

TABLE 1. COMPARISON OF FLAP THICKNESS

Microkeratome	Deviation in Flap Thickness
Amadeus II (Advanced Medical Optics, Inc., Santa Ana, CA) – 130µm	20 to 32µm
Moria M2 (Moria, Antony, France) – 130µm	18 to 28µm
Hansatome (Bausch & Lomb, Rochester, NY) – 160µm	17 to 33µm

mechanical microkeratome, there is a translation of the keratome head across the cornea under high pressure and with vibration as it makes the cut. There is sometimes macroscopic, and almost always some microscopic, damage to the corneal epithelium as a result. The Intralase procedure involves no movement across the cornea, only applanation.

The second difference is in the placement, thickness, and size of a flap created with the Intralase versus a mechanical microkeratome. The Intralase technology allows a smaller flap diameter, so there is less risk of corneal de-innervation. The creation of a well-centered flap is also easier with the laser. Using the patient’s white-to-white measurement as my guide, the largest flap I create is 9.0mm in diameter for large corneas and 8.5mm for small corneas. My average Intralase flap size is 8.8mm. This contrasts to a 9.5-mm microkeratome flap, which is 15% larger in surface area. I am also able to create more consistent, thinner flaps with the Intralase laser. The deeper I cut into the cornea, the closer I get to the nerve bundles, thereby increasing the risk of impairing corneal sensitivity. As part of an unpublished multicenter clinical trial, my colleagues and I evaluated flap thickness using the Visante OCT. We compared flap thickness between microkeratomers at two sites and the Intralase at one site and found a more consistent correlation between programmed flap thickness and actual flap thickness with the Intralase (Figure 1).

In one study⁷ that looked at the average flap thickness (attempted vs achieved) with the Intralase laser, when the surgeon attempted a 100-µm flap, the actual mean thickness of the flap was 126µm, with a range of 89 to 165µm and a standard deviation of 14.1µm. This mean flap thickness was compared with the ranges seen in various clinical studies using mechanical microkeratomers.⁷ Table 1 shows the large standard deviation of flap thickness with microkeratomers, which is consistent with our own experience, as measured both by ultrasound and by the Visante OCT.

Any refractive surgery procedure somewhat exacerbates dry eye symptoms, but I have found the degree of irritation to be less in the 5 years (more than 6,000 cases) that I have used Intralase. In my practice, the two full-time optometrists who conduct the postoperative evaluations have

reported on numerous occasions that they see less dry eye in the Intralase patients. One practical example of this low incidence of dry eye is that fluorescein staining is very common in eyes with flaps created by a mechanical microkeratome and almost nonexistent with the Intralase.

THE BEST CARE

When I bought my first Intralase laser in 2001, I had two offices. In one, I used a mechanical microkeratome for LASIK. In the other, I used the Intralase laser. Gradually, I concluded that providing my patients with the best possible care meant using the Intralase laser during all LASIK procedures. I closed the second satellite office primarily on this basis. Today, almost 100% of my LASIK cases are IntraLASIK. The only exceptions are in studies for which I am required to use a mechanical microkeratome and in patients who have a corneal scar or who previously underwent RK. There is no question in my mind that Intralase has improved the quality of my and my colleagues’ LASIK practice, especially related to reducing dry eye issues. ■

Jon G. Dishler, MD, FACS, is in private practice in Greenwood Village, Colorado, and is Medical Director of the Dishler Laser Institute in Denver, Colorado. He is an investigator for Carl Zeiss Meditec, Inc., but acknowledged no financial interest in Intralase Corp. Dr. Dishler may be reached at jond@dishler.com.

1. Albietz JM, Lenton LM, McLennan SG. Dry eye after LASIK: comparison of outcomes for Asian and Caucasian eyes. *Clin Exp Optom.* 2005;88:89-96.
2. Benitez-del-Castillo JM, del Rio T, Iradiar T, et al. Decrease in tear secretion and corneal sensitivity after laser in situ keratomileusis. *Cornea.* 2001;20:30-32.
3. Schultz J. Goblet cell changes may be linked to dry eye after LASIK. *Ocular Surgery News.* Available at <http://www.osnsupersite.com/default.asp?ID=11820>. Accessed April 18, 2006.
4. Vroman DT, Sandoval HP, Fernandez de Castro LE, et al. Effect of hinge location on corneal sensation and dry eye after laser in situ keratomileusis for myopia. *J Cataract Refract Surg.* 2005;31:1881-1887.
5. Albietz, JM, Lenton LM. Management of the ocular surface and tear film before, during and after laser in situ keratomileusis. *J Refract Surg.* 2004;20:62-71.
6. Rezende RA, Uchoandro C, Cohen EJ, et al. Complications associated with anterior basement membrane dystrophy after laser in situ keratomileusis. *J Cataract Refract Surg.* 2004;30:2328-2331.
7. Binder P. 1,000 consecutive Intralase LASIK flaps. Poster presented at: The AAO Annual Meeting; October 2004; New Orleans, LA.