Childhood Ocular Trauma Epidemiology and Outcome at a Tertiary Care Centre in Rajasthan

Anil Chauhan¹, Chandana Kumari^{2*}, Manoj Soni³, Jitendra Acharya⁴

¹Assistant Professor, ^{2*}MS Opthalmology,

Department of Opthalmology, S P Medical College, Bikaner, Rajasthan, India.

³Assistant Professor, Department of Statistics, Government Engineering College, Bikaner, Rajasthan, India.

⁴Senior Demonstrator, Department of Dentistry, S P Medical College, Bikaner, Rajasthan, India.

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to identify the risk factors, different modalities of management and suggest preventive measures in children below 16 years of age.

Materials and Methods: A total of 295 children below 16 years of age with history of ocular injury were included in our study. A detailed history and complete ocular examination including Slit lamp examination, indirect ophthalmoscopy as well as special investigations like B-scan, X-ray were done wherever required and appropriate timely medical and surgical intervention was done.

Results: We observed the incidence of ocular trauma in this age group was 8.7%, male female ratio 2.5:1. Most of the injury occurred during outdoor activity and pointed objects mainly stick were the common cause of injury. Among all cases 75.2% were close globe injury, 16.6% cases were open globe injury and in 8.2% only ocular adnexa were involved. Most cases (76%) required conservative management only. At 6 months follow up 91.8% had BCVA \geq 6/60, 3.9% had <6/60, 4.3% had no perception of light.

Conclusion: In children ocular injuries are an important cause

of unilateral & some time bilateral blindness. Such injuries could not be always preventable but by identifying the risk factors, most effective methods of management, parents' awareness and by reducing exposure to dangerous objects can prevent the morbidity to some extent.

Keywords: Mechanical Injury, Close Globe Injury, Opens Globe Injury, Ocular Adnexa Injury.

*Correspondence to:

Dr. Chandana Kumari,

MS Opthalmology,

Department Of Opthalmology,

S P Medical College, Bikaner, Rajasthan, India.

Article History:

Received: 04-12-2017, Revised: 29-12-2017, Accepted: 11-01-2018

Access this article online		
Website: www.ijmrp.com	Quick Response code	
DOI: 10.21276/ijmrp.2018.4.1.139		

INTRODUCTION

Ocular injuries are the most common cause of uniocular blindness in children.¹ It is mainly accidental and has an age specific pattern. Children are most frequently injured at home by common and innocuous objects.² Penetrating injury involving the posterior segment of the eye has a poorer prognosis as compared to blunt injury. Aim of this study is to determine the magnitude of the problem and identify the major causes for suggesting preventive strategies. Purpose of this study was to identify the risk factors for ocular trauma, determine different modalities of management and suggest preventive measures in children below 16 years of age.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

It is a longitudinal hospital based study done in a tertiary eye care centre in western part of Rajasthan. We included 295 children below 16 years of age with history of mechanical injury in the past one year, who presented within 5 days of injury. A detailed history was taken and data such as age, sex, eye involved, causes of injury, place and time of presentation, visual complaints and status

of tetanus immunization were documented. Visual acuity was taken by snellen chart (wherever possible), pupillary reflex for relative afferent pupillary defect, ocular motility, periorbital area for associated injury was checked out. A complete slitlamp examination was done for status of lid & adnexa, conjunctiva, sclera, cornea, anterior chamber iris, pupil and lens was evaluated. IOP was taken by applanation tonometry in close globe injury only; gonioscopy was done to rule out angle recession and fundus examination by indirect ophthalmoscope for posterior segment involvement wherever possible. Wherever needed special investigation like B-scan, X-ray, and CT scan were done. Surgical and /or medical management was planned as per the need. Systemic antibiotics were started in all open globe injuries. Eyes with lid laceration were repaired with 6-0 silk or 8-0 polygalactin, conjunctival laceration with 8-0 or 10-0 polygalactin and cornea, corneo-scleral or sclera tear were closed with 10-0 nylon, uveal prolapse was managed by doing iris abscission & wound repair. Post-operative topical antibiotic, steroid (after ruling out fungal infection) and cycloplegic were given, also systemic

antibiotic and steroid wherever needed given. In case of traumatic endophthalmitis intravitrial injection of antibiotic and steroid (Amikacin /Vancomycin + Dexamethasone) was given only after exclusion of fungal endophthalmitis. Core vitrectomy was done in all fungal and bacterial endophthalmitis not responding to conservative management.

