

1 **Effect of accelerated corneal collagen cross-linking combined with transepithelial**  
2 **photorefractive keratectomy on dynamic corneal response parameters and**  
3 **biomechanically-corrected intraocular pressure measured with the Corvis ST**

4  
5 **Running head:** DCR parameters and biomechanically-corrected IOP after PRK with  
6 accelerated CXL

7  
8 Hun Lee, MD<sup>1,2</sup>, Cynthia J. Roberts, PhD<sup>3</sup>, Renato Ambrósio Jr, MD, PhD<sup>4</sup>, Ahmed  
9 Elsheikh, PhD<sup>5</sup>, David Sung Yong Kang, MD<sup>6</sup>, Tae-im Kim, MD, PhD<sup>2</sup>

10  
11 **Affiliation:**

12 <sup>1</sup>Department of Ophthalmology, International St. Mary's Hospital, Catholic Kwandong  
13 University College of Medicine, Incheon, South Korea

14 <sup>2</sup>The Institute of Vision Research, Department of Ophthalmology, Yonsei University  
15 College of Medicine, Seoul, South Korea

16 <sup>3</sup>Department of Ophthalmology & Visual Science and Department of Biomedical  
17 Engineering, Ohio State University, Ohio, USA

18 <sup>4</sup>Rio de Janeiro Corneal Tomography and Biomechanics Study Group, Rio de Janeiro,  
19 Brazil

20 <sup>5</sup>School of Engineering, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom

21 <sup>6</sup>Eyereum Eye Clinic, Seoul, South Korea

22  
23 **Correspondence and reprint requests to:**

1 Tae-im Kim, MD, PhD

2 Department of Ophthalmology, Yonsei University College of Medicine, 50-1 Yonseiro,  
3 Seodaemungu, Seoul 03722, Korea, Tel: 82-2-2228-3574, Fax: 82-2-312-0541, E-mail:  
4 tikim@yuhs.ac

5

6 **Funding:** This work was partially supported by a grant of the Korean Health Technology  
7 R & D Project, Ministry of Health & Welfare, Republic of Korea (HI14C2044) and by  
8 research fund of Catholic Kwandong University International St. Mary's Hospital (CKURF-  
9 201604900001). The funding agency had no role in the design or conduct of this study;  
10 collection, management, analysis, or interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or  
11 approval of the manuscript; or in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

12

13 **Competing interests:** Drs Ambrósio and Roberts are consultants for and Dr. Elsheikh  
14 has received research funding from Oculus Optikgeräte GmbH. Dr. David Sung Yong  
15 Kang is consultant to Avedro Inc. The remaining authors have no financial or proprietary  
16 interest in the materials presented herein.

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **PURPOSE:** To investigate the effect of accelerated collagen cross-linking combined with  
3 transepithelial photorefractive keratectomy (tPRK-CXL) on changes in new dynamic  
4 corneal response (DCR) parameters and biomechanically-corrected intraocular pressure  
5 (bIOP) measured by corneal visualization Scheimpflug technology (Corvis ST)

6 **SETTING:** Yonsei University College of Medicine, Eyereum Eye Clinic.

7 **DESIGN:** Retrospective, comparative, observational case series

8 **METHODS:** Medical records of 69 eyes of 69 patients undergoing tPRK(n=35) or tPRK-  
9 CXL(n=34) were examined retrospectively. Patients underwent a complete ophthalmic  
10 examination, including Corvis ST and manifest refraction, before and 6 months after  
11 surgery. Main outcome variables were bIOP and new DCR parameters including  
12 deformation amplitude (DA) ratio 1 mm, DA ratio 2 mm, stiffness parameter at first  
13 applanation (SP-A1), as well as integrated inverse radius. Paired *t*-test, simple linear  
14 regression analysis, and ANCOVA with spherical equivalent change or corneal thickness  
15 change as a covariate, were performed.

16 **RESULTS:** DA ratio 1 mm, DA ratio 2 mm, and integrated inverse radius significantly  
17 increased, while SP-A1 significantly decreased after surgery in both groups, all consistent  
18 with decreased stiffness. Changes in DA ratio 2 mm and integrated inverse radius in tPRK  
19 group are significantly larger than those in tPRK-CXL group without and with ANCOVA,  
20 indicating less decreased stiffness in tPRK-CXL group. No significant differences in bIOP  
21 were noted before and after surgery in either group.

