



## “BOMBILE” - Newest Enemy to Our Sight?- A Case Series

Pranidhi Sharda<sup>1\*</sup>, GC Rajput<sup>2</sup>, Vinod Sharma<sup>3</sup> and Praveen Panwar<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>MS Ophthalmology, IGMC, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh, India

<sup>2</sup>Professor, Department of Ophthalmology, IGMC, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh, India

<sup>3</sup>Associate Professor, Department of Ophthalmology, IGMC, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh, India

\*Corresponding Author: Pranidhi Sharda, MS Ophthalmology, IGMC, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh, India.

Received: March 08, 2021

Published: May 11, 2021

© All rights are reserved by Pranidhi Sharda, et al.

### Abstract

We all have become slaves to our mobile phones for most of our daily activities which directly or indirectly has hazardous impact on our health and lives especially for vision. Although blast injuries are common with war, cooking gas and firecracker, but in last couple of years, mobile phone blast cases also popularly known as “BOMBILE” (Blast of Mobile Battery in Living Eye) are coming up which are time to time reported on internet and in scientific journals. We present a case series of 3 patients presented with phone battery explosion which highlights how this technology driven device created to make our lives easier can be a menace and why there is an urgent need to create awareness in society for their safe and proper handling.

**Keywords:** BOMBILE (Blast of Mobile Battery in Living Eye); BCVA (Best Corrected Visual Acuity); Phone Battery Explosion

### Introduction

In parallel with technological advancements, humankind encounters devices transforming chemical energy to electrical energy such as mobile phones [1]. Indiscriminate usage of mobile phones makes us vulnerable to the associated risks including accidental burns and blast injuries [2]. Although, sparsely reported, mobile phone blasts are increasing in recent times causing disastrous consequences. This increase can be attributed mainly to the usage of low quality products, user negligence and use of phone while on charging. Lithium-ion batteries, commonly used to power devices such as laptops, cell phones, smart watches and e-cigarettes are known as explosion hazards [3,4]. Explosions involving smartphone batteries are sparsely reported in literature [3]. Through these cases, we draw attention to such injuries and consider how their incidence and severity may be reduced by appropriate safety measures.

### Case Series

#### Case 1 (C1) and case 2 (C2)

23 Year (C1) and 22 Year (C2) old sisters, college students, presented to emergency department after sustaining eye injuries due to mobile phone battery blast while using and charging the phone simultaneously. They had complaints of blurred vision, severe irritation bilaterally. On initial examination, eyes were covered with soot particles, lid edema and conjunctival congestion. Eye irrigation was done with copious amount of normal saline to remove all the soot particles there and then patients were taken for ophthalmic examination.

C1 had BCVA (Best Corrected Visual Acuity) of 20/200 RE (Right Eye) and 20/40 LE (Left Eye). On slit lamp examination, soot particles were present in both eyes, there was full thickness epithelial defect measuring 7\*9 mm in RE and punctuate staining LE along

with a few sub epithelial opacities. Evidence of limbal ischemia in two clock hours with < 30% of conjunctival involvement in RE and no limbal or conjunctival involvement was seen in LE, although bulbar and palpebral conjunctiva were congested bilaterally. Siedel’s test was negative, no evidence of corneal perforation or foreign body in Anterior Chamber. Patient was admitted in ophthalmology ward and was diagnosed as ocular surface burn grade 2 in RE and grade 1 in LE. RE was patched, and patient started on Tab Vit C, topical antibiotics and lubricant for both eyes and corticosteroids for RE in tapering doses.

On PAD 1 (Post Admission Day), BCVA in both eyes were same as previous day, while epithelial defect in RE was reduced to 3\*2 mm, had sub epithelial opacities approximately 8 - 10, limbal vessel blanching had disappeared and limbal vasculature was present 360 degrees, conjunctival involvement had also decreased with only mild congestion present. On LE, the cornea was clear of any epithelial staining, and was free of symptoms, no sub epithelial opacities and conjunctival congestion was present. Fundus was examined and revealed no abnormality.

Patient was discharged on PAD 3, with BCVA of 20/80 and 20/20 LE with a full course of topical antibiotics, tapering corticosteroids and lubricants.

On follow-up day 7, some of the opacities were reduced in size and thickness, BCVA was 20/40 in RE, visual prognosis was explained and 2 weekly follow-up advised for which she was lost.

C2 had milder symptoms, BCVA 20/40 LE and 20/20 RE. Punctuate staining in LE with 3 areas of corneal burns in the form of sub epithelial opacities in both visual axis and away were present, without any limbal or conjunctival involvement. RE was free of any corneal, limbal, conjunctival involvement, a mild congestion was seen on conjunctiva, rest of the ocular examination was within normal limits.

Patient was managed on OPD (Outpatient Department) basis with topical antibiotics, lubricant and decongestant. She was reassessed on next day, epithelial lesions were resolved, corneal burns were present, congestion reduced significantly and was explained about chronic nature and associated visual symptoms because of sub epithelial opacities. BCVA in LE remained 20/40 for a period of 2 weeks after which she was lost to follow up.

