











Earriers to Entry Executing the trials necessary to get FDA approval can be very costly Inexpensive treatments would never recoup high cost of the approval process Running a clinical trial may not be feasible FDA approval is very specific and limited Beneficial uses of a drug or device evolve over time In reality, many treatments that have not gone through the FDA-approval process have demonstrated effectiveness and are widely used Quite a few are even standard of care... Many clinical trials reported in the peer-reviewed literature were not done under FDA supervision





C	Off-Label Use Defined
٠	Any use of a drug not listed on the label is considered off-label to include: Utilizing an approved drug for a condition or indication other than the condition for which it is approved Prescribing approved drug at different dose, frequency or route of administration than specified in the label
	Treating pediatrics when the product is approved to treat adults Although the FDA label has important marketing implications, use of an approved product is NOT restricted by the FDA to the limitations of the label Providers are allowed to use FDA-approved drugs in the treatment of a specific patient as medical practice.
-	FDA recognizes that off-label use is often appropriate and may represent the standard of care **Example: Intraviteral antibiotic use for reduction of post-operative endophthalmitis incidence reduction despite the fact that no FDA-approved drugs for endophthalmitis prophylaxis exist
	**Legal implications of off-label use primarily involves risk management



	nformed Consent
	FDA approval status does not necessarily define appropriate medical practice nor regulate medical practice • Medical practice is the therapeutic relationship between a physician and an individual patient and this decision must fall within the standard of care
5	AMPLE INFORMED CONSENT TEMPLATE FOR A DRUG OR DEVICE
١	When a drug or device is approved for medical use by the FDA, the manufacturer produces a label to explain its use. Once a device/medication is
	pproved by the FDA, physicians may use it off-label for other purposes if they are well-informed about the product, base its use on firm scientific
	nethod and sound medical evidence, and maintain records of its use and effects.
ı	State purpose of the off-label drug/device.]
ı	State alternatives to the off-label drug or device.]
ı	State known complications and side effects of the off-label drug/device.]
1	understand that [state drug/device] was approved by the FDA for [state approval purpose/conditions]. Nevertheless, I wish to have [state
t	reatment/procedure] performed on my eye/used in my eye and I am willing to accept the potential risks that my physician has discussed with me.
ı	acknowledge that there may be other, unknown risks and that the long-term effects and risks of [state drug/device] are not known.

Insurance Carrier Criteria Question then becomes "when does off label drug use become the standard of care?" Answer depends on who is defining the standard of care. Payers may use specific definitions of the standard of care to establish coverage determinations based upon supporting authoritative literature, expert consensus, scientific rationale and national medical practice patterns.

Off-label use of U.S. FDA approved drugs as prescribed by a physician to treat chronic, disabling, or life-threatening illnesses may be considered medically necessary when approved by the FDA for at least one indication, AND one of the following:


- Is recognized in one of the following prescription drug reference compendium for treatment of the indication for which the drug is prescribed
 1. Thompson Micromedec Drug Dex Compendium (Drug Dex).
 2. American Hospital Formulary Service Drug Information (AHFS DI):
 3. National Comprehensive Cancer Network's Drugs and Biologics Compendium;
 4. The United States Pharmacopoeia-Drug Information: OR
- MUST supported by qualified clinical research in peer-reviewed scientific literature specific for treatment of the indication for which the drug is prescribed


20

19

Rules of Engagement (ROEs) • Discussion will center around evidence-based medicine and peer-reviewed literature Slides are intentionally information-dense Use as reference · Starting point for further peer-reviewed review Off-label use discussed here is synergistic and adjunctive NOT intended as replacement for standard of care Summary slides with Take Home Pearls Medication with dosage / frequency / duration Off-label indications