22 **CONCLUSIONS:** We speculate that prophylactic CXL combined with tPRK has a role in  
23 reducing the change in biomechanical properties of the corneal tissue. The Corvis ST

1 showed stable BIOP measurement before and after both tPRK and tPRK-CXL.

2

3 **Keywords:** accelerated corneal collagen cross-linking combined with transepithelial  
4 photorefractive keratectomy; Corvis ST; dynamic corneal response parameters;  
5 biomechanically-corrected intraocular pressure

6

## 7 **INTRODUCTION**

8 Collagen cross-linking (CXL) is a recently introduced surgical procedure whereby  
9 riboflavin sensitization with ultraviolet-A (UVA) radiation produces stromal cross-linking.<sup>1</sup>

10 This procedure is known to alter the biomechanics of the cornea by strengthening the  
11 corneal microstructure with the addition of crosslinks, resulting in significantly increased  
12 stiffness of the anterior corneal stroma.<sup>2</sup> An accelerated CXL protocol consisting of  
13 higher-intensity UV irradiation applied for a shorter period of time than the standard  
14 protocol, has recently been developed and can be applied in many clinical settings. This  
15 protocol has shown outcomes comparable with those of conventional CXL, with no  
16 evidence of changes in endothelial cell density (ECD).<sup>3</sup>

17 Corneal visualization Scheimpflug technology (Corvis ST; OCULUS Optikgeräte  
18 GmbH, Wetzlar, Germany) allowing *in vivo* characterization of corneal biomechanical  
19 deformation response to an applied air puff has become a useful instrument for evaluating  
20 biomechanical response parameters of the cornea.<sup>4</sup> The Corvis ST captures the dynamic  
21 corneal deformation caused by an air puff using an ultra-high-speed camera that operates  
22 at greater than 4300 frames/sec to capture a series of 140 sequential horizontal  
23 Scheimpflug images of the temporal-nasal cross-section of the cornea. The Corvis ST

1 enables the calculation of a variety of parameters by analyzing timing and patterns of  
2 deformation at the highest concavity (HC), as well as appplanation during inward  
3 deformation (loading) and outward recovery (unloading). The original parameters have  
4 been reported to be influenced most strongly by intraocular pressure (IOP), as well as  
5 age and central corneal thickness (CCT).<sup>5-7</sup> Recently, new corneal biomechanical  
6 parameters have been introduced, including deformation amplitude (DA) ratio 1 mm, DA  
7 ratio 2 mm, stiffness parameter at first appplanation (SP-A1), stiffness parameter during  
8 highest concavity (SP-HC), integrated inverse radius, maximum inverse radius, and  
9 biomechanically-corrected IOP (bIOP).<sup>8</sup>

10           While the Corvis ST has been previously used to measure changes in corneal  
11 biomechanical response parameters after laser vision correction procedures such as  
12 photorefractive keratectomy (PRK), laser in situ keratomileusis (LASIK), and small  
13 incision lenticule extraction (SMILE), as well as CXL, the new dynamic corneal response  
14 (DCR) parameters have not yet been studied.<sup>9-13</sup> Until now, a well-organized analysis  
15 investigating the effect of accelerated corneal CXL combined with transepithelial PRK  
16 (tPRK) using new corneal biomechanical parameters has not been reported. Moreover,  
17 knowledge remains limited with respect to understanding how corneal biomechanical  
18 properties are modified by prophylactic CXL concurrently with myopic tPRK.

19           Therefore, in the present study, we investigated the biomechanical response of  
20 the cornea in terms of new DCR parameters and assessed the stability of the bIOP  
21 estimates using Corvis ST before and after both tPRK and tPRK-CXL.

22

23 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

1 We performed a retrospective, comparative, observational case series with the approval  
2 of the Institutional Review Board of Yonsei University College of Medicine (Seoul, South  
3 Korea). The study adhered to the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki and followed good  
4 clinical practices.

5 Patients included in the study were older than 19 years and underwent tPRK alone  
6 (tPRK group) or tPRK with accelerated corneal CXL (tPRK-CXL group) by the same  
7 surgeon (DSYK) between May 2014 and April 2015. Prophylactic crosslinking was  
8 decided by informed consent with the patient after the risks of crosslinking had been  
9 explained.

