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Abstract

Purpose: To evaluate the efficacy of Wavefront-guided photorefractive keratectomy (PRK) for correction of residual refractive error after intrastromal corneal ring segments (ICRS) insertion for treatment of keratoconus.

Patients and Methods: In this prospective case series five eyes of 5 keratoconus patients who had previous ICRS implantation (four Intacs TM and one Keraring), underwent Wavefront-guided PRK to correct residual refractive error.

Results: Three months postoperatively, the mean spherical equivalent (SE) improved from 2.07 ± 1.38 Diopter to - 0.87 ± 0.54 Diopter. Four out of 5 eyes were within ± 1.00 D of Plano refraction. Three eyes had UCVA of 20/30 or better (all eyes; 20/40 or better). After 6 months, the mean SE was - 0.75 ± 0.50 Diopter and all eyes were within ± 1.00 D of Plano refraction. UCVA was 20/20 in 2 eyes, 20/30 or better in 2 eyes and 20/40 in one eye. One patient lost one line of BCVA.

Conclusion: This case series showed that wavefront-guided PRK might be an effective procedure for correction of residual refractive error after ICRS insertion in keratoconus patients. Significant improvement in UCVA was seen in all cases after PRK without any complications and haze.
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**Introduction**

Keratoconus, described more than one century ago is a non-inflammatory, progressive ectatic disease of the cornea\(^1\). In its early stages, spectacles and contact lenses are the usual treatment modalities. In cases of progressive keratoconus and among patients who become contact lens intolerant several surgical strategies including intrastromal corneal ring segments (ICRS) implantation, collagen cross-linking (CCL) and lamellar keratoplasty have been proposed to improve visual function \(^3\). Intacts offer a unique surgical alternative for treating contact lens intolerant patients with clear cornea keratoconus. Intrastromal Corneal Ring Segment (ICRS) implantation is a safe and effective treatment for patients with mild to moderate keratoconus and central clear cornea \(^1\). But ICRS only corrects a limited range of myopia and high refractive errors, commonly seen in patients with keratoconus, may remain \(^6\). So residual refractive error may be encountered after ICRS implantation. Available options for correction of the residual refractive error are spectacles, contact lens implantation and surgical procedures such as PRK \(^7\). In this study we report the results of PRK in keratoconus patients with previous ICRS implantation to correct residual refractive error. To our knowledge there is limited number of reports concerning the efficacy of PRK for correcting residual refractive errors after ICRS implantation in keratoconus patients.

**Patients and Methods**

In this prospective non-comparative clinical case series, we evaluated the safety and efficacy of PRK performed in five eyes of five keratoconus patients, for correction of residual refractive errors after ICRS implantation. All patients were male and had previously undergone ICRS implantation (four eyes Intacs \(^\text{TM}\) and one eye Keraring).

Inclusion criteria were residual refractive error resulting in significant visual loss and patient’s dissatisfaction from the results; clear central cornea; stable refraction; central pachymetry more than 400 μm and at least 6 months being passed since ICRS implantation. Exclusion criteria were untreated lid margin disease or tear film abnormalities, presence of central or para-central corneal leucoma, intraocular pressure > 21 mmHg or glaucoma, systemic diseases (autoimmune disorders, atopia and diabetes mellitus), a history of any ocular disease (except keratoconus) and complicated ICRS implantation. The options for correcting the residual refractive error including using spectacles or contact lens, removing the Intacs and PRK over the Intacs were discussed with all patients. All patients in this study chose PRK. Written informed consent was obtained from all patients before undertaking PRK. This study was approved by the ethics committee of Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

Before refractive surgery, a comprehensive ophthalmic examination was performed including uncorrected visual acuity (UCVA), best spectacle-corrected visual acuity (BSCVA), subjective refraction, slit lamp examination, tonometry, fundoscopy, Visante Optical Coherence Tomography (OCT), ultrasound pachymetry for measuring corneal thickness especially in optical zone, Pentacam (Oculus Inc. Wetzlar, Germany) and wavefront aberrometry (iTrace (Tracey Technologies Corp. TX, USA)). UCVA and BSCVA were obtained using a Snellen chart and were defined according to LogMAR for statistical analysis. All patients were examined one day, one week, one month, three months and six months after PRK. Patients were evaluated for visual and refractive outcome and aberration changes and probable complications.
If there were any complications in addition to routine examinations a complete ophthalmic examination was performed. Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS software version 22 (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA).

**Surgical technique**

A 5 % concentration of povidone-iodine solution was used for periocular disinfection. Operative field was exposed by a lid speculum. The epithelium was removed gently after contact with % 20 alcohol solution for 20 seconds. Wavefront guided laser ablation was performed using Technolas laser (217z Zyoptix, Bausch & Lomb Inc. New York, USA) and a customized laser ablation pattern. Maximum ablation depth was 50 µm and optical zone was 5.8 mm. After the ablation, a sponge soaked with 0.02 % mitomycin solution was applied for 30 seconds. The eye was then irrigated and a soft contact lens bandage was placed over the eye. Topical levofloxacin, betamethasone and Artelac were started for all patients postoperatively. Contact lens was removed as soon as epithelium was repaired.

**Results**

Five eyes of 5 patients (all men) underwent an uneventful PRK procedure over ICRS implantation and the results were followed for 6 months. The mean age of patients was 21 ± 3.21 years (range 21 to 29 years). The mean pre-operative UCVA and BCVA were 0.51 ± 0.14 LogMAR (range 0.30 to 0.70 LogMAR) and 0.07 ± 0.13 LogMAR (range 0.0 to 0.30 LogMAR) respectively. The mean manifest spherical equivalent (SE) refraction before the PRK was - 2.07 ± 1.38 diopters (D) (range, - 3.75 to - 0.25 D). The mean cylinder before the PRK was - 2.85 ± 1.22 D (range, - 4.50 to - 1.25 D). The mean keratometry (K) reading was 45.74 ± 3.38 D (range, 42.30 to 49.80).