Fourth Generation Fluoroquinolones: New V Antibiotics	leapons in th	ne /	Ars	en	al	of	0	ph	tha	lm	ic	
Am J Ophthalmol (2002)133 <mark>:463–466.</mark>												
METHODS: Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) of 93 bacterial endophthalmitis isolates were determined to CIP, OFX, LEV, GAT, and MOX using E-tests. The National Committee of Clinical Laboratory Standards (NCCLCS) susceptibility patterns and the potencies of the	15-1											
MICs were statistically compared.	Table 2. In vitro suscep	nomy	or con	ean o	acten	la1 1904		to and	microsi	ai ag	ems	
mes were statistically compared.	Morsoganian	Total	Guillo	186'8	Mexi	Souacin		figuacin	Ciprotio	acin	Otesa	
RESULTS:	Com neitra	N.	H	(%)	N.	Pil	14.	CH.	N. C	10	K	50
	Cosp./ase-negative Staphylocaccus	50	20	100	55	100	- 11	201.4	19 1	54	100	ка
With in vitro tests, Staph aureus isolates that were resistant to CIP and	Staphylecoccus aureus	1	6	180	- 6	500	- 8	100	5 1	90		08
OFX were statistically most susceptible to MOX. Coaqulase (-)	Simplicoccus preumoniae	5	- 6	100	6	100	- 3	600	5 1	90	4 1	10
	Streptococcus sp violans group Total gram-positive microorganisms	- 1	1	100	1	100	- 2				1	20
Staphylococci resistant to CIP and OFX were statistically most	Gran regative			180	- 00	100	- 87	***				
susceptible to MOX and GAT. Strep viridans were more susceptible to	Passibronas ap	7	1	100	7	100	. 5	TLA	6 8	5.7	E 0	47
MOX, GAT, and LEV than CIP and OFX. In general, MOX was the most	Abcovella sp Other gram-negative microorganisms *	3	- 3	100	3	100	3	100	3 1	00	3	00
potent FQ for gram (+) bacteria while CIP, MOX, GAT, and LEV	Total gran-regard microspenses		10	100	- 0	100	14	85.4	17 1	14	17 0	6.0
	Grand Total	51	11	160	61	100	41	80.4	46 1	0.2	45 6	82
demonstrated equivalent potencies to gram (-) bacteria.	#Serate to (I), Hermothica op (I) Assutinos	M AMAGINE	a(t), Pavi	lencie q	ITS aboy	ands ron	partiti.	unic Clinda	ave(t)			
CONCLUSIONS:												
 4th generation FQs appear to cover bacterial resistance compare to 2nd and 3rd generation FQs 	d											
 4th generation FQs were more potent for gram (+) bacteria and equally potent for gram (-) bacteria. 												




Clin Ophthal (2014) 8:315-320	40.0		
Purpose Ganciclovir has been reported to inhibit CMV, HSV types 1 and 2, VZV and Epstein–Barr virus. We investigated the <i>in vitro</i> anti– HAdV activity of Ganciclovir ophthalmic gel, 0.15% (Virgan®)			
ganciclovir in several common types currently inducing keratoconjunctivitis.		of ocular involvement and o oviral serotypes ^{2,8–10,12–14,37,4}	
	Ocular structure	Clinical manifestations	Subtypes involve
Results The 50% cytotoxic concentration of ganciclovir was 212 mg/mL. The 50% effective concentration of ganciclovir obtained by real-	Adnexa	Eyelid edema, lacrimal gland enlargement, nasolacrimal duct inflammation	I-5, 7, 8, 19, 37, 53, 54
time PCR ranged between 2.64 and 5.10 mg/mL. A significant inhibitory effect of ganciclovir on adenoviral proliferation was found in all types in a dose-dependent manner.	Conjunctiva	Follicles, hyperemia, edema, petechial hemorrhages, pseudomembranes	I-5, 7, 8, 19, 37, 53, 54
	Cornea	Multifocal punctate keratitis,	8, 19, 37, 53, 54
Conclusion Significant inhibitory activity against HAdV3, 4, 8, 19a and 37 which induce EKC		subepithelial infiltrates	