10 We excluded patients with previous ocular or intraocular surgery, ocular  
11 abnormalities other than myopia or myopic astigmatism with a corrected distance visual  
12 acuity (CDVA) of 1.00 (20/20 Snellen) or better in both eyes, ECD of less than 2000  
13 cells/mm<sup>2</sup>, cataract, ocular inflammation, infection, or moderate and severe dry eye.  
14 Patients with signs of keratoconus on Scheimpflug tomography (displacement of the  
15 corneal apex, decrease in thinnest-point pachymetry, and asymmetric topographic pattern)  
16 were also excluded.

17 We retrospectively reviewed the medical records of 69 eyes of 69 patients that  
18 met the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Only one randomly selected eye from each  
19 patient was included in the analysis to avoid bias of the relationship between bilateral  
20 eyes that could influence the results.

21

## 22 ***Examinations and Measurements***

23 Before and 6 months after surgery, all patients underwent complete ophthalmic

1 examinations including uncorrected distance visual acuity (UDVA) and CDVA with Snellen  
2 chart, manifest refraction spherical equivalent (MRSE), slit-lamp examination (Haag-  
3 Streit, Gartenstadtstrasse, Köniz, Switzerland), IOP (noncontact tonometer; NT-530, NCT  
4 Nidek Co., Ltd., Aichi, Japan), autokeratometry (ARK-530A; Nidek Co., Ltd.), ultrasound  
5 pachymetry (UP-1000; Nidek Co., Ltd.), and fundus examination.

6 As described in detail previously<sup>8</sup>, corneal biomechanical parameters were  
7 measured preoperatively and at 6 months postoperatively using the Corvis ST. New  
8 dynamic corneal response (DCR) parameters include the DA ratio 1 mm, DA ratio 2 mm,  
9 SP-A1, SP-HC, and integrated inverse radius. DA ratio 1 mm and DA ratio 2 mm are  
10 defined as the ratios between the deformation amplitude (DA) of the apex and the average  
11 of two points located 1 mm and 2 mm, respectively, on either side of the apex. The higher  
12 the value of either of these parameters, the more compliant is the cornea and the lower  
13 is its resistance to deformation. The stiffness parameter, SP-A1, is defined as applied  
14 load divided by displacement, in an analogous manner to one dimensional stiffness. The  
15 applied load is the air pressure, calculated at first applanation, minus bIOP. The  
16 displacement is the distance the corneal apex moves from the pre-deformation state to  
17 first applanation (A1). Therefore, the higher SP-A1, the greater the stiffness. The SP-HC  
18 parameter is also defined as load divided by displacement. However, in this case, the  
19 displacement is the distance from the position of A1 to the position of HC. The integrated  
20 inverse radius came from the integration of the inverse radius values which are the  
21 reciprocal of radius of curvature during the concave state of the cornea. A greater concave  
22 radius is associated with greater resistance to deformation or a stiffer cornea. Conversely,  
23 a higher integrated inverse radius is associated with greater compliance or a softer cornea.

1 Together with DCR parameters, the Corvis ST provides a new and validated bIOP  
2 measurement.<sup>8,14</sup> The algorithm for bIOP is based on numerical simulation of the Corvis  
3 ST procedure, as applied on human eye models with different tomographies (including  
4 thickness profiles), material properties and true IOPs.<sup>14-19</sup> The bIOP is an estimate of true  
5 IOP or the corrected value of measured IOP, which considers the biomechanical response  
6 of the cornea to air pressure including the effects of variation in CCT and material  
7 behavior.<sup>8,14</sup>

## 8

### 9 ***Surgical Technique***

#### 10 ***Transepithelial photorefractive keratectomy***

11 Photoablation was performed using an excimer laser (Amaris 1050 Excimer Laser  
12 platform; Schwind eye-tech-solutions GmbH and Co KG, Kleinostheim, Germany), which  
13 uses a flying-spot laser with a repetition rate of 1050 Hz. Ablation profile planning was  
14 carried out using the integrated Optimized Refractive Keratectomy-Custom Ablation  
15 Manager software (version 5.1; Schwind eye-tech-solutions GmbH and Co KG).  
16 Mitomycin 0.02% was applied to all corneas for 20 seconds followed by thorough rinsing  
17 with chilled balanced salt solution (BSS). Postoperatively, 1 drop of topical levofloxacin  
18 0.5% (Cravit; Santen Pharmaceutical, Osaka, Japan) was instilled at the surgical site, and  
19 a bandage contact lens (Acuvue Oasys; Johnson & Johnson Vision Care, Inc,  
20 Jacksonville, FL, USA) was placed on the cornea for both groups. Following surgery,  
21 topical levofloxacin 0.5% and fluorometholone 0.1% (Flumetholon; Santen  
22 Pharmaceutical) were applied 4 times per day for 1 month. The dosage was tapered over  
23 3 months.



