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ABSTRACT

Objective: To evaluate whether steroids or immunomodulator is a better mode of treatment in long term management of vernal keratoconjunctivitis.

Study Design: A quasi experimental study.

Place and Duration of Study: Armed Forces institute of Ophthalmology, Rawalpindi, from Feb 2019 to Oct 2019.

Methodology: Ninety-two patients in between ages of 5-20 years were divided into two equal groups of 46 patients each. After instillation of 0.1% Fluromethalone (steroid) into both eyes of patients of vernal keratoconjunctivitis, in group A and outcomes were compared with those of 0.05% Cyclosporine (immunomodulator) administered in the same manner in group B. All the patients were followed up regularly after 1, 3, and 6 weeks, 3 months, and 6 months and data recorded for inference.

Results: Both the drugs were found to effectively reduce the foreign body sensation but had no or minimal effect on visual acuity and intraocular pressure (p-value<0.001). Few patients in steroid group showed noticeable rise of intraocular pressure. (p<0.02). Cyclosporine was found to markedly reduce the mucoid discharge and photophobia without any adverse side effects (p-value=0.02).

Conclusion: Cyclosporine appears to be more effective in control of mucous discharge and inflammation than steroids in vernal keratoconjunctivitis with minimal or no side effects and hence was found to be a safe alternative to steroid usage in long-term treatment groups.
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INTRODUCTION

Vernal keratoconjunctivitis is an itchy condition of the eyes that develops typically in childhood and adolescence. It is generally bilateral and arises due to seasonal changes triggering a chronic inflammatory state of the eye (Figure). Vernal keratoconjunctivitis is a potentially debilitating condition where the person suffering must confront repeated ocular itching, tearing, burning sensation, photophobia, foreign body sensation, and mucoid discharge. Vernal keratoconjunctivitis is an important cause of hospital referral among children in many parts of Africa, Asia, and the Middle East. The pathophysiology includes, IgE and T-cell mediated allergic response to various factors including environmental allergens and weather conditions. Genetic predisposition is still debatable. Mast cells, eosinophils, and other inflammatory mediators play a critical role in producing congestion, conjunctival hyperemia, and tarsal and limbal papillae. Repeated blinking with the papillae leads to punctate epithelial keratitis and micro erosions, which in turn lead to shield ulcers and fibrosis and neovascularization and adversely affect the visual acuity in some cases. Immunomodulators are anti-IgE antibodies, that bind to circulating IgE, resulting in inactivation of the immune complexes, which are then cleared from the plasma. This in turn suppresses the activation of the mast and hence suppression of the inflammatory pathway. The male population is mostly affected. Vernal keratoconjunctivitis will go away over
Steroids or Immunomodulator

the years on its own, but the several years of discomfort and inflammation leave one with debilitating sequelae like ulcers and fibrosis. If it is detected and treated early, it has a good prognosis. Frequently topical mast cell stabilizers and antihistamines are first-line drugs that are prescribed. However, in severe cases with impending complications, topical steroids and immune modulators, which target the halting the lymphocyte proliferation and hence interleukin production are used. Steroids which are commonly prescribed for these cases also can lead to complications such as corneal scarring and advanced steroid-induced glaucoma.

In our study, we aimed to find whether Cyclosporin was a safer steroid alternative with minimum side effects.

**METHODOLOGY**

The quasi-experimental study was conducted from February 2019 to October 2019 at the Armed Forces Institute of Ophthalmology, Rawalpindi. It was approved by the Ethics Committee of the institute vide certificate number 188/ERC/AFIO dated 6th Dec 2017 and informed written consent was taken from all patients.

**Inclusion Criteria:** Patients between the ages of 5-20 years were included in the study without any gender discrimination.

**Exclusion Criteria:** All the patients who had undergone any refractive procedures, infected eyes, and corneal complications were excluded from the study. Patients having associated corneal diseases, uveitis, glaucoma, and optic atrophy were also points of exclusion.

A total of 92 patients were divided into two groups (A and B) of 46 patients each. Consecutive sampling was done. One drop of topical 0.1% Fluromethalone (steroid) was instilled into both eyes four times a day in group A and compared with the results of the installation of 0.05% Cyclosporine (immunomodulator) in the same manner in group B. One week of washout period was given to those patients who were previously taking treatment of vernal keratoconjunctivitis and were included in the study. All patients were followed up after 1, 3, and 6 weeks, 3 months, and 6 months. The study’s effect size was 0.89 estimated from a reference study. Using an online World Health Organization WHO sample size calculator, the sample size was calculated to be 46 patients in each group which equals a total of 92. The level of significance was taken as 95%, power of the study was 0.85, the effect size of 0.89, standard deviation of 1.5, and a two-tailed hypothesis was considered for sample size calculation. Variables such as inflammation were assessed by Ozlem Scoring system, Table-I.

