



Comparison of subjective grading of lid wiper epitheliopathy with a semi-objective method

Carolina M.E. Kunnen^{a,*}, James S. Wolffsohn^{a,b}, Eric R. Ritchey^a

^a The Ocular Surface Institute, College of Optometry, University of Houston, Houston, TX, United States

^b Ophthalmic Research Group, Aston University, Birmingham, United Kingdom

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Lid wiper epitheliopathy
LWE
Accuracy
Grading
Image analysis
Repeatability

ABSTRACT

Purpose: To validate a semi-objective method of grading lid wiper epitheliopathy (LWE) compared to subjective assessment.

Methods: Twenty upper and 20 lower eyelid margins of patients with LWE were photographed after instillation of fluorescein and lissamine green. The images were graded by two observers using a 0–3 grading scale for height (%) and width (mm) of the lid staining. The images were also processed using custom designed software in MATLAB. After manual delineation of the staining area, width and perpendicular height were automatically measured throughout the selected area. The height as a proportion of the lid margin width and width measures were then categorized into the same bins as in the grading scale.

Results: Repeatability of the image analysis system showed a mean difference (95% limits of agreement) between repeats of -0.01 mm (0.03 and -0.05 mm) for LWE height, 0.04 mm (1.16 and -1.08 mm) for LWE width, and -0.11 mm² (0.32 and -0.53 mm²) for LWE area. The mean difference (95% limits of agreement) between image analysis and human grading for LWE height was -0.84 grades (0.54 and -2.21 grades), for LWE width was 0.31 grades (1.22 and -0.59 grades), and for the final grade (mean height and width) was -0.26 (0.44 and -0.96 grades) (all $p < 0.001$).

Conclusion: Human observers tend to overestimate the height and underestimate the width of LWE staining. Lid wiper region is not well defined, thus, it might be a difficult process for human observers to judge the stained region as a proportion of the lid wiper total region.

1. Introduction

Lid wiper epitheliopathy (LWE) is an alteration of the marginal conjunctival epithelium of the upper or lower eyelid [1,2]. LWE is believed to be caused by mechanical trauma of the lid wiper area with the ocular surface, as a result of insufficient lubrication [3–7]. LWE has received increased attention in the last few years, due to its reported association with symptoms and ocular dryness during contact lens wear [3–5,7–10], as well as its relationship with aging [2].

Currently, the most common way to assess LWE [7] is with the use of lissamine green [11,12] or with a mixture of fluorescein and lissamine green [1,2,4,13–15] in combination with a subjective grading scale [3]. The most common grading scale used to assess LWE [1–3,5,6,9,10,16,17] incorporates the average between the height and the width grade of the stain on the eyelid margin.

Subjective grading depends highly on the ability and accuracy of the clinician to make judgments about the condition in light of its severity and complexity [18]; when the observer has to grade two features

(height and width), errors can occur while grading each of these aspects and in how they combine them, which can result in high variability. This limits the value in clinical studies due to factors such as the need for larger sample sizes. Only one paper has attempted to analyse LWE using image analysis, however it reports only the area following manual outlining of the lissamine green staining on the lid margin including the line of Marx [19] which is not considered to be part of LWE [3].

The purpose of this study was to validate a semi-objective method of grading LWE compared to subjective assessment.

2. Methods

The study was approved by the Institutional Research Board of the University of Houston and was carried out in accordance with the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants who had previously been screened for the presence of LWE, gave informed consent prior to enrolment and were aged between 23 and 60 years of age (mean \pm SD: 34.5 ± 11.9) at the time of enrolment.

* Corresponding author at: University of Houston, College of Optometry, 4901 Calhoun Rd, Houston, TX, 77204-2060 United States.
E-mail address: ckunnen@central.uh.edu (C.M.E. Kunnen).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.clae.2017.09.008>

Received 7 August 2017; Received in revised form 8 September 2017; Accepted 9 September 2017
1367-0484/ Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of British Contact Lens Association.

Table 1
LWE grading scale for height (%) and width (mm) [3,5].

Grading	Height (%)	Grading	Width (mm)
0	< 25% of the lid wiper height	0	< 2
1	25– < 50% of the lid wiper height	1	2–4
2	50– < 75% of the lid wiper height	2	5–9
3	> 75% of the lid wiper height	3	> 10

2.1. Subjective grading

Twenty upper and twenty lower eyelid margins were photographed after instillation with a solution of 2% fluorescein and 1% lissamine green (compounded ophthalmic drops – Greenpark Compounding Pharmacy, Houston, TX). Two drops of each ~20 µl were instilled in the conjunctival sac approximately 5 min apart. Images were captured 1 min after the second drop was instilled. The 40 images were selected from 116 images of a larger study to encompass the full range of LWE grades (final score > 1). and the images were graded by two masked experienced observers using the 0–3 grading scale for height (%) and width (mm) of the lid staining as represented in Table 1 [3]. Images were presented on a TV screen and settings were kept constant while both observers graded the images separately. For each image, the LWE height was estimated by the observers as a proportional staining height relative to the anatomical lid wiper region, as described by Korb et al. [3,5]. The observers then graded the absolute width of the staining. An average of the height and width grading was calculated as the final score, rather than imposing an integer scale on the data in this study. An average final score of the two observers was used in the analysis.

