The Modified Fasanella-Servat Procedure: Description and Quantified Analysis
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Purpose: To describe a modified Fasanella-Servat procedure and nomogram for the correction of minimal amounts of ptosis.

Methods: Retrospective review of this modified Fasanella-Servat procedure was performed on 118 eyelids in 86 consecutive patients over 2, 4-year periods by 1 surgeon (S.C.D.). The amount of tarsectomy was based on the amount of ptosis.

Results: Mean pre- and postoperative margin-to-reflex distance 1 were +0.7 mm and +2.4 mm, respectively. One hundred and twelve eyelids (95%) had satisfactory results with postoperative margin-to-reflex distance 1 ≥ 1.5 mm. Eyelid symmetry was achieved in 92% of eyelids to within 0.5 mm. There was no incidence of overcorrection, tarsal buckling, or corneal abrasion. One eyelid had a contour deficit. Tarsectomy amount ranged from 2 mm to 5 mm. Average amount of tarsectomy to eyelid elevation was 2.4:1.

Conclusions: The modified Fasanella-Servat procedure is technically easy, time-efficient, and has a low complication rate for the treatment of minimal blepharoptosis (< 2.5 mm) with good levator function and negative phenylephrine test. In the authors’ hands, the ratio of tarsectomy to eyelid elevation is approximately 2:1. In addition to other techniques such as levator advancement and Müller’s muscle conjunctival resection, the modified Fasanella-Servat technique is a useful adjunct to the modern ptosis surgeon’s armamentarium.

(Ophthal Plast Reconstr Surg 2013;29:30–34)

In 1961, Fasanella and Servat1 described their tarsectomy operation for correcting small amounts of blepharoptosis in patients with normal levator function. The Fasanella-Servat (FS) procedure is considered by many surgeons to be fairly reliable and of low technical complexity. Suboptimal results are frequently reported in the literature with success rates ranging from 28% to 61% and frequent reference to contour abnormality and suture keratopathy as surgical complications.2–5 Most authors have attributed the low success rate to improper surgical technique and poor patient selection.

In 1972, Putterman6 developed a clamp to replace the use of curved hemostats advocated for fixation of the tarsocconjunctival complex in the FS procedure. This particular clamp is best known today for its use in the Müller’s muscle conjunctival resection (MMCR). The authors use a modified clamp, which features a screw type lock closure mechanism and modified teeth for improved purchase stability of the tarsal plate and minimization of contour abnormalities. Other posterior approaches like the MMCR, also initially described by Putterman and Urist,7 and further modified and refined by Dresner,8 have been shown to provide better predictability, with less incidence of late postoperative complications. However, its widespread use is prevented by the sine qua non need of a positive response to the phenylephrine test in order for the procedure to have any predictable effect over the ptosis correction. The FS procedure is well suited for minimal ptosis (< 2.5 mm) with a negative phenylephrine test,9 because the effectiveness of the FS operation is likely independent from its effects on Müller’s muscle.

In this study, the authors investigate the efficacy of their modified FS procedure designed to avoid contour abnormality and suture keratopathy for the repair of minimal ptosis amounts.