1  
2 ***Transepithelial photorefractive keratectomy with accelerated collagen cross-***  
3 ***linking***

4 After completion of excimer laser ablation, patients were treated with 0.1% riboflavin with  
5 hydroxypropyl methylcellulose (Vibex Rapid; Avedro Inc, Waltham, MA, USA) placed on  
6 the corneal surface and carefully spread with an irrigating cannula for 90 seconds. Then,  
7 the corneal surface was rinsed thoroughly with 30 cc of chilled BSS. A UVA beam  
8 (wavelength, 365 nm) 9.0 mm in diameter was applied to the cornea in a continuous  
9 fashion in a uniform circular pattern by the KXL system (Avedro Inc). The UVA exposure  
10 was performed for 90 seconds for continuous and 180 seconds for pulsed irradiation  
11 protocols at a power of 30 mW/cm<sup>2</sup> (total dose; 2.7 J/cm<sup>2</sup>). Mitomycin 0.02% was applied  
12 to all corneas for 20 seconds after cessation of UVA irradiation, followed by thorough  
13 rinsing with chilled BSS. Postoperatively, 1 drop of topical levofloxacin 0.5% was instilled  
14 at the surgical site and a bandage contact lens was placed on the cornea for both groups.  
15 Following surgery, topical levofloxacin 0.5% and fluorometholone 0.1% were applied 4  
16 times per day for 1 month. The dosage was tapered over 3 months.

17  
18 ***Statistical analysis***

19 Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS software version 22.0 (IBM, Armonk, NY,  
20 USA). Differences were considered statistically significant when the *P* values were less  
21 than 0.05. The results are expressed as the mean ± standard deviation. The Kolmogorov-  
22 Smirnov test was used to confirm data normality. To statistically compare preoperative  
23 and postoperative data between tPRK and tPRK-CXL groups, we used independent t-

1 test for continuous variables and  $\chi^2$  test for categorical variables. We performed the paired  
2 *t*-test to evaluate the differences between preoperative and 6-month postoperative  
3 parameters including DCR parameters, IOP-NCT, bIOP, and Corvis-CCT in each group.  
4 Simple linear regression analysis was used to determine the relationship between  
5 changes in DCR parameters and bIOP, and  $\Delta$ MRSE or  $\Delta$ CCT in each group. Finally, we  
6 performed ANCOVA to compare changes in DCR parameters and bIOP between the two  
7 groups, with the  $\Delta$ MRSE or  $\Delta$ CCT as a covariate.

8

## 9 **RESULTS**

10 Data were collected from 69 eyes of 69 patients undergoing tPRK (n=35) or tPRK-CXL  
11 (n=34). Mean patient age was  $24.9 \pm 5.2$  years (range, 19 to 41 years). Table 1 shows  
12 the preoperative characteristics of both groups with no significant statistical difference  
13 between them as regards age, gender, preoperative sphere, cylinder, MRSE, mean  
14 keratometric values, CCT, optic zone, total ablation zone, and white-to-white. There were  
15 no significant differences in preoperative uncorrected distance visual acuity (UDVA) and  
16 postoperative UDVA, sphere, cylinder, MRSE between the two groups.

17 Table 2 summarizes the changes in new DCR parameters before and after both  
18 tPRK and tPRK-CXL. There were no significant differences in preoperative DCR  
19 parameters between the two groups. In both groups, all parameters were significantly  
20 different before and after surgery (all  $P < 0.001$ ). The DA ratio 1 mm, DA ratio 2 mm, and  
21 integrated inverse radius significantly increased, whereas SP-A1 and SP-HC significantly  
22 decreased after surgery, all consistent with decreased stiffness or less resistance to  
23 deformation. There were significant differences in changes of DA ratio 2 mm and

1 integrated inverse radius between the two groups ( $P = 0.009$  for DA ratio 2 mm and  $P =$   
2  $0.029$  for integrated inverse radius), whereas no significant differences in changes of DA  
3 ratio 1 mm, SP-A1, and SP-HC.