**Table-I: The scoring method of inflammation in vernal keratoconjunctivitis.**

| Signs | 0 | 1  | 2  | 3  |
|-------|---|----|----|----|
| Conjunctival Hyperemia | None | Mild | Moderate-signs | Severe |
| Tarsal Papillae | None | <1 mm | 1-3 mm | >3 mm |
| Limbal Papillae | None | <2mm or <90 | 2-4 mm or 90-180 | >4 mm or >180 |
| Corneal Involvement | Normal Cornea | Fine SPEK | Coarse SPEK/macro erosion | Shield ulcer/pannus |

*SPEK: Superficial Punctate Epithelial Keratitis Ozlem et al*

Visual acuity was measured using Snellen’s chart, intraocular pressure was measured using applanation tonometry and air puff and Corneal thickness (535-555 µm) was measured with VKG. Inflammation control, Photophobia, Mucus discharge, and foreign body sensation were documented at each visit. Data were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23. Descriptive analysis was done for simple frequencies and Fisher’s test was applied for comparison of Dichotomous categorical variables while Pearson-chi-square test was used for comparison of categorical variables. The p-value of ≤0.05 was of statistical significance.

**RESULTS**

A total of 92 patients were distributed into two groups of 46 in each group. The mean age of group A (steroid group) was 10.7 ± 2.8 years while in group B, the mean age of the patients was 9.9 ± 3.2 year.

At the end of the study, it was seen that the visual acuity in both groups remained unaffected on a comparative level. Only 3 (6.5%) patients out of 46 in each group showed betterment of vision, which reflects that both treatments are likely to help in the same quantity with respect to clarity of vision (p-value <0.001). The intraocular pressure remained unaffected in the cyclosporine group while 6 patients in the steroid group had notable intraocular pressure rise from the base reading measured at the first visit (p=0.02).

The severity of inflammation was found to reduce significantly earlier in the trial with topical Cyclosporine eye drops installation than the topical steroid eye drops instillation. Though long-term results were alike for both groups (Table-II). Both the drugs at the end of the study appeared to equally help in controlling...
the foreign body sensation in eyes, though the foreign body sensation at week 1 appeared to be better in group A with steroid eye drops instillation (Table-III). The effects of Cyclosporine on mucus production appeared more effective than steroids in long follow up (Table-IV). Photophobia was also less for the Cyclosporine group in week. While later both proved to be of same benefit (Table-V).

Table-II: Severity of Inflammation in both groups.

| Duration | Severity of Inflammation | 0.1% Fluoromethalone, n (%) | 0.05% Cyclosporine n (%) | p-value |
|----------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| Week 1   | Mild                      | 4 (8.7)                     | 6 (13%)                  | <0.001  |
|          | Moderate                  | 23 (50)                     | 35 (76)                  |         |
|          | Severe                    | 23 (50)                     | 7 (15.2)                 |         |
| Week 3   | Mild                      | 4 (8.7)                     | 21 (45)                  | <0.001  |
|          | Moderate                  | 33 (71.7)                   | 25 (54)                  |         |
|          | Severe                    | 9 (19.6)                    | -                        |         |
| Week 6   | Mild                      | 22 (48)                     | 40 (87)                  | 0.001   |
|          | Moderate                  | 24 (52)                     | 6 (13%)                  |         |
|          | Severe                    | -                           | -                        |         |
| 3 months | Mild                      | 46 (100)                    | 46 (100)                 | -       |
|          | Moderate                  | -                           | -                        |         |
|          | Severe                    | -                           | -                        |         |
| 6 months | Mild                      | 46 (100)                    | 46 (100)                 | -       |
|          | Moderate                  | -                           | -                        |         |
|          | Severe                    | -                           | -                        |         |

Table-III: Effects on foreign body sensation in both groups.

| Duration | Foreign Body Sensation | 0.1% Fluoromethalone, n (%) | 0.05% Cyclosporine n (%) | p-value |
|----------|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| Week 1   | No                     | 3 (6.5)                     | -                        | 0.024   |
|          | Yes                    | 43 (93.5)                   | 46 (100)                 |         |
| Week 3   | No                     | 15 (32.6)                   | 13 (28.3)                | 0.821   |
|          | Yes                    | 31 (67.4)                   | 33 (71.1)                |         |
| Week 6   | No                     | 41 (89.1)                   | 41 (89.1)                | 1.00    |
|          | Yes                    | 5 (10.9)                    | 5 (10.9)                 |         |
| 3 Months | No                     | 42 (91)                     | 46 (100)                 | 0.117   |
|          | Yes                    | 4 (9)                       | -                        |         |
| 6 Months | No                     | 45 (98)                     | 45 (98)                  | 1.00    |
|          | Yes                    | 1 (2)                       | 1 (2)                    |         |

Table-IV: Effects on mucus production in both groups (Separate the table).

