information we have at hand, the results fall into a range with certain trends evident. For example, in the Cantor study, bimatoprost was found to be more efficacious in lowering IOP than travoprost and the degree of difference is somewhat different from that reported in other studies, but similar. Also, the hyperaemia rate was higher with bimatoprost than travoprost. In this study, the difference was not significant, although it has been in others.²

The clinical question at hand is, "are the differences found in studies like the current one clinically relevant?" The first issue is which agent should be chosen to primarily treat a new patient with glaucoma or ocular hypertension. The second clinical issue is, "are the differences in efficacy enough to switch between agents in this group if the first one is not as efficacious as necessary for an individual patient?" Neither of these issues exist in a vacuum and in the real world; there are issues such as formulary status, hyperaemia and bottle differences. It is reassuring that both the drugs work well in lowering IOP. It gives practitioners confidence if choices are restricted by formulary issues.

Although studies such as Dr Cantor's may show differences between populations, individual differences are more difficult to tease out of the data. When treating glaucoma and ocular hypertension, there is an increasing body of evidence showing that it may be important to decrease IOP consistently, so as to minimise the occurrence of higher IOPs at which the damage to the optic nerve may occur.

The authors in this study chose to emphasise mean IOP reduction. Mean

IOP is a commonly used parameter that gives an overall impression of efficacy, but it can be influenced by outlier data points and it assumes that all patients follow a similar IOP curve throughout the day and over time. This may or may not be true. We are increasingly aware that an individual patient's IOP stability may be a more important factor in controlling the progression of glaucoma.

Both bimatoprost and travoprost have fairly flat diurnal curves when group means are evaluated. It would be interesting and helpful to analyse these data and other similar data looking at the profiles of individual patients. This would be useful in confirming our impression that these drugs are indeed superior to those in other classes when used as monotherapy. Likewise, if we do see a difference between the drugs, we might be more likely to use them preferentially over another that does not have this feature.

On the basis of this, there is probably no need to conduct a study similar to Dr Cantor's again. What is needed, however, is a look at data in terms of fluctuation. Looking for statistical significance in regard to the differences among the drugs in terms of lowering IOP at a given time point is probably no longer a worthwhile endeavour, given the body of evidence that is presently available in literature. Further information about this group of drugs compared with others and more information about combination treatment is the next step.

Bimatoprost and travoprost along with latanoprost have changed the way the glaucoma has been treated over the past 5 years. These drugs have become the de facto preferred treatments for glaucoma. Furthermore, with the recent Food and

Drug Administration recommendation for bimatoprost to be used as a first-line agent, the choice really becomes one of choosing the agent that offers the best chance of clinical success. The current study adds to the body of information about the relative efficacy of these drugs and will help clinicians make decisions via evidence-based medicine.

Br J Ophthalmol 2006;**90**:1336-1337.
doi: 10.1136/bjo.2006.098889

Correspondence to: R Noecker, UPMC Eye Center, Eye and Ear Institute, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, 203 Lothrop Street, Suite 820, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA; noeckerrj@upmc.edu

Competing interests: None declared.

RN is a consultant for Allergan and is on the Speakers Bureau for Allergan and Alcon.

REFERENCES

- 1 Cantor LB, Hoop JS, Morgan L. IOP-lowering efficacy of bimatoprost 0.03% and travoprost 0.004% in patients with glaucoma or ocular hypertension. *Br J Ophthalmol* 2006;**90**:1370-3.
- 2 Parrish RK, Palmberg P, Sheu WP, et al. A comparison of latanoprost, bimatoprost, and travoprost in patients with elevated intraocular pressure: a 12-week, randomized, masked-evaluator multicenter study. *Am J Ophthalmol* 2003;**135**:688-703.
- 3 Noecker R, Dirks MS, Choplin NT, et al. A six-month randomized clinical trial comparing the intraocular pressure-lowering efficacy of bimatoprost and latanoprost in patients with ocular hypertension or glaucoma. *Am J Ophthalmol* 2003;**135**:55-63.
- 4 Gandolfi S, Simmons ST, Sturm R, et al. Three-month comparison of bimatoprost and latanoprost in patients with glaucoma and ocular hypertension. *Adv Ther* 2001;**18**:110-21.
- 5 Netland PA, Landry T, Sullivan EK, et al. Travoprost compared with latanoprost and timolol in patients with open-angle glaucoma or ocular hypertension. *Am J Ophthalmol* 2001;**132**:472-84.
- 6 Noecker RJ, Earl ML, Mundorf T, et al. Bimatoprost 0.03% versus travoprost 0.004% in black Americans with glaucoma or ocular hypertension. *Adv Ther* 2003;**20**:121-8.

