

Prevalence of Keratoconus in Egyptian Astigmatic Patients

Thesis

*Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of Master Degree
in Ophthalmology*

Presented By

Hadir Mohamed Mohamed Mostafa Metwally

*M. B. B. ch. Faculty of Medicine
Ain Shams University*

Under Supervision of

Prof. Dr. Shaker Ahmed Khedr

*Professor of Ophthalmology
Faculty of Medicine-Ain Shams University*

Ass. Prof. Dr. Mona Mohamed El-Feky

*Assistant Professor of Ophthalmology
Faculty of Medicine-Ain Shams University*

*Faculty of Medicine
Ain Shams University
Cairo-Egypt-2017*

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قالوا

لَسْبَحَانَكَ لَا عِلْمَ لَنَا
إِلَّا مَا عَلَّمْتَنَا إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ
الْعَلِيمُ الْعَظِيمُ

صدق الله العظيم

سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢

Acknowledgments

*First thanks to **ALLAH** to whom I relate any success in achieving any work in my life.*

*I wish to express my deepest thanks, gratitude and appreciation to **Prof. Dr. Shaker Ahmed Khedr**, Professor of Ophthalmology Faculty of Medicine-Ain Shams University for his meticulous supervision, kind guidance, valuable instructions and generous help.*

*Special thanks are due to **Ass. Prof. Dr. Mona Mohamed El-Feky**, Assistant Professor of Ophthalmology Faculty of Medicine-Ain Shams University for her sincere efforts, fruitful encouragement.*

Hadir/Mohamed/Metwally

List of Contents

Title	Page No.
List of Tables	i
List of Figures.....	ii
List of Graph.....	v
List of Abbreviations	vi
Protocol	
Introduction	1
Aim of the Work	12
Review of Literature	
▪ Anatomy.....	13
▪ Pathogenesis.....	21
▪ Clinical Picture	27
▪ Role of Pentacam in Diagnosis	47
Patients and Methods.....	67
Results	69
Discussion.....	82
Conclusion	88
Recommendations	90
Summary	91
References	93
Arabic summary	

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (1):	Classification of keratoconus.....	29
Table (2):	Factors construct keratoconus leveling.	60
Table (3):	Comparison between male and female as regard keratoconus among the study.....	70
Table (4):	Comparison between studied groups as regard incidence of KC and K reading.....	71
Table (5):	Comparison between studied groups as regard astigmatism and pachymetry.	73
Table (6):	Comparison between studied groups as regard keratoconus gradings.....	73
Table (7):	Comparison between different parameters in -ve and +ve keratoconus.....	75
Table (8):	Comparison between keratoconus grading as regard all parameters.....	78

List of Figures

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (1):	Histologic full-thickness section of a normal cornea, with arrows and text boxes indicating its different layers and cells	14
Figure (2):	Magnified view of the corneal epithelium with three different morphologic cell types.	15
Figure (3):	A thin monolayer of corneal endothelial cells (arrow) is adjacent to Descemet's membrane (double arrows).....	18
Figure (4):	Anatomy of the cornea	19
Figure (5):	Dua's layer	20
Figure (6):	The three topographical shapes of advanced keratoconus: nipple, oval, and globus.....	29
Figure (7):	Nipple-shaped keratoconus shows a small central ectasia with moderate to high with-the-rule corneal astigmatism	30
Figure (8):	Photokeratoscopy of an oval shaped cone shows the inferior-nasal steepening	30
Figure (9):	Due to the size of the globus-shaped keratoconus, all nine rings of the photokeratoscopy image are encompassed by the conical area and no "islands" of normal mid-peripheral cornea are seen	31
Figure (10):	Fleisher ring	37
Figure (11):	Vogt Striae	38
Figure (12):	Corneal thinning.....	39
Figure (13):	Corneal scarring	40
Figure (14):	Munson's sign.....	41
Figure (15):	Rizzuti's sign	42
Figure (16):	Corneal hydrops	43
Figure (17):	The Pentacam (the device of the study).	47

List of Figures cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (18):	The Pentacam takes multiple image samples	48
Figure (19):	A Scheimpflug image	49
Figure (20):	Corneal pachymetry data displayed by Pentacam showing concentric rings around the thinnest location.....	49
Figure (21):	Corneal-topography.....	50
Figure (22):	3D AC analysis by Pentacam.....	51
Figure (23):	Densitometry display: evaluation in a line	51
Figure (24):	A Pentacam refractive 4-map of normal right eye	53
Figure (25):	A Pentacam 4 map of left keratoconic eye	54
Figure (26):	Two Pentacam single pachymetry maps of the same right normal eye in figure (24)	55
Figure (27):	A Pentacam Refractive display of the same keratoconic left eye in figure (25).	56
Figure (28):	A Pentacam Pachymetric display of the same normal right eye in figure (24). The corneal thickness at the thinnest point is 534 m and it increases in the periphery following the normal pattern. The bottom table gives corneal thickness values at different rings and its progression in percentages.....	56
Figure (29):	A Pentacam topometric display normal right eye	58
Figure (30):	By pachymetric progression display, corneal progression thickness easily detect and follow up keratoconus.....	61
Figure (31):	Belin and Ambrosia display.....	63

