributed to the small incision size used. However, phacoemulsification is an expensive technique; hence, it is not an affordable technique in developing countries with a meager income. With its sutureless and relatively more minor incision, SICS has similar advantages to phacoemulsification and is affordable; hence, it is an excellent alternative to phacoemulsification. In this study using both techniques, it was found that both methods can give excellent visual results. However, it was found that there is an increased incidence of posterior capsule opacification in the SICS group. The occurrence of endophthalmitis confirmed that no technique is immune until now, and all available prophylactic measures possible must be used.

There are many surgeons nowadays, especially in the developing countries, who prefer SICS, whereas others perceive phacoemulsification as the only way, and if failed, they convert to the unplanned ECCE. If phacoemulsification is not planned, conversion to SICS instead of conventional ECCE utilizes the same wound as the phacoemulsification one and provides better outcomes than the traditional ECCE. Transition to phacoemulsification is easier if one has mastered SICS, as he is familiar with the steps such as sclera pocket incision, capsulorhexis, and hydroprocedures. Familiarity with these steps helps to reduce the incidence of complications while learning phacoemulsification.

REFERENCES

1. Thylefors B, *et al.* Global data on blindness: an update. *Bull World Health Organ* 1995;73:115–121.
2. Foster A. Elimination of cataract blindness. *Survey* 2000;45:532–543.
3. Limburg H, Vasavada A, Muzumdar G, *et al.* Rapid assessment of cataract blindness in urban district of Gujarat. *Indian J Ophthalmol* 1999; 47:135–141.
4. Mitchell PW. Update on bimanual microincisional cataract surgery. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol* 2006;17:62–67.
5. Ravindran RD, Haripriya A, Minu M. In: Ashok G, Luther L, Geoffery T, *et al.* editors. Relevance and clinical significance of SICS (manual phaco) in modern cataract surgery. *Clinical practice in small incision cataract surgery (phacoemulsification manual)*. 1st ed. Jaypee Brothers; 2005. 238–240.

6. Soscia W, Howard JG, Olson RJ. Micro-phacoemulsification with WhiteStar: a wound-temperature study. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 2002;28:1044–1046.
7. Tsuneoka H, Shiba T, Takahashi Y. Feasibility of ultrasound cataract surgery with a 1.4 mm incision. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 2001;27:934–940.
8. Naus NC, Luyten GPM, Stijnen T, *et al.* astigmatism and visual recovery after phacoemulsification and conventional extracapsular cataract extraction. *Doc Ophthalmol* 1995; 90:53–59.
9. Gogate PM, Deshpande M, Wormald RP. Is manual small incision cataract surgery affordable in the developing countries? A cost comparison with extracapsular cataract extraction. *Br J Ophthalmol* 2003;87:843–846.
10. Steinert RF, Brint SF, White SM, *et al.* astigmatism after small incision cataract surgery: a prospective, randomized, multicenter comparison of 4- and 6.5-mm incisions. *Ophthalmology* 1991;98:417–424.
11. Ronnie G, Pankaj R, Sripriya AV, Rajesh PS, Smita P. Comparison of endothelial cell loss and surgically induced astigmatism following conventional extracapsular cataract surgery, manual small-incision surgery and phacoemulsification. *Ophthalmic Epidemiol* 2005; 12:293–297.
12. Nikhilesh T. In: Ashok G, Luther L, Geoffery T, *et al.* editors. Blumenthal's technique in MSICS: a 100% approach. *Clinical practice in small incision cataract surgery (phacoemulsification manual)*. 1st ed. Jaypee Brothers; 2005. 344–352.
13. Ruit S, Tabin G, Chang D, Bajracharya L, Kline DC, Richheimer W, *et al.* A prospective randomized clinical trial of phacoemulsification vs. manual sutureless small-incision extracapsular cataract surgery in Nepal. *Am J Ophthalmol* 2007;143:32–38.
14. Gogate PM, Kulkarni SR, Krishnaiah S, Deshpande RD, Joshi SA, Palimkar A, *et al.* Safety and efficacy of phacoemulsification compared with manual small-incision cataract surgery by a randomized controlled clinical trial: six-week results. *Ophthalmology* 2005;112:869–874.
15. MT Khan, S Jan, Z Hussain, S Karim, MK Khalid. Visual outcome and complications of manual sutureless small incision cataract surgery. *Pak J Ophthalmol* 2010;26.
16. Ahmed I, A Wahab, S Sajjad, RA Untoo. Visual rehabilitation following manual small incision cataract surgery. *JK Sci* 2005;7:146–148.
17. Gogate, Deshpande M, PK Nirmalan. Is manual small incision cataract surgery as safe for the cornea as phacoemulsification? 2008;114:965–968.