The type of secondary surgery decided for different patients were – anterior capsulotomy and lens aspiration with or without PCIOL and with or without primary posterior capsulotomy, secondary IOL implantation, core vitrectomy, evisceration. IOL power was

calculated with SRK formula II, where biometry was not possible it was done in other eye. Lens aspiration was done with a 3.5mmclear corneal incision superiorly 1mm into the limbus. Secondary IOL was given by 5mm corneo-scleral tunnel at 2mm from the limbus superiorly. A PCIOL (PMMA) preferably in the bag and sulcus fixated IOL where inadequate posterior capsule support, was implanted. Core vitrectomy was done by 20G, 3 ports pars planna route. Preferably general anaesthesia was given. Local anaesthesia was given in cooperative children above 10 years of age.

Table 1: Incidence of ocular trauma in children

Total number of OPD patients	Total number of pediatric patients	Percentage of pediatric patients (%)	Total number of pediatric patients with h/o trauma	Incidence of trauma in pediatric patients (%)
45,145	4,646	10.8	409	8.7

Table 2. Age distribution			
Age group (years)	n	%	
0-5	109	36.5	
6-10	118	40.4	
11-16	68	23.1	
Total	295	100	

Table 3: Objects causing injury

Objects causing injury	n	%
Stick	94	31.4
Stone	31	10.3
Ball	19	6.2
Hypodermic needle	5	1.7
Glass	4	1.4
Caterpiller hair	23	7.9
Study material (Pencil, Pen)	6	2.1
Finger/Fist	59	20.4
Metallic fragment	21	7.2
Bird's beak	3	1.1
Miscellaneous	30	10.3
Total	295	100

Table 4: Type of injury

Diagnosis	n	%		
Superficial injury	180	60.7		
Corneal/corneo-scleral/sclera tear	37	12.4		
without lens changes				
Lid injury	15	5.2		
Corneal ulcer	11	3.8		
Endophthamitis/ Panophthalmitis	11	3.8		
Corneal/corneo-scleral/sclera tear	10	3.4		
with lens changes				
Blunt trauma with cataract	5	1.7		
Blunt trauma with posterior	4	1.4		
segment complication				
Miscellaneous (hyphaema, angle	22	7.6		
recession, sphincter tear)				
Total	295	100		

RESULTS

All patients were examined on next day, then subsequently after 1 week, 1month and 6 months. At each visit the patients were assessed under these headings - visual acuity, detailed silt lamp examination including status of wound & suture, IOP with applanation tonometry and dilated fundus examination. The data thus collected was compiled and analysed using SPSS software package (version - 11.0).A total of 295 subjects were included in the study and the results are analysed. Out of total 295 study subjects, 210 (71.7%) were male and 85 (23.3%) were female. Left eye (52.5%) was found to be involved more frequently than right eye (44.5%) and bilateral involvement seen in 2.8% cases. The most common place of injury was outdoors (60.3%) i.e. during the sport activity and at home in 39.7% cases. Playing with injurious object was found to be the most common circumstance of injury in our study. Among all 42.1% patients presented to the hospital within 24 hours of injury, 41.7% within 2-3 days and 16.2% within 4-5 days. The most common type of injury was type B in Open globe injury and type A in Close globe injury. Out of 295 cases, 232 (79%) children required only conservative management, primary repair was done in 55 (18.3%) cases, only intravitreal injection was given in 2 (0.7%) cases, repair with intravitreal was given in 2 (0.7%) and core vitrectomy with intravitreal injection was given in 1 (0.3%) case. Primary evisceration was done in 1 (0.3%) case. Visual acuity at presentation and final visual outcome was compared. 100% (196) children had good final visual acuity who presented with good visual acuity (≥6/60) as compared to 44.1% (15)children who presented with poor VA (<6/60). Vision could not be checked in 58 cases.