List of Figures cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (32):	Schematic drawing showing how inclusion of the cone in the reference surface calculation will influence the BFS and hide the corneal abnormality	63
Figure (33):	Schematic drawing showing how exclusion of the cone from the reference surface calculation will influence the best-fit sphere and highlight the corneal abnormality	64
Figure (34):	Schematic drawing comparing how removal of the exclusion zone will affect the BF	65
Figure (35):	Device used in the study.....	68
Figure (36):	4 maps selectable, patient no.(43) gr.(B).	69
Figure (37):	Refractive display, patient no.(60) gr.(B).....	69

List of Graph

Graph. No.	Title	Page No.
Graph (1):	Incidence of keratoconus in different groups.....	72
Graph (2):	Difference between studied groups as regard K reading.	72
Graph (3):	Distribution of kertoconus grading in the study groups.....	74
Graph (4):	Difference between positive and negative keratoconus as regard K- readings.	76
Graph (5):	Difference between positive and negative keratoconus as regard astigmatism.....	76
Graph (6):	Difference between positive and negative keratoconus as regard pachmetery and thinnest point of cornea.	77
Graph (7):	Difference between keratoconus grades as regard K1- reading.....	79
Graph (8):	Difference between keratoconus grades as regard K2- reading.....	79
Graph (9):	Difference between keratoconus grades as regard astigmatism.....	80
Graph (10):	Difference between keratoconus grades as regard pachymetery.....	80
Graph (11):	Difference between keratoconus grades as regard thinnest point in cornea.	81

List of Abbreviations

Abb.	Full term
AC	<i>Anterior Chamber</i>
AST.....	<i>the degree of the regular corneal astigmatism</i>
BB	<i>Big bubble</i>
BFS.....	<i>Best Fit Sphere</i>
BFTA	<i>best-fit toric and aspheric</i>
CKI.....	<i>Center Keratoconus-Index</i>
CLEK.....	<i>Collaborative longitudinal evaluation of keratoconus</i>
CXL.....	<i>Cross Linking</i>
D.....	<i>Diopter</i>
DALK.....	<i>Deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty</i>
EBFS	<i>Enhanced Best Fit Sphere</i>
ECC.....	<i>Eccentricity value in 30 degree</i>
EDS.....	<i>Ehlers Danlos syndrome</i>
FES.....	<i>Floppy Eyelid syndrome</i>
FHI.....	<i>Fuchs' heterochromic iridocyclitis</i>
ICRS	<i>intracorneal ring segments</i>
IgA	<i>Immunoglobulin A</i>
IgE	<i>Immunoglobulin E</i>
IgG	<i>Immunoglobulin G</i>
IgM.....	<i>Immunoglobulin M</i>
IHA	<i>Index of Height Asymmetry</i>
IL.....	<i>Interleukin</i>
IOP.....	<i>Intraocular Pressure</i>
IS.....	<i>inferior–superior dioptric asymmetry</i>
ISV.....	<i>Index of Surface Variance</i>
IVA.....	<i>Index of Vertical Asymmetry</i>
KC	<i>Keratoconus</i>
Kd.....	<i>Kilo Dalton</i>
KI	<i>Keratoconus-Index</i>
KISA	<i>KC percentage index</i>
Km.....	<i>Mean keratometry</i>
KPD	<i>Keratometric power difference</i>

List of Abbreviations Cont...

Abb.	Full term
<i>KSS</i>	<i>Keratoconus Severity Score</i>
<i>MMPS</i>	<i>Matrix metalloproteinases</i>
<i>OCT</i>	<i>Optical coherence tomography</i>
<i>PIOL</i>	<i>Phakic Intraocular Lens</i>
<i>PKP</i>	<i>Penetrating Keratoplasty</i>
<i>PRK</i>	<i>Photorefractive keratectomy</i>
<i>QS</i>	<i>Quality specification of examination</i>
<i>Rm</i>	<i>Radius of curvature in 3.0 mm zone</i>
<i>RMin</i>	<i>Radii minimum</i>
<i>Rper</i>	<i>Mean radius of curvature of 7.0-9.0 ring area</i>
<i>SRAX</i>	<i>Irregular astigmatism occurring in KC</i>
<i>TIMP</i>	<i>Tissue inhibitor of metalloproteinase</i>
<i>TNF</i>	<i>Tumor necrosis factor</i>

Abstract

Purpose: Screening of Egyptian patients with corneal astigmatism for early diagnosis and study the prevalence of keratoconus by using Scheimpflug imaging device (pentacam).