MODIFIED FS SURGICAL TECHNIQUE

Preoperatively, an upper eyelid mark is placed above the pupillary axis, with the patient sitting upright. A modified Müllerectomy clamp, model no. E2512, with screw type lock closure mechanism (Bausch & Lomb, Rochester, NY, U.S.A.) is included in the sterile instrument tray (Fig. 1A). Topical anesthetic eyedrops are instilled in the superior fornix. The upper eyelid is distracted from the globe, and a bent needle is used to inject 1 ml to 2 ml of 1% lidocaine with 1:100,000 epinephrine and hyaluronidase through the palpebral conjunctiva, superior to the tarsus (Fig. 1B). The patient is prepped and draped for surgery. The eyelid clamp, model no. E2512, with screw type lock closure mechanism (Bausch & Lomb, Rochester, NY, U.S.A.) is included in the sterile instrument tray (Fig. 1A). Topical anesthetic eyedrops are instilled in the superior fornix. The upper eyelid is distracted from the globe, and a bent needle is used to inject 1 ml to 2 ml of 1% lidocaine with 1:100,000 epinephrine and hyaluronidase through the palpebral conjunctiva, superior to the tarsus (Fig. 1B). The patient is prepped and draped for surgery. The eyelid clamp is placed over the tarsus and conjunctiva with the maximum height of the clamp centered over the pupillary axis (Fig. 1C). Two-millimeter tarsus should be resected for each millimeter of desired elevation. Two 4-0 silk sutures are placed through the conjunctivotarsal border medially and laterally and tied for traction (Fig. 1D). The Desmarres is removed, and the tissues are elevated via the 2 traction sutures. The clamp is placed over the tarsus and conjunctiva with the maximum height of the clamp centered over the pupillary axis (Fig. 1E). The screw device is turned until the tissues are firmly crushed. A 6-0 prolene suture is passed from the eyelid skin surface approximately 5 mm above the eyelid margin to the conjunctiva under the clamp10 (Fig. 1F). The prolene is then passed back and forth with approximately 3-mm spacing in a horizontal running fashion below the clamp and...
finally exteriorized through the skin at the other end of the clamp (Fig. 1G). The authors prefer a longer semicircular needle, e.g., P3 equivalent (Ethicon, Somerville, NJ, U.S.A.), to facilitate the pass from conjunctiva to skin. While holding the prolene against the forehead and silk sutures upward with the clamp, the conjunctivotarsal tissues are excised with a no. 15 Bard-Parker blade, using metal-to-metal contact from the blade to the clamp (Fig. 1H). The eyelid is reflected back in its anatomical position, and the suture is tied loosely to itself anterior to the skin in the pretarsal area (Fig. 1I). Any encountered bleeding subsides once the suture is tied. The surgical time is approximately 10 minutes for each upper eyelid. Antibiotic-steroid drops are used postoperatively. The suture is removed in 5 to 7 days by cutting the externalized portion nasally and pulling the suture out laterally.

METHODS

A Current Procedural Terminology–guided query for Current Procedural Terminology code 67908 (FS procedure) was conducted during all periods of available electronic medical records (Fox Med, San Antonio, TX; NextGen, Horsham, PA, U.S.A.) for one of the authors (S.C.D.). Inclusion criteria consisted of all patients with documentation of the following variables: preoperative margin-to-reflex distance 1 (MRD1) in primary gaze, levator excursion, and postoperative MRD1 measurements with a minimum of at least 2 postoperative follow-up visits at 1 month or longer. Demographics, history of previous ptosis surgeries, and result of the phenylephrine testing (MRDp)11 were documented. The authors considered any eyelid that did not reach acceptable elevation 5 minutes after superior fornical instillation of 2.5% phenylephrine as a negative test. Patients undergoing concurrent blepharoplasty or other upper eyelid procedures were excluded. Informed consent was obtained for each procedure, and the review was Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act compliant and adhered to the standards of the Declaration of Helsinki.

The change in MRD1 was calculated as the postoperative MRD1, at the latest follow up minus the most recent preoperative MRD1. Symmetry was measured by comparing the postoperative MRD1 of both eyelids at the latest follow up. A positive or negative sign was given to the symmetry value based on what the final MRD1 result of the operative eyelid was relative to anticipated result using the author’s 2:1 tarsectomy to eyelid elevation ratio. Actual tarsectomy to eyelid elevation ratio was calculated by dividing the amount of tarsus resected by the change in preoperative versus postoperative MRD1 in each patient. To assess the influence of age, prior surgery, preoperative values, levator and resection amount on outcomes (difference and ratio), univariate and multivariate mixed-effects modeling were performed to account for variability in results due to intraindividual differences. All analyses were performed by one of the authors (C.J.L.) using SPSS (IBM, Armonk, NY, U.S.A.) version 20 software; α = 0.05.

RESULTS

The database search yielded 2 consecutive series from June 1997 to November 2000 (Fox Med) and May 2005 to September 2011 (NextGen). A total of 118 FS surgeries from 86 patients were identified. Demographic and clinical data are shown in the Table. There were no differences in the patient characteristics between the series, and data were combined for analysis.