4 When comparing the changes in DCR parameters and bIOP between the two  
5 groups using ANCOVA with the  $\Delta$ MRSE as a covariate, there were significant differences  
6 in  $\Delta$ DA ratio 2 mm and  $\Delta$  integrated inverse radius ( $P = 0.002$  and  $P = 0.010$ , respectively;  
7 Table 2). The  $\Delta$ DA ratio 2 mm and  $\Delta$  integrated inverse radius in tPRK group are  
8 significantly larger than those in tPRK-CXL group, consistent with less decrease in  
9 stiffness with tPRK-CXL. No significant differences were noted in  $\Delta$ DA ratio 1 mm,  $\Delta$ SP-  
10 A1,  $\Delta$ SP-HC, and  $\Delta$ bIOP between the two groups ( $P = 0.155$  for  $\Delta$ DA ratio 1 mm,  $P =$   
11  $0.653$  for  $\Delta$ SP-A1,  $P = 0.367$  for  $\Delta$ SP-HC, and  $P = 0.329$  for  $\Delta$ bIOP, respectively).

12 When comparing the changes in DCR parameters and bIOP between the two  
13 groups using ANCOVA with the  $\Delta$ CCT as a covariate, there were significant differences  
14 in  $\Delta$ DA ratio 2 mm and  $\Delta$  integrated inverse radius ( $P = 0.003$  and  $P = 0.018$ , respectively;  
15 Table 2). The  $\Delta$ DA ratio 2 mm and  $\Delta$  integrated inverse radius in tPRK group were  
16 significantly larger than those in tPRK-CXL group, also indicating less increase in  
17 compliance or less decrease in stiffness. No significant differences were noted in  $\Delta$ DA  
18 ratio 1 mm,  $\Delta$ SP-A1,  $\Delta$ SP-HC, and  $\Delta$ bIOP between the two groups ( $P = 0.243$  for  $\Delta$ DA  
19 ratio 1 mm,  $P = 0.888$  for  $\Delta$ SP-A1,  $P = 0.448$  for  $\Delta$ SP-HC, and  $P = 0.357$  for  $\Delta$ bIOP,  
20 respectively).

21 Figure 1 and Table 3 demonstrate the scatter plots and results for simple linear  
22 regression analysis between changes ( $\Delta$ ) in DCR parameters and bIOP, compared to  
23  $\Delta$ MRSE or  $\Delta$ CCT for the two groups.

1 Table 4 summarizes the changes in IOP-NCT, bIOP, and Corvis-CCT before and  
2 after tPRK and tPRK-CXL. The bIOP was stable before and after tPRK and tPRK-CXL ( $P$   
3 = 0.739 for tPRK group and  $P = 0.326$  for tPRK-CXL group). There were no significant  
4 differences in changes of bIOP between the two groups ( $P = 0.351$ ).

## 6 **DISCUSSION**

7 In the present study, we investigated the changes in newly developed DCR parameters  
8 and bIOP before and after both tPRK and tPRK-CXL, and demonstrated that changes in  
9 DA ratio 2 mm and integrated inverse radius between before and after surgery are  
10 significantly smaller in tPRK-CXL than tPRK group, indicating less decrease in stiffness  
11 with tPRK-CXL. The original parameter DA is defined as the maximum amplitude when  
12 the cornea is deformed to its greatest concave curvature by an air puff and is influenced  
13 by corneal stiffness.<sup>20</sup> Thinner corneas are expected to demonstrate higher DA than  
14 thicker corneas under the same value of IOP, since they would be less resistant to  
15 deformation.<sup>20</sup> Changes in DA ratio 2 mm after adjustment for corneal thickness change  
16 or refractive error change are significantly smaller in tPRK-CXL than tPRK group.  
17 Regarding the DA ratio 1 mm, there were no significant differences in changes of the DA  
18 ratio 1 mm between the two groups. It might be attributed to the smaller region of DA ratio  
19 1 mm, describing the ratio between deformation amplitude at apex and at 1 mm from the  
20 apex. This smaller region may be less sensitive, and might not be enough to reflect the  
21 overall corneal biomechanics after tPRK surgery, when compared with the DA ratio 2 mm  
22 covering the deformation amplitude changes at apex and at 2 mm from the apex.  
23 Regarding the integrated inverse radius, changes in integrated inverse radius without or

1 with adjustment for corneal thickness change or refractive error change are significantly  
2 smaller in tPRK-CXL than tPRK group. Considering that greater concave radius is  
3 associated with greater resistance to deformation, corneas with accelerated CXL were  
4 more resistant to deformation than those after tPRK alone.