Completed examinations of all eyes were performed 3 months and 6 months after PRK. At the 3-month examination, the mean UCVA was 0.18 ± 0.06 LogMAR (range 0.30 to 0.15 LogMAR), the mean BSCVA was 0.05 ± 0.06 LogMAR (range 0.15 to 0.00 LogMAR), and the mean SE was - 0.87 ± 0.54 D (range - 1.50 to 0.00 D). The mean keratometry (K) reading was 44.34 ± 3.50 D (range, 40.30 to 48.60). At the 6-month examination, the mean UCVA was 0.11 ± 0.12 LogMAR (range 0.30 to 0.00 LogMAR), the mean BSCVA was 0.08 ± 0.12 LogMAR (range 0.30 to 0.00 LogMAR), and the mean SE was - 0.75 ± 0.50 D (range - 1.12 to 0.13 D). The mean keratometry (K) reading was 43.23 ± 2.80 D (range, 39.75 to 46.50). Pre and post-operative data is presented in Table1. There were no wound healing problems or any signs that the PRK procedure had adversely affected the cornea. There were no complications.

**Discussion**

Although ICRS implantation is an effective method for improving visual acuity in keratoconus patients it cannot always correct high refractive errors and astigmatism frequently seen in these patients and the successful rate of surgery is 70 % . Available options for correction of residual refractive error after ICRS implantation include: spectacle prescription, contact lens, ICRS removal, IOL implantation and refractive surgery. Spectacles or contact lenses have a negative impact on quality of life. Contact lens users also may lose their tolerance and have the risk of contact lens-wearing complications. There are some reports regarding the results of refractive surgery over ICRS or after its removal in myopic patients. Based on these limited number of studies, refractive surgery with ICRS in place or after its extraction can be used safely and effectively.
Bu et al., used PRK for correction of residual refractive error over Intacs. PRK was performed in 8 eyes of 5 patients who had Intacs for low myopia correction. Three months after PRK all patients had Plano refraction with UCVA of 20/20 or better and in last follow-up (2 years) all patients had near Plano vision (20/10 to 20/25). In their study the incidence of haze formation was high. In comparison, our patients had higher residual refractive error and PRK was performed in patients with a history of keratoconus. Moreover no haze formation was seen among our patients. This can be explained by application of mitomycin C for all our patients.

Refractive surgery is contraindicated in keratoconus patients but there are reports on safety and efficacy of refractive surgery after ICRS implantation or corneal collagen crosslinking (CXL) among these patients. One study indicated that combined topography-guided transepithelial PRK with intracorneal ring segments implantation and CXL in a three-step procedure is an effective treatment for improving functional visual acuity and stopping the progression of the ectatic disorder. In another study combination of ICRS implantation followed by sequential same-day topography-guided PRK/CXL was used as a reasonable option for improving visual acuity in keratoconus patients. Guell et al., in a case series of ICRS implantation in mild to moderate keratoconus, reported PRK over ICRS in one eye. The only complication was a hyperopic shift due to severe epithelial hyperplasia in the mid-periphery of the cornea that acted as a negative lens. Kymionis et al., reported CXL and topography-guided PRK as the most effective method among keratoconus patients. They showed simultaneous CXL and Topography - guided PRK seems to be a promising treatment capable of offering significant improvement in all parameters (UCVA, BSCVA, SE, keratometry). Dirani et al., evaluated the safety and efficacy of non-topography–guided PRK for treatment of residual mild refractive errors after sequential ICRS implantation and CXL in 17 eyes of 14 patients with mild to moderate stable keratoconus. At the 6-month follow-up after PRK, UDVA significantly improved to 0.18 ± 0.06 LogMAR and CDVA was 0.15 ± 0.05 LogMAR. The mean spherical error and mean cylinder significantly decreased to -1.10 ± 0.41 D and 0.98 ± 0.37 D, respectively. No complications were seen intraoperatively or postoperatively. They suggested that non-topography–guided PRK is an effective and safe option for correcting residual refractive error and improving visual acuity in patients with moderate keratoconus. In a study by Hirsh and et al., LASEK was performed for correction of residual myopia and astigmatism in four keratoconus patients with previous Intacs implantation. The mean refraction before LASEK was -0.2 diopter for myopia and -2.71 diopter for astigmatism. The mean followup after surgery was 8 months. The mean UCVA in last visit was 6/12 (range: 6/18 - 6/10). The mean BSCVA in last visit was 6/9 (range: 6/12 - 6/8.5). These researchers believed that wavefront-guided LASEK for correction of residual refractive error in keratoconus patients after Intacs implantation will result in excellent visual outcomes without loss of visual acuity and complications. In our study in five keratoconus patients having ICRS(4 Intacs and 1 Keraring), wavefront guided PRK was performed for correction of residual refractive error. Our results indicated improvement in visual outcomes. No complications were seen during PRK and in the follow up period. Visual and refractive outcomes in two patients were less desirable.
than others. These 2 patients had hyperopia and high astigmatism. It seems that PRK after Intacs implantation in keratoconus patients may be more successful in patients with low to moderate myopia and low astigmatism.

**Conclusion**

This case series showed that wavefront-guided PRK might be an effective procedure for correction of residual refractive error after ICRS implantation in keratoconus patients. Significant improvement in UCVA was seen in all cases after PRK without any complications and haze.
References

21. Iovieno A, Legare ME, Rootman DB, Yeung SN,


Footnotes and Financial Disclosures

Conflict of Interest:
The authors declare no conflict of interest with the subject matter of the present manuscript.