### Case 3

10 year old male child sustained eye injury in similar fashion as previously described as he was playing on mobile phone while it was being charged (Figure 1).



Figure 1

Parents took him to nearby primary health care centre where his eye were irrigated vigorously with saline, primary treatment with antibiotics was given and was referred to our centre the very next day. On presentation, child’s RE was patched, he had complaints of burning sensations and pain in both eyes. As primary treatment, eye wash was done and then further evaluated for ophthalmic injury. BCVA in RE was 20/40, LE 20/20. In right eye, soot particle and corneal opacity were present centrally in the visual axis (Figure 2).

Fluorescein stain was assessed under cobalt blue filter, which revealed full thickness epithelial defect measuring around 9\*5mm (Figure 3), no evidence of limbal ischaemia or conjunctival involvement was seen clinically. LE was free of any signs of ocular involvement but patient had mild burning sensation in it. Patient was admitted, diagnosed with grade 1 ocular surface burn and started on topical antibiotic, lubricants and corticosteroids in tapering doses.

On the next day, epithelial defect had reduced significantly to 5\*2 mm dimension, opacity was present centrally (Figure 4), conjunctival congestion has disappeared, fundus was normal, no refractive




Figure 2




Figure 4




Figure 3




Figure 5

error was found, AS-OCT was ordered which was within normal. Parents were counselled about the visual sequelae which can be caused due to central corneal opacity. Patient was discharged on day 3 (Figure 5), with BCVA of 20/40 RE under the cover of antibiotics, tapering steroids and lubricants. Attendants showed inability to come for follow-up, were advised to visit local hospital.

### Discussion and Conclusion

Lithium ion batteries may overheat during charging leading to “THERMAL RUNAWAY” an unregulated increase in internal battery temperature [3]. Inside the main line of defence against short circuiting is a thin and porous slip of polypropylene that keeps the

electrodes from touching. If that separator is breached, the electrodes come in contact, the things get very hot very quickly. The batteries are also filled with a flammable electrolyte, one that can combust when it heats up, then really get going once oxygen hits it. Thus, the mechanism of injury from battery blasts could be a combination of mechanical (battery pieces), thermal and chemical injuries [5]. Zieker AW, et al. [5] reported a case about corneal injury due to watch battery explosion. Kumar A, et al. [6] published 3 non related cases, all cases presented with open globe injury when mobile phones exploded while charging. Patients were taken for repair surgeries but had severe ocular morbidity with only upto perception of light. Kumar, et al. [7] published a case of 15 year old boy who sustained abdominal injury in the form of colonic perforation when he was using mobile phone while still on charging. Ohri, et al. [8] presented a case of 15 year old boy who sustained oral and ocular injuries due to phone battery blast while he was pulling out battery with his teeth. Timely presentation and proper management of the ocular surface burns can salvage the vision. These cases signify the need to increase public awareness about the potential risks associated with cellphone use, to adopt safe practices as per recommendations from the manufacturers and to avoid counterfeit products, to avoid such accidents. One should remove the battery if handset gets wet and let your cell phone dry before you put it back, should not place cell phone in a hot car, should not use plastic cases to protect cell phone, they can overheat it, prefer original and authorized accessories, should not answer a call while it is being charged, never use the cell when it is hooked to the mains. We must be aware that it can also be an instrument of death [7].

### **Bibliography**

1. Tahsin G, et al. "A cause of severe thigh injury: Battery explosion". *Annals of Medicine and Surgery* 5 (2016): 49-51.
2. Karabagli Y, et al. "Partial thickness burns caused by a spontaneously exploding mobile phone". *Burns* 32 (2006): 922-924.
3. Brown CJ and Cheng JM. "Electronic cigarettes: Product characterization and design considerations". *Tobacco Control* 23 (2014): 4-10.
4. Shastry S and Langdorf MI. "Electronic vapor cigarette battery explosion causing shotgun-like superficial wounds and contusion". *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine* 17 (2016): 177-180.

5. AW Zieker and J Wisnicki. "Corneal burns from watch battery explosion". *American Journal of Ophthalmology* 88.4 (1979): 798-799.
6. Kumar A, et al. "BOMBILE' [Blast of Mobile Battery in Living Eye] Eye Injury – A Newer Threat to Sight (2019).
7. Bharat Kumar. "Case Report on Abdominal Injury Due To Mobile Battery Blast". *IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences (IOSR-JDMS)* 17.4 (2018): 28-30.
8. Neera Ohri, et al. "Injury Following Blast of Mobile Phone Battery". *International Annals of Medicine* 1.8 (2017).

### **Assets from publication with us**

- Prompt Acknowledgement after receiving the article
- Thorough Double blinded peer review
- Rapid Publication
- Issue of Publication Certificate
- High visibility of your Published work

**Website:** [www.actascientific.com/](http://www.actascientific.com/)

**Submit Article:** [www.actascientific.com/submission.php](http://www.actascientific.com/submission.php)

**Email us:** [editor@actascientific.com](mailto:editor@actascientific.com)

**Contact us:** +91 9182824667