| Duration | Mucus Production | 0.1% Fluoromethalone | 0.05% Cyclosporine | p-value |
|----------|------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------|
| Week 1   | No                | 5 (11%)              | -                  | 0.056   |
|          | Yes               | 41 (89%)             | 46 (100%)          |         |
| Week 3   | No                | 17 (37%)             | 34 (55%)           | 0.001   |
|          | Yes               | 29 (63%)             | 12 (45%)           |         |
| Week 6   | No                | 40 (87%)             | 44 (96%)           | 0.267   |
|          | Yes               | 6 (13%)              | 2 (9%)             |         |
| 3 Months | No                | 46 (100%)            | 46 (100%)          | -       |
|          | Yes               | -                    | -                  |         |
| 6 Months | No                | 46 (100%)            | 46 (100%)          | -       |
|          | Yes               | -                    | -                  |         |

Table-V: Effects on Photophobia in both groups (separate the table).

| Duration | Photophobia | 0.1% Fluoromethalone, n (%) | 0.05% Cyclosporine n (%) | p-value |
|----------|-------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| Week 1   | No          | -                           | 6 (13%)                  | 0.026   |
|          | Yes         | 46 (100%)                   | 40 (87%)                 |         |
| Week 3   | No          | 19 (41%)                    | 27 (59%)                 | 0.144   |
|          | Yes         | 27 (59%)                    | 19 (41%)                 |         |
| Week 6   | No          | 43 (94%)                    | 43 (94%)                 | 1.000   |
|          | Yes         | 3 (7%)                      | 3 (7%)                   |         |
| 3 Months | No          | 45 (98%)                    | 46 (100%)                | 1.000   |
|          | Yes         | 1 (2%)                      | -                        |         |
| 6 Months | No          | 46 (100%)                   | 46 (100%)                | -       |
|          | Yes         | -                           | -                        |         |

DISCUSSION

Vernal keratoconjunctivitis is an allergic disease, which is documented to lead to complications such as shield ulcers and can cause permanently reduced vision.7 The commonly used drugs for the treatment of vernal keratoconjunctivitis include antihistamines, steroids, and immunomodulators. The main aim is to provide relief from uncomfortable symptoms such as itching, foreign body sensation, watering, and ophthalmic discharge.8 For the management of vernal keratoconjunctivitis induced symptoms, the mainstay has always been through steroid usage, which is known to be effective but also cause side effects in long term usage such as raised intraocular pressure, cataract etc.9,10 Even with mild steroid formulations it is known to have complications.11,12 Hence an attempt to compare the effects of immunomodulators like Cyclosporine over steroids, in controlling symptoms was monitored in our study.

Our study showed that in the first 6 weeks Cyclosporine group (group B) showed better control of moderate inflammatory symptoms, while the steroid group (group) had more effect on moderate to severe inflammation. However later in the treatment, there was no significant difference in control of all grades of inflammation between both the groups. As supported by the results of Ozlem et al., who found that lower concentrations (0.1% and 0.05%) of Cyclosporine are good steroid-sparing agents in steroid-responsive patients. In contrast to their study, we were able to have significant results proving early betterment of symptoms such as mucoid discharge, inflammatory conditions, and photophobia in the Cyclosporine group, while Ozlem observed that the effect started after 2 weeks of administration of the drug. Their study also highlighted that adjuvant Cyclosporine with steroids help in reducing the need for steroids hence providing a safe and effective alternative in vernal keratoconjunctiv-
tivitis. This was also supported by our study results where there was no visual or intraocular pressure deterioration seen after Cyclosporine use.\textsuperscript{13,14}

Phogat et al.\textsuperscript{13} studied around 100 patients who were treated with topical Cyclosporine eye drops and found an appreciable reduction in signs and symptoms. Compared to our study, not only the inflammatory condition got better with the treatment but also other complaints like discharge, photophobia was also noticed to be less. Supporting our results, another study by Hayatulhaya and Edward,\textsuperscript{14} highlighted many other studies,\textsuperscript{15} where the roles of topical Cyclosporine, antihistamine, and tacrolimus were studied. They found that Cyclosporine and tacrolimus proved to have better effects in controlling the inflammation and complaints of discharge than steroids. The possible reason for Cyclosporine to have affected better in controlling the disease was explained by Utine et al.,\textsuperscript{16} when they studied that the number of clusters of differentiation 4 (CD4) and interleukin (IL-17) were reported to decrease after the treatment with Cyclosporine ($p=0.08$) hence reducing the inflammatory pathway and inflammation. Cyclosporine was considered to have augmentative effects in other studies also.\textsuperscript{16-18} Our study revealed that the foreign body sensation and discomfort due to photophobia showed an almost equal response to the use of the 2 drugs after 1 week.

**CONCLUSION**

Control of inflammation and mucoid discharge was better with Cyclosporine than steroids with no significant side effects like rise in intraocular pressure. We conclude that Cyclosporine is a safe and effective alternative to steroid usage, in patients who require long-term treatment for vernal keratoconjunctivitis.
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