

Papillary Response In Contact Lens Papillary Conjunctivitis Is Either General Or Localised

Cornea and Contact Lens Research Unit at the School of Optometry and the Cooperative Research Centre for Eye Research and Technology, Sydney, Australia¹; L.V.Prasad Eye Institute, Hyderabad, India²

PURPOSE

Contact Lens Papillary Conjunctivitis (CLPC), is of significance as it is a major cause for patients discontinuing from contact lens (CL) wear.¹ However, the aetiology of the condition is poorly understood. We determined if during CLPC, specific areas of the tarsal conjunctiva exhibit a papillary response. This may help provide some insights into the mechanisms leading to the condition.

METHODS

- Prospective CL clinical trials at L.V.Prasad Eye Institute, Hyderabad, India from March 1993 to September 2000.
- ♦ 1,584 eyes of 792 subjects. Low Dk disposable CL (FDA Groups Type I, II & IV) on a 6 night (N) extended wear and disposal schedule or high Dk silicone hydrogel CL on a 30N extended wear and disposal schedule.
- Events of CLPC diagnosed were considered for the study.

Upper tarsal conjunctival examination:

♦ The upper tarsal surface was classified into 5 areas and:



- the presence of papillae in each area recorded as yes/no. If papillae present, and scattered across the tarsus, it was 'General' and if located in specific areas, it was 'Local'.





- roughness (0-4 where 0= no roughness and 4= severe) was recorded in each area. Tarsal roughness at baseline (BL) was compared to CLPC using Grouped T-test.













1=very slight

2=slight

3=moderate

4=severe

Sankaridurg P¹, Sweeney D¹, Naduvilath T², Aasuri M, Holden B¹, Rao GN²



DISCUSSION

- ◆ Papillae in 'General' were found all over central tarsus (Areas 1, 2 & 3) and in Area 5. However, in 'Local', the papillae were primarily in Areas 2 & 3. Interestingly, Korb et al reported papillae with hard CL wear to be present mainly in the zone adjacent to lid margin and the intervening central zone.² In contrast, papillae with soft CL wear were found mainly in the zone adjacent to tarsal fold and never adjacent to lid margin.³ Localised papillae were also reported in response to sutures, elevated corneal deposits etc.^{4,5}
- ♦ The association of localised papillae with rigid CL wear, sutures, elevated corneal deposits etc suggests that mechanical trauma could be responsible. It is probable that the physical interaction of the CL surface or edge with the conjunctival surface could lead to local papillae.
- Therisk factors leading to 'General' response are not clear and it is possible that mechanical factors or other factors such as deposits leading to an immune reaction are responsible.

CONCLUSION

Two distinct presentations of CLPC, general and local were observed and may indicate different mechanisms underlying the response. The prevalence of general was greater then the local response. Possible risk factors include the lens type, however, these differences were not addressed in this study. The type and nature of the cellular infiltration of the tarsal conjunctival epithelium in these 2 categories may provide further insights to the mechanisms leading to these conditions.

REFERENCES

- Sankaridurg PR, Sweeney DF, Sharma S et al: Ophthalmol, 106(9), 1671-1680, 1999.
- Korb DR, Allansmith MR, Greiner JV et al: Ophthalmol, 88(11), 1132-1136, 1981. 3. Korb DR, Greiner JV, Finnemore VM et al: Br J Ophthalmol, 67(11), 733-736, 1983.
- 4. Sugar A, Meyer R: Am J Ophthalmol, 91, 239-242, 1981.
- 5. Dunn BJ, Weissman B, Mondino B: Cornea, 9, 357-358, 1990.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The study was funded in part by the Australian Federal Government through the CRC scheme, Hyderabad Eye Research Foundation, Vistakon, USA and Bausch & Lomb, USA. The authors would like to thank I-Media Graphics for their assistance in preparation of this poster.