5         Based upon the current results, we could postulate that application of prophylactic  
6 CXL concurrently with myopic tPRK is expected to relatively increase mechanical stiffness  
7 by changing the microstructure of the corneal tissue with the addition of crosslinks, when  
8 compared to the same procedure without CXL. All refractive procedures cause a  
9 reduction in corneal stiffness, which appears to be less with the addition of CXL. Corneal  
10 biomechanics demonstrated by the response of corneal tissue to applied force involves  
11 interactions between the externally applied force, the intrinsic properties of the cornea as  
12 well as IOP.<sup>21,22</sup> Several studies demonstrated the safety and efficacy of application of  
13 prophylactic CXL concurrently with myopic LASIK surgery.<sup>23-25</sup> Considering the  
14 achievement of greater improvements in refractive and keratometric stability after  
15 concurrent CXL and LASIK, it could be speculated that combined application of CXL and  
16 tPRK would have a positive effect on conservation of the biomechanical properties of the  
17 cornea.<sup>23,25</sup> To date, no studies have evaluated the effects of combined tPRK and  
18 accelerated CXL on corneal biomechanical properties. Based on our results, it can be  
19 concluded that application of prophylactic CXL concurrently with tPRK would cause less  
20 change in biomechanical properties in the corneal tissue which is demonstrated by  
21 significantly smaller postoperative changes in DA ratio 2 mm and integrated inverse  
22 radius.

23         The BIOP obtained from the Corvis ST was stable before and after tPRK and

1 tPRK-CXL. Considering that not only corneal thickness changes but also corneal  
2 biomechanical properties have been reported to have a crucial impact on IOP  
3 measurements with applanation tonometry, unaltered bIOP measurements by the Corvis  
4 before and after both tPRK and tPRK-CXL are clinically important.<sup>26</sup> Our results are in  
5 line with recent published study by Vinciguerra *et al.* demonstrating that corrected and  
6 clinically validated bIOP estimates were significantly less affected by corneal parameters,  
7 CCT, and age than measurements using a non-contact tonometer.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, our group  
8 demonstrated that bIOP estimates are not only less influenced by changes in CCT and  
9 MRSE, but also less sensitive to changes in biomechanical properties induced by  
10 refractive surgery than the uncorrected IOP measurements.

11 We performed the ANCOVA with change in either corneal thickness or refractive  
12 error as a co-factor – these factors were selected for the thickness effect on corneal  
13 biomechanics and the refractive error's influence on the surgical procedure parameters.<sup>27</sup>  
14 Interestingly,  $\Delta$ SP-HC showed a significant relationship with  $\Delta$ CCT only in the tPRK-CXL  
15 group, with greater reduction in CCT associated with greater reduction in SP-HC. This is  
16 in contrast to the SP-A1 parameter which showed a significant relationship in both groups.  
17 It is possible that the difference between groups is only evident with the larger  
18 displacement in SP-HC while the cornea is concave. It may be that in a softer cornea,  
19 CCT has less biomechanical effect than in a stiffer cornea. We did not include changes  
20 in bIOP as a co-factor during the ANCOVA analysis because the bIOP obtained from the  
21 Corvis ST was stable before and after both tPRK and tPRK-CXL.

22 The present study had a number of limitations, including its retrospective design,  
23 the relatively small number of patients and the short follow-up duration of 6 months.

1 Subsequently, using the bIOP and DCR parameters obtained from the Corvis ST, we plan  
2 to conduct a prospective controlled comparative paired-eye study comparing tPRK and  
3 tPRK with accelerated CXL.