DISCUSSION

Though many reports are available on ocular injury³⁻⁶, very little literature is available on ocular injuries in children in this part of India. The diagnosis and management of injury in children is a real challenge. In our study the incidence of ocular trauma in children was 8.7% of all paediatric eye patients. It differs from the study by Takvam JA et al⁷, who found it to be 14%. Majority 40.4% of cases were children of 6-10 years of age group, Jaison SG et al⁸ and Das gupta S et al⁹ and also many other studies have shown the preponderance of this age groups.¹⁰⁻¹³ In our study male to female ratio was 2.5:1. The high incidence, in boys, in this study is

consistent with finding of most other studies. 14-19 Pointed object, particularly sticks were the most common causative agent in this study as well as others. 20,21 In our study one of the major factors contributing to ocular injury in children was playing with injurious materials (41.4%) like stick, bow & arrow and sharp plastic toys, which can be prevented. And 55.5% of ocular injuries were avoidable. Ocular injuries during outdoor activity like sports accounts for 60.3%, where as domestic activity accounts only 39.7% which was consistent with the study by Narang S et al21 but different from other studies.^{22,23} In our study mechanical trauma was classified according to the Ocular Trauma Classification Group recommendation by Pieramici DJ at al.24 We found predominantly Close globe injuries (75.2%) and Open globe injuries amounted to 19.6%, this is also consistent with the study by Takvam JA et al. We also found that injuries caused by hypodermic needle²⁵ and bird's beak were mostly associated with endophthalmitis.

In our study most of the cases had better visual outcome. At the end of 6 months follow up 91.8% had best corrected visual acuity $\geq 6/60,\ 3.9\%$ had < 6/60 and no PL in 4.3% cases. This varies considerably from the study by Desai P et al, where 10.7% had visual acuity $\geq 6/60$ and no patient registered blind. Dasgupta S et al found No PL in 7 patients. Among open globe injury cases 15.4% had visual acuity < 6/60 and 25.6% had No PL in our study. This differs from the study by Thompson CG et al who found the visual acuity <6/60 in 31% cases. 68% of perforated eye had No PL at the end of treatment in the study by Jaison SG et al. Delayed presentation and poor visual acuity at presentation were the main risk factors for poor visual outcome in our study.

CONCLUSION

Good visual acuity at presentation and prompt management are two favourable prognostic factors for visual outcome in ocular trauma. Penetrating injuries result in poorer visual outcome as compared to blunt injuries. This study shows, in 55.5% cases the injury was avoidable. But this may not be so easy. In children of preschool age group at home, injury can be prevented by parental supervision, awareness of child's activities and use of proper protective measures. Public education, general awareness and aggressive primary management may be indicated to improve the visual prognosis in children.

Trauma is the commonest cause of monocular blindness in pediatric age group. Various etiological factors and preventable causes have been described and vary from study to study.

The cases which attend ophthalmic care within 24 hours of injury have a better prognostic visual outcome than those who report late. Most of the injuries are preventable. To the best of our knowledge we have reported 3 cases of ocular trauma by bird's beak all culminating in blindness secondary to endophthalmitis.

REFERENCES

- 1. Aghadoost D. Ocular trauma: An Over view. Arch Trauma Res.2014 June;3(2): e21639.
- 2. MacEwen CJ, Baines PS and Desai P. Eye injuries in children: the current picture. Br. J. Ophthalmol., Aug 1999; 83:933-36.
- 3. Parmar IP, Nagpal RC, Sunandan S. Pattern of ocular injuries in Haryana. Indian J Ophthalmol,1985;33(3):141-44.
- 4. Salvin JH. Systematic approach to paediatric ocular trauma. Curr Opin Ophthalmol. 2007;18:366–72.
- 5. Zagelbaum BM, Tostanoski JR et al. Urban eye trauma- A one year

Prospective study. Ophthalmology 1993;100:851-56.

