



## Condition

Diabetic macular edema (DME) is a complication of diabetes in which the centre of the retina swells, causing vision loss. The goal of treatment is to preserve or improve current vision by preventing or reducing macular swelling.

## Treatment Options

To reduce macular swelling, options include:

- Laser photocoagulation therapy to cauterize leaking blood vessels
- Injection into the eye with anti-vascular endothelial growth factors (VEGF) to prevent blood vessel growth
- Injection into the eye with a corticosteroid.

## Issue

Lucentis (ranibizumab), an anti-VEGF, is the only drug therapy licensed by Health Canada for the treatment of DME. Lucentis is priced at \$1,575 per 2.3 mg vial. Avastin (bevacizumab), another anti-VEGF, is available as an anti-cancer agent and is being used to treat DME without an indication for this use. What evidence exists as to the benefits and harms of using Avastin in DME?

## Methods

A systematic review with meta-analyses was conducted to compare the therapeutic effects of intravitreal Avastin with standard therapies for DME. A supplementary search identified evidence on the safety of Avastin in DME and other eye conditions.

## Implications for Decision-Making

- Although Avastin does not have an indication for treatment of DME, there is considerable interest in its use for this condition.
- This review found: Avastin improved vision compared to laser therapy, insufficient evidence comparing Avastin to corticosteroid, and lack of robust evidence for the long-term safety profile of Avastin.
- There were no trials that directly compared Avastin with Lucentis in DME, although a recently published indirect comparison suggested that they may have similar efficacy.
- Large, well-conducted trials are needed to provide better evidence of the effects of Avastin compared with other options, as well as to better define the optimal dose, timing, and duration of Avastin in DME.

## Results

Ten trials met the inclusion criteria, were critically appraised, and the findings reported. Six additional studies are critically appraised within the supplemental safety evaluation. Comment is also provided on a recent review for the United States Medicare Evidence Development & Coverage Advisory Committee, which used indirect comparison methodology to compare four anti-VEGFs for treating DME.

For the complete report, please visit [www.cadth.ca](http://www.cadth.ca).

**DISCLAIMER:** The information in this Report in Brief is intended to help health care decision-makers, patients, health care professionals, health systems leaders, and policy-makers make well-informed decisions and thereby improve the quality of health care services. The information in this Report in Brief should not be used as a substitute for the application of clinical judgment in respect of the care of a particular patient or other professional judgment in any decision-making process nor is it intended to replace professional medical advice. While CADTH has taken care in the preparation of the Report in Brief to ensure that its contents are accurate, complete, and up-to-date, CADTH does not make any guarantee to that effect. CADTH is not responsible for any errors or omissions or injury, loss, or damage arising from or as a result of the use (or misuse) of any information contained in or implied by the information in this Report in Brief.

CADTH takes sole responsibility for the final form and content of this Report in Brief. The statements, conclusions, and views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the view of Health Canada or any provincial or territorial government. Production of this document is made possible by financial contributions from Health Canada and the governments of Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador, Northwest Territories, Nova Scotia, Nunavut, Ontario, Prince Edward Island, Saskatchewan and Yukon.