4 In summary, we investigated the biomechanical response of the cornea, using the  
5 recently introduced DCR parameters and bIOP obtained from the Corvis ST in both tPRK  
6 and tPRK-CXL groups. Based on our results regarding significantly smaller magnitude of  
7 changes in DA ratio 2 mm and integrated inverse radius in tPRK-CXL group, we suggest  
8 that tPRK combined with a prophylactic CXL appears to cause a smaller reduction in  
9 corneal stiffness relative to uncrosslinked tPRK. Furthermore, the bIOP obtained from the  
10 Corvis ST can be helpful in assessing intraocular pressure before and after both tPRK  
11 and tPRK with CXL.

12

### 13 **WHAT WAS KNOWN**

14 • There was no well-organized study investigating the effect of accelerated corneal CXL  
15 combined with tPRK on changes in new DCR parameters and bIOP.

16

### 17 **WHAT THIS PAPER ADDS**

18 • Prophylactic CXL combined with tPRK is shown to reduce the change in corneal  
19 biomechanical properties, compared with tPRK alone, along with no significant effect on  
20 bIOP measured with the Corvis ST.

21

### 22 **REFERENCES**

23 1. Sorkin N, Varssano D. Corneal collagen crosslinking: a systematic review. *Ophthalmologica* 2014;  
24 232:10-27

- 1 2. Wollensak G, Spoerl E, Seiler T. Stress-strain measurements of human and porcine corneas after  
2 riboflavin-ultraviolet-A-induced cross-linking. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 2003; 29:1780-1785
- 3 3. Kanellopoulos AJ. Long term results of a prospective randomized bilateral eye comparison trial  
4 of higher fluence, shorter duration ultraviolet A radiation, and riboflavin collagen cross linking  
5 for progressive keratoconus. *Clin Ophthalmol* 2012; 6:97-101
- 6 4. Ambrósio Jr R, Ramos I, Luz A, Faria FC, Steinmueller A, Krug M, Belin MW, Roberts CJ. Dynamic  
7 ultra high speed Scheimpflug imaging for assessing corneal biomechanical properties. *Revista*  
8 *Brasileira de Oftalmologia* 2013; 72:99-102
- 9 5. Bao F, Deng M, Wang Q, Huang J, Yang J, Whitford C, Geraghty B, Yu A, Elsheikh A. Evaluation  
10 of the relationship of corneal biomechanical metrics with physical intraocular pressure and  
11 central corneal thickness in ex vivo rabbit eye globes. *Exp Eye Res* 2015; 137:11-17
- 12 6. Valbon BF, Ambrosio R, Jr., Fontes BM, Luz A, Roberts CJ, Alves MR. Ocular biomechanical metrics  
13 by CorVis ST in healthy Brazilian patients. *J Refract Surg* 2014; 30:468-473
- 14 7. Huseynova T, Waring GOt, Roberts C, Krueger RR, Tomita M. Corneal biomechanics as a function  
15 of intraocular pressure and pachymetry by dynamic infrared signal and Scheimpflug imaging  
16 analysis in normal eyes. *Am J Ophthalmol* 2014; 157:885-893
- 17 8. Vinciguerra R, Elsheikh A, Roberts CJ, Ambrosio R, Jr., Kang DS, Lopes BT, Morengi E, Azzolini  
18 C, Vinciguerra P. Influence of Pachymetry and Intraocular Pressure on Dynamic Corneal Response  
19 Parameters in Healthy Patients. *J Refract Surg* 2016; 32:550-561
- 20 9. Hong J, Xu J, Wei A, Deng SX, Cui X, Yu X, Sun X. A new tonometer--the Corvis ST tonometer:  
21 clinical comparison with noncontact and Goldmann applanation tonometers. *Invest Ophthalmol*  
22 *Vis Sci* 2013; 54:659-665
- 23 10. Shen Y, Chen Z, Knorz MC, Li M, Zhao J, Zhou X. Comparison of corneal deformation parameters  
24 after SMILE, LASEK, and femtosecond laser-assisted LASIK. *J Refract Surg* 2014; 30:310-318
- 25 11. Tomita M, Mita M, Huseynova T. Accelerated versus conventional corneal collagen crosslinking.  
26 *J Cataract Refract Surg* 2014; 40:1013-1020
- 27 12. Osman IM, Helaly HA, Abdalla M, Shousha MA. Corneal biomechanical changes in eyes with  
28 small incision lenticule extraction and laser assisted in situ keratomileusis. *BMC Ophthalmol*  
29 2016; 16:123
- 30 13. Pedersen IB, Bak-Nielsen S, Vestergaard AH, Ivarsen A, Hjortdal J. Corneal biomechanical  
31 properties after LASIK, ReLEx flex, and ReLEx smile by Scheimpflug-based dynamic tonometry.  
32 *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol* 2014; 252:1329-1335
- 33 14. Joda AA, Shervin MM, Kook D, Elsheikh A. Development and validation of a correction equation  
34 for Corvis tonometry. *Comput Methods Biomech Biomed Engin* 2016; 19:943-953
- 35 15. Davey PG, Elsheikh A, Garway-Heath DF. Clinical evaluation of multiparameter correction  
36 equations for Goldmann applanation tonometry. *Eye (Lond)* 2013; 27:621-629
- 37 16. Elsheikh A, Alhasso D, Gunvant P, Garway-Heath D. Multiparameter correction equation for



