



A Response to: Letter to the Editor Regarding PRK Enhancement for Residual Refractive Error After Primary PRK: A Retrospective Study

Majid Moshirfar · Yasmyne Ronquillo · Shannon McCabe

Received: June 15, 2021 / Accepted: June 24, 2021 / Published online: July 9, 2021
© The Author(s) 2021

Dear Drs. Benito-Llopis and Teus,

We acknowledge that widening our literature search to include articles involving “LASEK” and “surface ablation” would have allowed us to strengthen our assertion that surface ablation enhancements following previous surface ablation procedures are safe and effective, as well stated in Drs. Benito-Llopis and Teu’s 2010 article on this topic [1]. However, our focus was comparing our results with PRK enhancement after PRK to the specific FDA criteria for safety and efficacy of PRK. Given that a systematic review of the literature concluded that the comparative effectiveness of LASEK versus PRK in treating low to moderate myopic eyes is uncertain [2], we felt it would not be appropriate to compare our results to other surface ablation procedures with different techniques. We do agree that all surface ablation procedures should be considered minimal modification of the same corneal refractive procedure, but since existing scientific literature has intentionally created a distinction between them, we consequently chose to focus our comparison on the traditional surgical form of PRK with complete epithelial debridement. Again, we thank the authors for their comments as well as their valuable contribution to the literature.

M. Moshirfar (✉) · Y. Ronquillo · S. McCabe
HDR Research Center, Hoopes Vision, Utah, USA
e-mail: cornea2020@me.com

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Funding. No funding or sponsorship was received for this study or publication of this article.

Authorship. All named authors meet the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) criteria for authorship for this article, take responsibility for the integrity of the work as a whole, and have given their approval for this version to be published.

Author Contributions. All authors contributed equally to the preparation of this letter.

Disclosures. Majid Moshirfar, Yasmyne Ronquillo and Shannon McCabe have nothing to disclose.

Compliance with Ethics Guidelines. This article is based on previously conducted studies and does not contain any new studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

Open Access. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License, which permits any non-commercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give

appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

REFERENCES

1. De Benito-Llopis L, Teus MA. Efficacy of surface ablation retreatments using mitomycin C. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2010;150(3):376–80.
2. Li SM, Zhan S, Li SY, Peng XX, Hu J, Law HA, Wang NL. Laser-assisted subepithelial keratectomy (LASEK) versus photorefractive keratectomy (PRK) for correction of myopia. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2016;2:CD009799. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD009799.pub2>.