Smoking and the ophthalmologist

Smoking and the ophthalmologist

M Belkin

Emphasising the adverse effects of smoking on eye diseases

Both my daughters smoke. This fact annoys me greatly, not only because of the damage they are knowingly doing to themselves but also because it underscores the apparently insurmountable difficulties all of us have in trying to minimise the enormous health effect of this chronic self-poisoning. Why do intelligent,

well-informed people like my daughters not give up this habit? Is it because of the chemical addiction originated by the first puff and enhanced by subsequent ones,¹ emotional dependence, provision of stress relief, the power of routine practices, social pressures and coziness, lack of information, the infinite capability that people have for denying

threatening realities, the unwillingness of governments to reduce important revenue source or all of the above? I do not know the answer to this question, nor can I explain the failure of humankind to eliminate smoking, by far the most important modifiable risk factor for diseases of all body systems of users, and, in the form of second-hand smoke, of people in their environment. Smoking rates increase steeply the world over, mainly as a result of higher consumption in developing countries. Furthermore, the decline in smoking rates in Western countries stalled recently and, according to the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, teenage smoking in America is on the increase again. This occurs despite the clear evidence given by the World Health Organization that smoking is

responsible for 10% of mortality in adults worldwide and will eventually kill half of all current smokers. Obviously, the threat of death, cardiovascular diseases, carcinoma of the lung and other cancers, emphysema and the multitude of other chronic and fatal diseases associated with smoking are insufficient to deter many people from smoking. Perhaps disseminating information about the risk of blindness associated with smoking, tobacco use being the main modifiable risk factor for eye diseases, may be a boost to the apparently less than effective smoking cessation and prevention campaigns. The evidence on the association of smoking with eye diseases is nowhere as impressive as it is in relation to age-related macular degeneration (AMD). A 2–3.5-fold increase is observed in the various forms of AMD among smokers when compared with people who have never smoked.^{2–3} These figures make it apparent that even after the advent of effective neovascularisation inhibiting drugs, we cannot prescribe better medicine for AMD than smoking cessation. As is the case with most diseases associated with smoking, the risk for the spouse increases nearly twofold for non-smokers who have lived with a smoker for more than 5 years.³ Smoking also accelerates the development of diabetic retinopathy, thyroid ophthalmopathy (fourfold increase) and acute ischaemic optic neuropathy (16fold increase). A less known observation is that smoking delays the response to treatment of some conditions, such as scleritis and episcleritis.⁴ Of special ominous importance is the association between maternal smoking and childhood eye diseases, such as invasive meningitis, anophthalmia, optic nerve hypoplasia and strabismus. Smoking in pregnancy is associated with low birth weight and premature birth, and thus may lead to retinopathy of prematurity. When we consider all these severe eye conditions and the many non-ophthalmic paediatric and lifelong diseases associated with maternal tobacco use, we are tempted to consider smoking during pregnancy as a malicious attack on the child by his mother, akin to the battered child syndrome.