- 1 Goldmann applanation tonometry. *Optom Vis Sci* 2011; 88:E102-112
- 2 17. Elsheikh A. Finite element modeling of corneal biomechanical behavior. *J Refract Surg* 2010;  
3 26:289-300
- 4 18. Elsheikh A, Wang D, Brown M, Rama P, Campanelli M, Pye D. Assessment of corneal  
5 biomechanical properties and their variation with age. *Curr Eye Res* 2007; 32:11-19
- 6 19. Elsheikh A, Geraghty B, Rama P, Campanelli M, Meek KM. Characterization of age-related  
7 variation in corneal biomechanical properties. *J R Soc Interface* 2010; 7:1475-1485
- 8 20. Hon Y, Lam AK. Corneal deformation measurement using Scheimpflug noncontact tonometry.  
9 *Optom Vis Sci* 2013; 90:e1-8
- 10 21. Soergel F, Jean B, Seiler T, Bende T, Mucke S, Pechhold W, Pels L. Dynamic mechanical  
11 spectroscopy of the cornea for measurement of its viscoelastic properties in vitro. *Ger J*  
12 *Ophthalmol* 1995; 4:151-156
- 13 22. Dupps WJ, Jr., Wilson SE. Biomechanics and wound healing in the cornea. *Exp Eye Res* 2006;  
14 83:709-720
- 15 23. Kanellopoulos AJ, Asimellis G, Karabatsas C. Comparison of prophylactic higher fluence corneal  
16 cross-linking to control, in myopic LASIK, one year results. *Clin Ophthalmol* 2014; 8:2373-2381
- 17 24. Tomita M, Yoshida Y, Yamamoto Y, Mita M, Waring Gt. In vivo confocal laser microscopy of  
18 morphologic changes after simultaneous LASIK and accelerated collagen crosslinking for  
19 myopia: one-year results. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 2014; 40:981-990
- 20 25. Kanellopoulos AJ. Long-term safety and efficacy follow-up of prophylactic higher fluence  
21 collagen cross-linking in high myopic laser-assisted in situ keratomileusis. *Clin Ophthalmol* 2012;  
22 6:1125-1130
- 23 26. Liu J, Roberts CJ. Influence of corneal biomechanical properties on intraocular pressure  
24 measurement: quantitative analysis. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 2005; 31:146-155
- 25 27. Lee H, Kang DS, Ha BJ, Choi JY, Kim EK, Seo KY, Kim HY, Kim TI. Biomechanical Properties of the  
26 Cornea Measured With the Dynamic Scheimpflug Analyzer in Young Healthy Adults. *Cornea*  
27 2017; 36:53-58
- 28
- 29
- 30

## 31 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

32 Figure 1. Scatter plots and results for simple linear regression analysis between changes  
33 in dynamic corneal response parameters and biomechanically-corrected intraocular

1 pressure, and changes in manifest refraction spherical equivalent or central corneal  
2 thickness between transepithelial photorefractive keratectomy alone or transepithelial  
3 photorefractive keratectomy with accelerated corneal collagen cross-linking. DA,  
4 deformation amplitude; MRSE, manifest refraction spherical equivalent; SP-A1, stiffness  
5 parameter at first appplanation; SP-HC, stiffness parameter during highest concavity; bIOP,  
6 biomechanically-corrected intraocular pressure; tPRK, transepithelial photorefractive  
7 keratectomy; CXL, collagen cross-linking.