PREFERRED PRACTICE PATTERN®

Dry Eye Syndrome

Limited Revision

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF OPHTHALMOLOGY

The Eye M.D. Association

Prepared by the American Academy of Ophthalmology Cornea/External Disease Panel

Cornea/External Disease Panel Members
Robert S. Feder, MD, Chair
Steven P. Dunn, MD
Matthew R. Jones, MD
Francis S. Mah, MD
Leslie A. Olsakovsky, MD
Audrey R. Talley-Rostov, MD
Andrew J. Velazquez, MD
David C. Musch, PhD, MPH, Methodologist

Preferred Practice Patterns Committee Members
Christopher J. Rapuano, MD, Chair
David F. Chang, MD
Emily Y. Chew, MD
Robert S. Feder, MD
Stephen D. McLeod, MD
Bruce E. Prum, Jr., MD
C. Gail Summers, MD
David C. Musch, PhD, MPH, Methodologist

Academy Staff
Flora C. Lum, MD
Nancy Collins, RN, MPH
Doris Mizuiri
Jessica Ravetto
Medical Editor: Susan Garratt
Design: Socorro Soberano
Reviewed by: Council
Approved by: Board of Trustees
September 27, 2008

Reviewed and updated for currency:
September 2011

This document should be cited as:
American Academy of Ophthalmology Cornea/External Disease Panel. Preferred Practice Pattern® Guidelines. Dry Eye Syndrome – Limited Revision. San Francisco, CA: American Academy of Ophthalmology; 2011. Available at: www.aao.org/ppp.

As a service to its members and the public, the American Academy of Ophthalmology has developed a series of clinical practice guidelines called Preferred Practice Patterns that **identify characteristics and components of quality eye care.** Appendix 1 describes the core criteria of quality eye care.

The Preferred Practice Pattern® (PPP) guidelines are based on the best available scientific data as interpreted by panels of knowledgeable health professionals. In some instances, such as when results of carefully conducted clinical trials are available, the data are particularly persuasive and provide clear guidance. In other instances, the panels have to rely on their collective judgment and evaluation of available evidence.

Preferred Practice Pattern guidelines provide the pattern of practice, not the care of a particular individual. While they should generally meet the needs of most patients, they cannot possibly best meet the needs of all patients. Adherence to these PPPs will not ensure a successful outcome in every situation. These practice patterns should not be deemed inclusive of all proper methods of care or exclusive of other methods of care reasonably directed at obtaining the best results. It may be necessary to approach different patients' needs in different ways. The physician must make the ultimate judgment about the propriety of the care of a particular patient in light of all of the circumstances presented by that patient. The American Academy of Ophthalmology is available to assist members in resolving ethical dilemmas that arise in the course of ophthalmic practice.

Preferred Practice Pattern guidelines are not medical standards to be adhered to in all individual situations. The Academy specifically disclaims any and all liability for injury or other damages of any kind, from negligence or otherwise, for any and all claims that may arise out of the use of any recommendations or other information contained herein.

References to certain drugs, instruments, and other products are made for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to constitute an endorsement of such. Such material may include information on applications that are not considered community standard, that reflect indications not included in approved U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) labeling, or that are approved for use only in restricted research settings. The FDA has stated that it is the responsibility of the physician to determine the FDA status of each drug or device he or she wishes to use, and to use them with appropriate patient consent in compliance with applicable law.

Innovation in medicine is essential to assure the future health of the American public, and the Academy encourages the development of new diagnostic and therapeutic methods that will improve eye care. It is essential to recognize that true medical excellence is achieved only when the patients' needs are the foremost consideration.

All PPPs are reviewed by their parent panel annually or earlier if developments warrant and updated accordingly. To ensure that all PPPs are current, each is valid for 5 years from the "approved by" date unless superseded by a revision. Preferred Practice Pattern guidelines are funded by the Academy without commercial support. Authors and reviewers of PPPs are volunteers and do not receive any financial compensation for their contributions to the documents. The PPPs are externally reviewed by experts and stakeholders before publication.