Methods: One hundred and sixty eyes of 87 subjects with astigmatism $\geq 1.5D$ were included in the study. All subjects underwent a complete ophthalmic examination which included refraction, visual acuity measurement, slit lamp biomicroscopy, retinoscopy, fundus examination, conventional corneal topography and elevation-based topography with Pentacam.

Results: Mean age of the study population was 30 ± 10 (range 20-40) years which included 53 (56.4%) female and 41 (43.6%) male subjects. Maximum corneal power and keratometric astigmatism values were significantly higher and pachymetry was significantly thinner in eyes with clinical KC than normal astigmatic eyes.

Conclusion: The current study showed that subjects with 1.5D or more of astigmatism who present to outpatient clinics should undergo corneal topography screening for early diagnosis of KC even if visual acuity is not affected. Pentacam may provide more accurate information about anterior and posterior corneal anatomy especially in suspect eyes.

Keywords: Keratoconus – Pentacam – Myopic astigmatism

INTRODUCTION

Keratoconus is the most common primary corneal ectatic disease (*Rabinowitz, 1998; Romero-Jimenez et al., 2010*). It is non-inflammatory and localized paraxial stromal thinning of the cornea, which often results in bilateral and asymmetrical corneal distortion and anterior corneal protrusion. Patients with corneal protrusion often develop high myopia and irregular astigmatism resulting in significant impairment of visual acuity (*Rabinowitz, 1998*). Keratoconus usually appears during puberty or the second decade of the life and, normally progresses for the following two decades until it stabilizes. In severe cases, corneal scarring further contributes to vision loss (*Matalia, 2013*).

A genetic predisposition to keratoconus is well documented with increased incidence in some familial groups, and numerous reports of correspondence between monozygotic twins (*Karimian et al., 2008*). Approximately 6% - 23.5% of patients with keratoconus have a positive family history (*Hughes et al., 2003; Rabinowitz et al., 2003; Karimian et al., 2008*). Similar to other ocular genetic disorders, studies have indicated that relatives of keratoconus patients have an elevated risk compared to those with unaffected relatives (*Rabinowitz et al., 1998; Rabinowitz et al., 2003*). The majority of familial keratoconus is inherited through an autosomal dominant pattern (*Stabuc-Silih et al., 2010; Romero-Jimenez et al., 2010*). Other

models of inheritance such as autosomal recessive pattern have been suggested, especially in populations of high consanguinity (*Stabuc-Silih et al., 2010; Abu-Amero et al., 2011*).

Diagnosis of keratoconus has greatly improved from simple clinical diagnosis with the advent of modern imaging modalities. These diagnostic devices have allowed us to diagnose the disease much earlier, and newer treatment modalities have been used. There are variety of diagnostic imaging tools to diagnose subtle abnormalities in corneal curvature, thickness, and tissue architecture like photographic placido disk studies, keratometry, photokeratoscopy and finally computer assisted videokeratoscopy (*Matalia, 2013*).

One of the most important diagnostic imaging tools for keratoconus, has evolved through placido disk based devices to slit scanning and Scheimpflug imaging devices. Although placido disc based devices are still a highly sensitive tool to diagnose curvature changes on the anterior corneal surface, they might miss signs of early posterior corneal ectasia. Newer devices such as Scheimpflug imaging and optical coherence tomography(OCT) are useful adjuncts in imaging these early indicators of keratectasia (*Matalia, 2013*).

Over the last decade, outcome data have accumulated for new interventions in keratoconus which promise to reduce transplantation rates significantly, arrest disease progression and save many patients from long-term reliance on rigid contact

lens wear. These interventions include corneal collagen crosslinking (CXL), intracorneal ring segments (ICRS), topographic photorefractive keratectomy (topoPRK), and phakic intraocular lens implantation (pIOL). None of these recent treatment modalities are applicable to advanced (stage IV) disease with corneal scarring, in this case corneal transplantation is indicated by deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty (DALK) up to penetrating keratoplasty (PKP) (*Shortt et al., 2013*).

The overall prevalence of keratoconus in the general population has been estimated to be between 5 and 23 per 10,000, respectively with both sexes equally affected (*Espandar, 2010*). However, it would not be surprising to expect an increase in the incidence and prevalence rates of this disease nowadays with the current wide spread use of newer diagnostic devices leading to early diagnosis (*Matalia, 2013*).