Thirty-four percent of patients had a history of prior ptosis surgery, the majority through a posterior approach (MMCR).
Those who had previous MMCR surgery did not undergo phenylephrine testing. All other patients had a negative phenylephrine test. Mean pre- and postoperative MRD₁ were +0.7 mm and +2.4 mm, respectively. One hundred and twelve eyelids (95%) had satisfactory results with postoperative MRD₁ ≥ 1.5 mm (Fig. 2). Of the 6 eyelids with residual ptosis, 4 were elected for reoperation and were repaired to patient satisfaction with external levator advancement. Eyelid symmetry was achieved in 92% of eyelids to within 0.5 mm (Fig. 3). There was no incidence of overcorrection, tarsal buckling, instability, or corneal abrasion. One eyelid had a contour deficit.

Tarsectomy amount ranged from 2 mm to 5 mm. Mean amount of tarsectomy resection to eyelid elevation was 2.4:1 with 2:1 being the most frequent ratio (Fig. 4). There were no correlations between ratio predictability and age (r = −0.13), prior surgery, preoperative MRD₁, resection amount, or levator function (all p values > 0.15). In univariate analyses, significant predictors of greater change in MRD₁ included older age (p = 0.003), lower preoperative MRD₁, value (p < 0.001), and larger resection amount (p < 0.001). These 3 variables remained significant predictors, even when adjusting for each other in the model.

**DISCUSSION**

This study found that the modified FS is a technically easy, time-efficient procedure with low complication rate for the treatment of minimal blepharoptosis (< 2.5 mm) with good levator function and negative phenylephrine test. In the authors’ hands, the resection nomogram is approximately 2:1 for tarsectomy resection to amount of ptosis correction, with a maximum tarsectomy of 5 mm. In one third of the patients, the technique was used secondarily to augment results of previous ptosis repair.

Fasanella and Servat originally described their procedure using 2 curved hemostats. Placing these hemostats can be cumbersome and is assistant-dependent, often leading to misplacement and postoperative contour abnormalities. The success rate of the operation has been quoted from 28% to 61.6% or 94.6% depending on the severity of the ptosis and include multiple references to eyelid contour abnormalities such as upper eyelid peaking and tarsal buckling.² ⁴, ¹⁰–¹⁶ and need for postoperative

---

**Clinical characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total cohort</th>
<th>Patients (n = 86)</th>
<th>Eyelids (n = 118)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior ptosis surgery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anterior</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posterior</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bilateral surgery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laterality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean (SD)                    |                  |                   |
| Age (range, 5–95)           | 71 years (19)    |                   |
| Follow up (range, 4–80)     | 9 weeks (10)     |                   |
| Levator function            | 14 mm (3)        |                   |
| MRD₁ preoperative           | 0.7 mm (0.7)     |                   |
| MRD₁ postoperative          | 2.4 mm (0.8)     |                   |
| MRD₁ change                 | 1.7 mm           |                   |
| Ratio:Resection/change      | 2.4 (1)          |                   |

MRD₁, margin-to-reflex distance 1; SD, standard deviation.
adjustment. The use of a Müllerectomy clamp with the authors’ surgical technique facilitates a straight-forward stabilization of the tarsus and has many advantages over the use of hemostats or forceps for this purpose. Most clamps have an arched design, which when centered on the previously marked pupilary eyelid margin facilitates a controlled, naturally arched cut, using the no.15 blade metal to metal against the clamp. The teeth on the modified Müllerectomy clamp used by the authors have been moved closer to the arch edge, enabling smaller, more precise resections. The screw type lock mechanism provides for a variable amount of crush depending on thickness of the tarsus, encouraging hemostasis and preventing slippage of the clamp. Use of traction sutures marked, placed, and held completely by the surgeon during excision of tarsus eliminates the dependence on a surgical assistant for consistent tension and orientation of the hemostats during excision. There was 1 contour abnormality in 118 eyelids in this study, and the authors believe the above improvements to the previously described FS procedure account for this lower rate.