The intended users of the Dry Eye Syndrome Preferred Practice Pattern guideline are ophthalmologists.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURES

In compliance with the Council of Medical Specialty Societies' Code for Interactions with Companies (available at www.cmss.org/codeforinteractions.aspx), relevant relationships with industry occurring from January 2011 to September 2011 are listed. The Academy has Relationship with Industry Procedures to comply with the Code (available at http://one.aao.org/CE/PracticeGuidelines/ppp.aspx).

David F. Chang, MD: Alcon Laboratories, Inc. – Consultant/Advisor; Allergan, Inc. – Lecture fees

Emily Y. Chew, MD: No financial relationships to disclose

Steven P. Dunn, MD: No financial relationships to disclose

Robert S. Feder, MD: No financial relationships to disclose

Matthew R. Jones, MD: No financial relationships to disclose

Francis S. Mah, MD: Alcon Laboratories, Inc. – Consultant/Advisor; Allergan, Inc. – Consultant/Advisor

Stephen D. McLeod, MD: No financial relationships to disclose

David C. Musch, PhD, MPH: No financial relationships to disclose

Leslie A. Olsakovsky, MD: No financial relationships to disclose

Bruce E. Prum, Jr., MD: Allergan, Inc. – Consultant/Advisor

Christopher J. Rapuano, MD: Alcon Laboratories, Inc. – Lecture fees; Allergan, Inc. – Consultant/Advisor, Lecture fees; EyeGate Pharma – Consultant/Advisor

C. Gail Summers, MD: No financial relationships to disclose

Audrey R. Talley-Rostov, MD: No financial relationships to disclose

Andrew J. Velazquez, MD: No financial relationships to disclose

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Preferred Practice Pattern® (PPP) guidelines have been written on the basis of three principles.

- Each Preferred Practice Pattern should be clinically relevant and specific enough to provide useful information to practitioners.
- Each recommendation that is made should be given an explicit rating that shows its importance to the care process.
- Each recommendation should also be given an explicit rating that shows the strength of evidence that supports the recommendation and reflects the best evidence available.

In the process of revising this document, a detailed literature search of articles in the English language was conducted in December 2007 in PubMed and the Cochrane Library on the subject of dry eye for the years 2002 to 2007. To complete this limited revision, PubMed and the Cochrane Library were searched on January 27, 28, February 4, 11, and 15, 2011 on the subject of dry eye, limited to English language and publication date from 2008 to the date of the search. Details of the literature search are available at www.aao.org/ppp. The results were reviewed by the Cornea/External Disease Panel and used to prepare the recommendations, which they rated in two ways.

The panel first rated each recommendation according to its importance to the care process. This "importance to the care process" rating represents care that the panel thought would improve the quality of the patient's care in a meaningful way. The ratings of importance are divided into three levels.

- Level A, defined as most important
- Level B, defined as moderately important
- Level C, defined as relevant but not critical

The panel also rated each recommendation on the strength of evidence in the available literature to support the recommendation made. The "ratings of strength of evidence" also are divided into three levels.

- Level I includes evidence obtained from at least one properly conducted, well-designed, randomized controlled trial. It could include meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials.
- Level II includes evidence obtained from the following:
  - Well-designed controlled trials without randomization
  - Well-designed cohort or case-control analytic studies, preferably from more than one center
  - Multiple-time series with or without the intervention
- Level III includes evidence obtained from one of the following:
  - Descriptive studies
  - Case reports
  - Reports of expert committees/organizations (e.g., PPP panel consensus with external peer review)

The evidence cited is that which supports the value of the recommendation as something that should be performed to improve the quality of care. The panel believes that it is important to make available the strength of the evidence underlying the recommendation. In this way, readers can appreciate the degree of importance the panel attached to each recommendation and they can understand what type of evidence supports the recommendation.

The ratings of importance and the ratings of strength of evidence are given in bracketed superscripts after each recommendation. For instance, "[A:II]" indicates a recommendation with high importance to clinical care [A], supported by sufficiently rigorous published evidence, though not by a randomized controlled trial [II].

The sections entitled Orientation and Background do not include recommendations; rather, they are designed to educate and provide summary background information and rationale for the recommendations that are presented in the Care Process section. A summary of the major recommendations for care is included in Appendix 2.

DOCKET ALARM

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts

Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research

With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips

Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS
Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS
Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.