

21/11/13

To Whomsoever It May Concern

I have used the original Baerveldt implant, marketed initially by Pharmacia and later by AMO, in the past. In my experience it gave a lower IOP control with less elevated bleb as compared to other aqueous drainage devices. Hence in patients with advanced damage, I would prefer inserting the Baerveldt implant. Unfortunately the original implant was not available to us in India, despite a lot of requests to AMO. That is when the AADI implant was introduced a year back. In the last 1 year I have the opportunity to used 4 AADI implants.

The quality of the implant is comparable to the original. The costing is just perfect for Indian patients. The technique of insertion is well demonstrated in the video.

In 3 of the 4 patients the IOP control and the bleb appearance is very satisfactory. However in 1 patient of post-silicone oil glaucoma I had great difficulty in inserting the implant. This I attribute to the severe tissue adhesions in the subconjunctival space post silicone oil surgery. In the post op period there was partial exposure of the implant which required conjunctival resuturing.

I had a similar experience in another case of silicone oil glaucoma in which I planned to insert the AADI. However due to the dense adhesions I could not create enough space under the muscle bellies to insert the AADI. Hence had to insert another drainage device. Following these 2 cases I learnt that probably in post silicone oil glaucoma it might just be difficult to insert the AADI implant as it requires larger area of dissection and space as compared to other implants. I have no experience with inserting the original Baerveldt in post-silicone oil glaucoma, hence will not be able to compare AADI with the original in similar clinical situation.



Dr. Sunil S. Jain