Although the mechanism by which smoking facilitates most eye diseases can be assumed to be via its effects on vasculature, the mechanism whereby smoking accelerates cataractogenesis is uncertain. However, it has been clearly established that smokers of a pack of cigarettes a day more than double their risk for cataract.⁵ Smoking contributes especially to cortical and nuclear cataract, the risk being dose related.⁶ It was shown that smoking cessation considerably reduces the risk of cataract.⁷ In a recent Indian study⁸ (see p 1374), which showed no major association between cigarette smoking and cataract, a marked association with tobacco use in other forms was found. The fact that smoking increases the prevalence of cataract is particularly relevant to developing countries, where, owing to the scarcity of surgical resources, cataract is the foremost cause of blindness. When we consider that the rapid increase in tobacco use in recent years is almost completely due to the rise in smoking rates in these countries, it becomes apparent that the magnitude of cataract blindness in the world can be considerably lowered by reducing the extent of exposure to tobacco, thus freeing more surgical facilities to non-smoking-related cataracts. An interesting corollary to this problem of developing countries is the finding that the social inequality in developed countries, which leads to excess male mortality in the lower social classes, is almost all owing to smoking being more common among these classes.⁹ It must be emphasised that, as is the case with the effect of smoking on non-ophthalmic diseases, there is no safe level of exposure to smoke. It is the duty of every ophthalmologist to inquire about his patients' smoking habits and to explain to the smokers in no uncertain terms that for the relevant ophthalmic diseases, smoking cessation is a part of the treatment, more effective in slowing down the disease's progression and thus preventing its clinical effect than many other therapeutic modalities available. Therefore, strongly advising the relevant patients to give up smoking should be as integral a part of medical practice as are

the prescription of drugs and the performance of surgery. Inquiring about the patients' smoking habits and admonishing him or her against it should become an integral part of the treatment guidelines for all relevant diseases.

Actually, in view of the voluminous, definitive evidence about the severe adverse effects of smoking on eye diseases, not asking a patient about his or her smoking habits, not explaining the consequences and not chastising smokers to stop by emphasising that there is no safe level of smoking should be construed as medical malpractice.

Br J Ophthalmol 2006;**90**:1337–1338.
doi: 10.1136/bjo.2006.102004

Correspondence to: M Belkin, Goldschleger Eye Research Institute, Tel Aviv University, Sheba Medical Center, Tel Hashomer 52621, Israel; belkin@netvision.net.il

Competing interests: None declared.

REFERENCES

- 1 Gervais A, O'Loughlin J, Meshefedjian G, *et al.* Milestones in the natural course of onset of cigarette use among adolescents. *Can Med Assoc J* 2006;**175**:255–61.
- 2 Seddon JM, George S, Rosner B. Cigarette smoking, fish consumption, omega-3 fatty acid intake, and association with age-related macular degeneration. *Arch Ophthalmol* 2006;**124**:995–1001.
- 3 Khan JC, Thurlby DA, Shahid H, *et al.* Genetic factors in AMD Study. Smoking and age related macular degeneration: the number of pack years of cigarette smoking is a major determinant of risk for both geographic atrophy and choroidal neovascularisation. *Br J Ophthalmol* 2006;**90**:75–80.
- 4 Boonman ZF, de Keizer RJ, Watson PG. Smoking delays the response to treatment in episcleritis and scleritis. *Eye* 2005;**19**:949–55.
- 5 Kelly SP, Thornton J, Edwards R, *et al.* Smoking and cataract: review of causal association. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 2005;**31**:2395–404.
- 6 Krishnaiah S, Das T, Nirmalan PK, *et al.* Smoking and its association with cataract: results of the Andhra Pradesh eye disease study in South India. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2005;**46**:58–65.
- 7 Christen WG, Glynn RJ, Ajani UA, *et al.* Smoking cessation and risk of age-related cataract in men. *JAMA* 2000;**284**:713–16.
- 8 Raju P, George R, Sathyanagaram RV, *et al.* Influence of tobacco use on cataract development. *Br J Ophthalmol* 2006;**90**:1374–7.
- 9 Jha P, Peto R, Zatonski W, *et al.* Social inequalities in male mortality, and in male mortality from smoking: indirect estimation from national death rates in England and Wales, Poland, and North America. *Lancet* 2006;**368**:367–70.