2.2. Objective measurement

The same 40 images were also processed using custom designed software in MATLAB (Fig. 1). After a region of interest of 12.1 × 21.2 mm was selected, the staining area was manually selected by the operator and after delineation automatically masked by transforming it to a black and white image. The operator then manually selected evenly spaced points throughout the masked area. The system automatically drew a spline interpolation curve between the manually selected points and at each midpoint between two adjacent points on the spline curve a perpendicular bisector to the spline was calculated.

2.3. Data extraction

The height of the staining area for each line was calculated and an average of the height (mm) was used for analysis. The length of the spline curve was used as the width of the staining area (mm).

In some images, the staining area was spread out as several ‘patches’ (Fig. 2). In those cases, each of the staining areas were analysed and a total LWE width (mm) and the overall average height (mm) was used in the analysis.

To make comparisons between the image analysis outcomes and the subjective grading, it was necessary to calculate the height of the LWE as a proportion of the individual lid wiper region. The anatomical lid wiper region was manually computed by measuring the height of the lid wiper area at three locations, approximately 1.5 mm apart, in the centre of the eyelid (Fig. 3). The final relative LWE height was calculated by the mean LWE height divided by the average individual lid wiper area height. The height and width measures were then categorized into the same bins (grade 0–3) as described in the grading scale [3]. The LWE area (mm²) was calculated from the number of white pixels (representing the LWE area). This was done by multiplying the surface area of 1 pixel with the total number of pixels in the LWE area. To test repeatability of the objective measurement technique, 40 images (20 upper and 20 lower eyelids) were reanalysed on a separate occasion

two months after the original analysis by the original investigator, masked to the original readings.

2.4. Statistical analysis

Bland-Altman plots for absolute staining area height and width were used to examine repeatability of the objective measurement technique. The mean of the difference between replicates ± 1.96 SD of the differences represents the 95% limits of agreement. Bland-Altman plots were also used to test the repeatability of the lid wiper area height. Student *t*-tests were used to compare the normally distributed (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test) upper and lower height and width LWE staining. Bland-Altman plots comparing the height and width measures image analysis outcomes with the average score of the 2 observers were used to examine grading accuracy. Comparisons between height, width and final grade between the image analysis and subjective grading were made using Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Tests. Correlations between the final subjective grade and the relative proportion of LWE were made using Spearman Rank correlation analysis.

3. Results

3.1. Subjective grading

The mean ± standard deviation (SD) of the final LWE scores of the twenty upper and twenty lower eyelids are shown in Fig. 4. The average SD of LWE by the two observers was 1.98 grades (range: 1.00–3.00). For LWE height and width the average standard deviation was 1.94 grades (range: 1.00–3.00) and 2.01 grades (range: 0.50–3.00), respectively (data not displayed).

3.2. Absolute image analysis results

The mean absolute LWE height (mm) measured with image analysis was not significantly different between the lower and the upper eyelid (0.27 ± 0.06 vs. 0.30 ± 0.13, *p* = 0.27) (Fig. 5A). However, when the LWE height was calculated as relative proportion to the lid wiper area height, a significantly larger staining height for the lower eyelid was observed (46.33 ± 11.94 vs. 32.89 ± 12.92, *p* = 0.002) (Fig. 5B). LWE width and LWE area were not significantly different between the lower and upper eyelid (10.76 ± 5.50 vs. 10.20 ± 4.39, *p* = 0.72 and 3.00 ± 2.01 vs. 3.36 ± 2.60, *p* = 0.62, respectively) (Fig. 5C and D). The average anatomical lid wiper region height (Fig. 3) of the lower eyelid was 0.59 ± 0.07 mm, whereas the average lid wiper of the upper eyelid was 0.92 ± 0.13 mm.

Image analysis showed that in more than half of the eyelids LWE was distributed over 2 or more areas, or ‘patches’ (Fig. 6). For the lower eyelid, the staining was in 1 or 2 patches, whereas for the upper eyelid the staining area was distributed over 3 or more ‘patches’ in some cases.

3.3. Image analysis repeatability

The Bland-Altman plots in Fig. 7A, B and C show the repeatability of the image analysis for the absolute staining area height, width and LWE area. The mean difference between repeats for the height was –0.01 mm and 95% limits of agreement were between 0.03 and –0.05 mm. The mean difference between repeats for the width was 0.04 mm and 95% limits of agreement were between 1.16 and –1.08 mm. The mean difference between repeats for LWE area was –0.11 mm² and 95% limits of agreement are between 0.32 and –0.53 mm².

3.4. Comparison of subjective grading vs image analysis

The median and interquartile range (IQR) for LWE height, width and final grade is shown in Table 2. The absolute height, width and

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8590397>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8590397>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)