Adv Therapy (2008) 25:858							
METHODS 21 patients diagnosed with posterior blepharitis were randomized to receive either azithromycin plus warm compresses (10) or compresses alone (11)	Comparation versus composterior b	ventio		in treatme	nt of	ycin	
 All patients: Compresses to each eye for 10min BID x 14d 	Second Visi		Azithrenydn greep No. = 30	Correctional group	Test value	P-value	Sig
 Treatment group: Azasite BID x 2d then QD x 12d 	Symptoms Foreign body sensation	MouniSD	1/47 ± 0.73	1.73 ±0.69	-1.452	0.152	NS
RESULTS At visit 2, Azasite group demonstrated significant	Lucrimation Barning	MountSD Range MeantSD Range MountSD	1.0±0.79 0-3 1.40±0.72 0-2	1.43 ±0.77 0 - 3 1.83 ±0.81 0 - 2 1.80 ±0.76	-2.149 -1.177	0.036 0.244	S NS
improvements in MGD, MG secretions and eyelid redness as compared with the compress group. In the Azasite, MGD	Vision fluctuation	Russe MeanthD Russe	0.63 ± 0.64 0 − 2	0-3 0-7±0.67 0-2	-2.814	0.030	8
resolved completely in 3 patients and MG secretion returned to normal in 2 patients. Furthermore, a higher percentage of	Second Vis		Azithrumycia grusp No. = 30	Conventional group No. = 30	Test value	P-value	Sig
patients in the Azasite group rated overall symptomatic relief	Lidhypermia	Mcunt5D Range	1.00±0.39 0 - 3	2.10 ± 0.55 1 – 3	-2.611	0.011	5
as excellent or good.	Lid collactics	Range	0.50 ± 0.54	0-3	-1.336	0.187	NS
CONCLUSION	MG secretion	MeanaSD	1.83 ± 0.70	2.03 ± 0.56	1.227	0.225	NS
Azithromycin ophthalmic solution in combination with	Conjunctival hyperenia	Meant SD Range	1.10±0.88 0 - 3	1.57 ± 0.73 0 – 3	-2.231	0.030	5
warm compresses provided a significantly greater clinical	Frotty-discharge	Meana5D Range	1.50 ± 0.75 0 - 3	1.40 ± 0.67	0.551	0.584	NS









































































oral doxycycline and topical corticoster Clin Exp Ophthal (2008) 36(1):8-12					Becovery		Prophriscile
Methods Retrospective single-observer case series involving 21 patients		reatment	Artificial tears with NSAIDs and without and	Acute attack	Feried	Effectiveness	Qualities
with RCE who were treated at a community-based clinic and received oral doxycycline 50 mg BID and topical FML 0.1% TID for at least 4 weeks.		Lubrication	Lacri-Late or Muro 128 with NSAIDs and artitivities	Direnic episodes	Short	Low	Wet
Results	Medical	Purclal occlaion	Dollagen or silicone puncted plugs	failed lubrication	Short	Wodewie	Moderate
At 8 weeks, 15/21 patients (71%) were symptom free. All but one of these patients reported an improvement in symptoms. Of those patients not lost to follow up, 15/18 patients (83%)		flandage soft contact lens	Facus Night & Day or Norths	Failed lubrication and ponctual occlusion	Long	Moderate	NA
and 11/15 patients (73%) denied any symptoms suggestive of relapse at 6 and 12 months, respectively. Among the patients in remission was one who had responded poorly to other		Continuation therapy	One bracyclines, topical corticostereids, labrication	Failed lubrication and punctal occlusion	Short	Не	Hgs.
treatments including ocular lubricants, epithelial debridement, serum eyedrops, anterior stromal puncture and PTK.		Arterior stronal microporchare	-	Failed aggressive medical Everapy, lesions off visual axis	Skelun	Moderate	Mile
Conclusion Combination of oral doxycycline and topical	Sergical	Superficial leasectority		Failed aggressive medical Printing: lesions on visual arts	Long	High	Mid
corticosteroid is the first treatment option when conservative management with ocular lubricants fails May help patients with recurrent corneal erosion syndrome who have failed other forms of treatment.		Phototherapeutic lieutectury	-	Falled appressive medical throaps patients with conductories RCES	Long	High	Más

Topical azithromycin and oral doxycycline therap clinical and spectroscopic study Comea (2013) 32(1):44	y of MG	D: Co	mpai	rative			
Methods Signs of MGD were evaluated with a slit lamp and symptoms were		omycin :				at	
measured by the response of subjects to a questionnaire. Meibum lipid-		Azithr	omycin	Doxyc	ycline	р	
lipid interaction strength, conformation and phase transition parameters		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	value	
were measured using Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy	Pre-treatme	nt					
Results	Symptoms	7.50	1.26	7.60	1.35	0.704	
Topical therapy with azithromycin and oral therapy with doxycycline	Sign	8.70	1.28	8.38	1.87	0.321	
relieved signs and symptoms and restored the lipid properties of the MG	Total	16.20	2.01	16.18	2.39	0.964	
retion towards normal	1st Follow up						
secretion towards normal	Symptoms	2.36	1.27	2.50	1.29	0.587	
TF lipids were brought closer to normal with azithromycin	Sign	3.22	1.20	2.84	1.27	0.127	
treatment than doxycycline treatment	Total	5.58	2.19	5.34	2.13	0.581	
	2nd Follow t	ıр					
Both doxycycline and azithromycin treatment restored the levels of the	Symptoms	0.82	0.69	0.76	0.77	0.683	
relative areas of resonance to normal levels.	Sign	2.08	0.63	2.04	0.80	0.783	
THE RESERVE OF THE PARTY OF THE	Total	2.92	0.96	2.80	1.30	0.603	
Conclusions	Last Follow	up					
MOA of doxycycline may be different than that of azithromycin in	Symptoms	0.62	0.23	0.62	0.40	0.701	
MGD therapy	Sign	1.22	0.76	1.30	0.78	0.608	
Carotenoids restoration in combination with azithromycin and	Total	1.84	1.09	1.92	1.08	0.714	
doxycycline treatment restored TF stability and resolve DED S/S							