- 6. Saini JS, Mukharjer AK, Dabral SM, Moraes O. A Profile of penetrating eye injuries. Indian J Ophthalmol 1985;33:95-97.
- 7. Takvam JA, Midelfart A. Survey of eye injuries in Norwegian children. Acta Ophthalmol, 1993 ;71(4): 500-5.
- 8. Jaison SG, Silas SE, Daniel R, Chopra SK. Areview of childhood admission with perforating ocular injuries in a hospital in north-west India. Indian J Ophthalmol. 1994;42 (4):199-201
- 9. Dasgupta S, Mukharjee R, Ladi DS, Gandhi VH. Paediatric ocular trauma: A clinical presentation. J Postgrad Med, 1990;36(1):20-22.
- 10. Jovanovic M, Medarevic A, Knezevic M, Krstic V. Mechanical eye injuries in children aged 0-15 years treated at the clinic of eye diseases in Belgrade:frequency, causes and preventive measures. Srp Arh Celok Lek, 2013,141: 586-91.
- 11. Saxena R, Sinha R et al. Pattern of paediatric ocular trauma in India.Ind J of Pediatr, 2002;69(10):863-67.
- 12. Cariello AJ, Moraes NS et al. Epidemiological finding of ocular trauma in childhood. Arg bras Oftalmol.,2007;70(2):271-75.
- 13. Chakraborti C et al. Paediatric ocular trauma in a tertiary eye care centre in Eastern India. Indian J Public Health, 2014;58(4):278-80.
- 14. Hosseini H, Masoumpour M et al. Clinical and Epidemiologic Characteristics of Severe Childhood Ocular Injuries in Southern Iran. Middle East Afr J Ophthalmol. 2011; 18(2): 136–140.
- 15. Soylu M, Sizmaz S, Cayli S. Eye injury (ocular trauma) in southern Turkey: Epidemiology, ocular survival, and visual outcome. Int Ophthalmol. 2010;30:143–48.
- 16. Thompson CG, Kumar N et al. The aetiology of perforating ocular injuries in children. Br.J. Ophthalmol., 2002;86: 920-22.
- 17. Khatry SK, Lewis AE et al. The epidemiology of ocular trauma in rural Nepal. Br. J. Ophthalmol, 2004;88:456-60.
- 18. Mukherjee AK, Saini JS, Dabral SM. Aprofile of penetrating eye injuries. Indian J Ophthalmol.1984;32:269-71.
- 19. Niiranen M, Raivio I. Eye injuries in children. Br J Ophthalmol 1981;65(6):436-38.
- 20. Jovanovic M. Mechanical injuries of the eyeball: Frequency, structure, and possibility of the prevention. Srp Arh Celok Lek.2006;134:11-21.
- 21. Narang S, Gupta V, Simalandhi P, Gupta A, Raj S, Dogra MR. Paediatric open globe injuries. Visual outcome and risk factors for endophthalmitis. Indian J Ophthalmol. 2004;52(1):29-34.
- 22. Desai P, MacEwen CJ, Baines P, Minassian DC. Incidence of cases of ocular trauma admitted to hospital and incidence of blinding outcome. Br J Ophthalmol. 1996; 80(7):592-96.
- 23. Ilsar M, Chirambo M, Belkin M. Ocular injuries in Malawi. Br.J. Ophthalmol.1982; 66:145-48.
- 24. Pieramici DJ, Sternberg P Jr et al. The ocular Trauma classification group.A system for classifying mechanical injuries of the eye (globe). Am j. Ophthalmol. 1997;123:820-31
- 25. Soylu M et al. Etiology of pediatric perforating eye injuries in southern Turkey. Ophthalmic Epidemiol. 1998;5:7–12

Source of Support: Nil. Conflict of Interest: None Declared.

Copyright: © the author(s) and publisher. IJMRP is an official publication of Ibn Sina Academy of Medieval Medicine & Sciences, registered in 2001 under Indian Trusts Act, 1882. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Cite this article as: Anil Chauhan, Chandana Kumari, Manoj Soni, Jitendra Acharya. Childhood Ocular Trauma Epidemiology and Outcome at a Tertiary Care Centre in Rajasthan. Int J Med Res Prof. 2018 Jan; 4(1):638-40. DOI:10.21276/ijmrp.2018.4.1.139