Histopathologic evaluation of specimens studied from FS procedures has failed to show smooth muscle in most patients; nevertheless, these patients had equally successful ptosis correction. The success of the procedure in the subset of patients with a negative phenylephrine test may be attributed to the fact that the effect of the FS procedure does not depend on the excision and shortening of Müller’s muscle, but instead likely a combination of vertical posterior lamellar shortening, secondary contraction of the wound, and plication or advancement of the Müller’s smooth muscle-levator aponeurosis complex on the tarsus. Although the original article recommended the FS procedure for the correction of 3-mm to 4-mm ptosis, the authors’ findings do not support the use of the procedure for this degree of ptosis. In the authors’ hands, the maximum amount of ptosis correction is 2.5 mm; this allows a maximum of 5-mm tarsectomy while ensuring an adequate amount of remaining tarsus to prevent postoperative buckling or instability, and resection nomogram of 2:1 for tarsectomy to amount of ptosis correction.

The FS procedure can be performed on patients with or without a positive phenylephrine test. However, the authors advocate the use of MMCR in patients with a positive phenylephrine test, because these patients are usually better served with the excellent predictability of the nomogram described and used for this surgical technique. Phenylephrine testing is not useful in patients who would generally be poor candidates for MMCR surgery such as those with history of prior MMC.

The FS procedure was originally described using plain gut suture. This may lead to suture keratopathy. In contrast to plain gut, the authors have found that prolene does not irritate the cornea, and with exteriorization of the knot on the eyelid skin, corneal irritation is prevented. There were no cases of suture keratopathy or need for bandage contact lens in the authors’ series of 118 patients.

The authors’ study attempts to produce a standardized nomogram for the FS procedure. Buckman et al. described a large series of patients who underwent the FS procedure performed by 4 surgeons. They found that most patients had absent to minimal amounts of Müller’s muscle in their histopathologic specimens; yet, these patients had equal success in their postoperative results for their ptosis correction. The authors could not correlate the amount of tarsocutaneous resection to the amount of ptosis correction. Two factors may explain the inability to detect a correlation. First, patient cohorts from 4 surgeons were combined with no mention of standardized technique. Second, tarsectomy amount was attained by measuring postoperative specimen, which likely had undergone variable amounts of mechanical shortening after excision or fixative agent contraction. Gupta et al. published a series of 50 patients who had ptosis correction using the FS procedure with a standard resection formula of 3 mm as described by Fasanella and Servat in their original procedure. Gupta et al. quantified their postoperative results using the change in preoperative and postoperative eyelid fissure height. Because no amount of ptosis could be accurately identified using this method and all the patients treated received the same amount of tarsectomy, no correlation analysis to determine a surgical nomogram could be derived from this study.

Betharia et al. previously reported the use of traction sutures and tarsus excision of double the amount of desired ptosis correction. This ratio was not confirmed with actual MRD measurements. In the series of 14 patients examined, there were 3 corneal abrasions and 2 contour abnormalities. The authors believe this higher rate of complications likely relates to the use of absorbable catgut suture and tarsocutaneous complex excision without a clamp.

One third of the eyelids that underwent the FS procedure in the authors’ study were reoperations after prior ptosis surgery. Two thirds of these were after a previous MMCR and one third after anterior levator advancement. No statistically significant difference in efficacy or tarsectomy to resection ratio between FS surgeries done as a primary versus secondary procedure was found. This procedure has become an invaluable tool for the authors to easily and reliably correct small amounts of asymmetry that arise after other primary ptosis repairs.

Complications inherent to the proposed technique include overcorrection, undercorrection, eyelid asymmetry, and the rare contour abnormality. Overcorrections can usually be treated by early removal of the prolene suture and by digital massage. In the authors’ series, there were no overcorrections that required early suture removal. Undercorrections will need further surgical intervention using external levator aponeurotic advancement as occurred successfully in 4 patients in the authors’ study.

Limitations of the authors’ study arise from its retrospective, noncomparative design. The relatively short-term follow-up based on the referral pattern of the authors’ practice is a further limitation. Thus, consecutive ptosis and late contour abnormalities may be under-reported.

The modern ptosis surgeon benefits from a variety of ptosis repair options. The modified FS procedure is technically easy, time-efficient, minimizes contour abnormalities, and has a low complication rate for the treatment of minimal blepharoptosis (< 2.5 mm) with good levator function and negative phenylephrine test. In the authors’ hands, the ratio of tarsectomy to eyelid elevation is approximately 2:1. In addition to other techniques such as levator advancement and MMC, the modified FS procedure is a useful adjunct to the modern ptosis surgeon’s armamentarium.
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