

Table 35: Effect of MIGS Versus Comparators on Visual Field in Adults With Glaucoma

Quality Assessment							Summary of Findings			Importance	
No. of Studies	Study Design	Risk of Bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other Considerations	No. of Eyes		Effect		Quality
							MIGS	Comparator			
MIGS Vs. Pharmacotherapy: 2x iStent Vs. Travoprost											
1	RCT ^a	Very serious risk of bias ^b	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious imprecision ^c	None	2x iStent, 54	Travoprost, 47	2x iStent [=] Travoprost Visual field (mean deviation and pattern standard deviation) was similar between groups and across time points (baseline through 36 mo follow-up), but this was not tested statistically. ⁵⁸	⊕○○○ VERY LOW	CRITICAL
MIGS Vs. Another MIGS: 1x Vs. 2x Vs. 3x iStent											
1	RCT ^d	Very serious risk of bias ^e	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious imprecision ^f	None	iStent, 38 2x iStent, 41 3x iStent, 40	NA ^g	1 iStent = 2 iStents = 3 iStents: The change in visual field from screening to 42 mo follow-up was not significantly different between groups; whether the absolute visual field was significantly different from screening within groups at 18 or 42 mo follow-up was not tested statistically. ^{59,60}	⊕○○○ VERY LOW	CRITICAL

= = not significantly different between groups; [=] = not compared statistically but tendency for no difference between groups; 2x = two devices; 3x = three devices; MIGS = minimally invasive glaucoma surgery; mo = months; NA = not applicable; no. = number; RCT = randomized controlled trial; vs. = versus.

Note: Data were collected by RCT, with up to 42 months of follow-up. Visual field was measured by Humphrey 24-2 Swedish Interactive Threshold Algorithm, or method of measurement was not reported.

^a One RCT.⁵⁸

^b Very serious risk of bias.⁵⁸ Selection bias: no indication of allocation concealment. Attrition bias: low-risk at 12- and 24-month follow-up; large amount of missing data at 36-month follow-up and reasons not reported. Reporting bias: no statistical comparisons conducted.

^c Serious imprecision.⁵⁸ Only one study, and no measures of variability.

^d One RCT in two publications.^{59,60}

^e Very serious risk of bias.^{59,60} Selection bias: no indication of allocation concealment. Detection bias: method of measuring visual field not specified. Reporting bias: relevant statistical comparisons not conducted or reported.

^f Serious imprecision. Only a single study, and the variability in the estimate (standard deviation) was similar in magnitude to the parameter (mean).^{59,60}

^g In this study, different numbers of iStents (all MIGS) were compared.^{59,60}