METHODS		
Search of PubMed, Embase and Cochrane Library Central Register of Controlled Trials and abstracts from main annual meetings. The primary endpoint was the progression of DR, and the secondary		
endpoints included vision loss, development of DME and	Statio Placebe Fook Ratio Study or Subgroup Events Total Events Total Weight M.H. Randows, 95% Cl	Fink Fortio M.H. Faredon, 1975, Cl.
aggravation of hard exudates.	1.1.1 Progression of SR (processed of reacular orders), event eye: 0-upts 2004 8 15 6 15 37.7% 6.00 230.00, 1.35; Narrang 2002 2 15 3 15 62.7% 6.67(613.3.3.44)	-
RESULTS	Submini (55% CI) 30 30 100.0% 0.30 (0.03, 2.69) Total events 2 9	-
Results revealed that lipid-lowering drugs were associated with	Hattergeneity: Tau* = 1.34, CbP= 1.90, df = 1 (F = 0.16), F = 40%. Textific overall effect Z = 1.80 (F = 0.26).	
reduced risk in DR progression [OR=0.77] and may have	1.1.2 Progression of DR (worsened of hard condutes, worst eye)	_
protective effect on DME compared to placebo However, no	Ough 2054 1 15 6 15 59.0% 8.17(0.02,1.22) Nameng 2012 1 15 0 15 41.0% 3.00(0.13,00.36) Nameng 2012 1 15 0 15 41.0% 3.00(0.13,00.36)	
significant differences in the worsening of vision acuity and hard	Total entrols 2 6 Estimate 2 14 Cept 2 34 Cept 2 24 Cept 2 27 February 2	
exudates were found between the lipid-lowering drugs and the	Testitir overall effect Z = 0.43 (F = 0.67)	
placebo	1.1.3 Impairment of visual aculty (Seedice-test, worst eye) Courts 2004 0 15 2 15 51.2% 0.14(0.01.2.50)	
	Naming 2012 8 15 2 15 48.7% 8.20(8.01, 3.85) Naming 2012 8 15 2 15 48.7% 8.20(8.01, 3.85)	
CONCLUSION	Total events 0 5 5 100 CMP = 0.03 (F = 0.07) P = 0%	
 Lipid-lowering agents show a protective effect on DR 	Test for overall effect Z = 1.69 (F = 0.09)	
progression and might be associated with reduced risk in		Sec 61 10 6
the development of DME		Farours State: Farours Placebe







Association of Metformin Use With AMD: Case-Control Study

JAMA Ophthal (2021) 139(3) 302-309

Conclusion

Dose-dependent metformin use was associated with reduced odds of developing AMD with the greatest benefit at low to moderate doses. When looking only at patients with diabetes, we saw a preservation of the dose-dependent decrease in the odds of patients developing AMD. Metformin DOES NOT appear to be protective in patients with diabetes AND coexisting diabetic retinopathy. This study suggests that metformin may be useful as a preventive therapy for AMD and provides the basis for potential prospective clinical trials.

Metformin and risk of AMD in individuals with type 2 diabetes: a retrospective cohort study


BY J Ophthal (2022) doi:10.1136/bjophthalmol-2021-319641

Conclusion


No evidence that metformin was associated with risk of AMD in primary care patients requiring treatment for type 2 diabetes

*On-going Clinical Trials:
Investigation of Metformin in Pre-Diabetes on Atherosclerotic Cardiovascular OuTcomes (VA-IMPACT) Metformin in Longevity Study (MILES)



















































Abstract	
divided into four subgroups be collected and the serum was to chalazion in the age groups of Serum vitamin A levels in	OT subjects (S2 patients with chalazion and S5 control healthy subjects). Patients were further seed on the type of chalazion single, multiple, primary, and recurrent. Blood samples were sted for levels of vitamin A using HRLC. The average serum vitamin A levels in patients with 7-12 and 13-19 years were significantly loven than in their control counterparts. potients with recurrent, multiple chalazion were significantly lower than in patients with and patients with a recurrent, single chalazion.
	rrelation of Serum Vitamins and Chalazion
OVS (2022) doi: 10.1097,	/OPX.00000000001887
	ts (90 patients with chalazion and 90 control healthy subjects) with an average age of 4.13 ± hom were females. Serum samples were collected and used to measure the levels of vitamin A
Results	
	evels in patients with chalazion (0.54 ± 0.15 µmol/L) were significantly lower than in their 15 µmol/L). The percentage of vitamin A deficiency in chalazion group (52.2%) was much terparts (28.6%).
Conclusions	



























Table 8 Mean ± SD	of changes (improveme	ent) in visual functions
Treatment group	Visual acuity	Glare radius
9-month follow-up of	older subjects with catarac	t
Control group	0.90 ± 0.03 (n = 36)	1.53 ± 0.07 (n = 36)
NAC-treated group	1.54 ± 0.05 (n = 39)	0.41± 0.05° (n = 39)
9-month follow-up of	older adult noncataract sul	pjects
Control group	0.96 ± 0.03 (n = 35)	1.27 ± 0.05 (n = 35)
NAC-treated group	1.20 ± 0.04° (n = 37)	0.38 ± 0.05* (n = 37)
	Treatment group 9-month follow-up of Control group NAC-treated group 9-month follow-up of Control group	9-month follow-up of older subjects with catarac Control group $0.90\pm0.03~(n=36)$ NAC-treated group $1.54\pm0.05^{c.}~(n=39)$ 9-month follow-up of older adult noncataract sul Control group $0.96\pm0.03~(n=35)$
























































Take Home Points: Adjunctive Therapy Optometric Off-Label Use Topical ganciclovir 0.15% (Zirgan) QID x 7 days Adenoviral conjunctivitis Pred Forte 1% QID + Ketorolac 0.4% QID + Dorzolamide 2% TID x 4-12 wks DME CME RVO Pred Forte 1% QID + Timolol 0.5% BID + Dorzolamide 2% TID x 4-12 weeks nvAMD Macular Holes Cyclosporine 0.05% (Restasis) HSV stromal keratitis

134

Take Home Points: Adjunctive Therapy Optometric Off-Label Use Topical Apraclonidine 0.5% (lopidine) BID or PRN Mild ptosis Topical Brimonidine 0.2% (Alphagan-P 0.15%) BID or PRN Glare Timolol 0.5% 2gtts spaced by 15 minutes PRN Acute migraines Dorzolamide 2% (Trusopt) TID x 4-12 weeks CME Rho-kinase inhibitor 0.02% (Netarsudil) QD x 4 weeks Corneal endothelial injury

0	Optometric Off-Label Use
	Oral Doxycycline 100mg BID x 4 weeks RCE
	Atorvastatin 40mg and 80mg High-risk AMD
	Oral Prednisone 1250mg QD x 3 days Optic Neuritis
	Metformin 500mg BID or Glucophage XR 500mg QD x 12 weeks • DR and AMD
	Lisinopril 20-40mg QD x 12 weeks DR
	Spironolactone (Aldactone) 25mg BID x 4-12 weeks Rifampin (Rifampicin) 300mg BID x 4-12 weeks • CSC





l	imitations
	Optometry is typically outside an integrated healthcare setting Private practice Corporate settings
1	Off-label medication use may not be standard of care
	Adverse reactions to off-label medication use can expose the provider to liability

Opportunity...

- Off-label, adjunctive therapy can provide meaningful medical treatment during the time between referral and specialist follow-up
- · Off-label medication use can shorten duration and severity of disease condition
- Off-label medication use can reduce need for more invasive therapies

PCM teaming embraces integrated medicine

140

What's next?

- Evidence-based off-label therapy
 - Off-label medication use should be pharmacologically
 - Pilot data drives larger scale, RCTs that can fundamentally change how medications are utilized
- Off-label algorithms
 - Clinical Findings
 - Drug Class
- Dosage / Duration Recommended follow-up and testing





