Overview of available and effective interventions for myopia control

Abdullatif Obaid Altowairqi, Naseem Saleem Altowairqi, Abdulrahman Omar Basalim, Ali Yasen Ali Ahmed

Abstract:

In this article, we discuss the epidemiology of myopia and genetic background, treatment methods to slow down the progression and a summary of early clinical investigations of drugs for controlling myopia. We conducted the literature search in following electronic database MEDLINE/PubMed, EMBASE, for published studies up to October, 2017. We have included most evidence based articles which were discussing the myopia control interventional. We then manually searched the references of the original studies and reviews to identify any potential studies omitted by our search concerned topic. Parental myopia may be both hereditary and environmental cause for myopia. Kids with myopic parents have the tendency to spend less time outdoors and do more near tasks. However, myopia development can be considerably reduced if kids with both myopic parents spend more time outside. Longer overall hours under the sun are defensive measures, and the small distance for near work and the duration for reading are worsening elements for myopia. While atropine is a strongly efficient treatment for myopia in randomized control trials, it is not well tolerated in medical setting due to its noticeable negative effects, especially with high dose. Rebound impact might alleviate and even

reverse its myopia control impact. Low-dose atropine is perhaps much more well approved and has proven to be very efficient in myopia control. Of all the methods studied to slow the development of myopia, topical pharmaceutical agents, orthokeratology contact lenses, and soft bifocal contact lenses were found to be the most efficient, commercially accessible modalities.

Introduction:

Myopia describes the refractive mistake in which light getting in the eye from distant things is focused in front of the retina, resulting in blurred vision. The condition is most frequently the result of excessive elongation of the posterior vitreous chamber of the eye, increasing the risk of retinal detachment and some degenerative retinal conditions, and making high myopia a major cause of visual impairment and blindness [1], [2].Myopia has ended up being a major public health concern owing to rapid surges in the occurrence of myopia, initial noted in East Asian populaces.

The regulation of myopia has been primarily directed at correcting the inequality between the eye's optical power and its size using either optical ways, such as single-vision spectacles and contact lenses, or refractive surgical treatments, such as photorefractive keratectomy (PRK) and laser-assisted in situ keratomileusis (LASIK), which both include reshaping and hence changing the optical power of the cornea. While these alternatives restore sharp distance vision in myopes, they do nothing to manage myopia progression. On the other hand, the possibility that myopia progression can be controlled optically has seen a recent rise in interest, driven in component by

the demonstration in animal models that positive lenses could slow eye growth. While thorough analysis of this literature is past the scope of this article, it is suitable to acknowledge the promising arise from some current contact lens research studies. Specifically, remarkable decreasing of eye elongation has been reported in early, albeit small-scale myopia studies entailing two different types of call lenses, one being a concentric bifocal soft get in touch with lens [3], [4], and the other being an inflexible lens worn overnight to squash and therefore reduce the power of the main cornea (a procedure referred to as orthokeratology or corneal refractive treatment) [5] CooperVision (CA, USA) recently launched the MiSight multifocal soft contact lens planned for myopia control [6].The reported therapy impacts are substantially higher than those of progressive addition spectacles (PALs), for which a large medical test, the Correction of Myopia Evaluation Trial (COMET), found their benefit to be fairly little and limited to a subgroup of myopes exhibiting binocular vision-related or accommodative (near concentrating) abnormalities [7].There are currently no pharmaceutical agents authorized by the US FDA for use as myopia therapies, although three drugs, particularly atropine, pirenzepine and 7-methylxanthine (7-MX), have been targeted in current professional tests [8].Topical atropine is likewise extensively used off-label in East Asian countries where myopia-related public health concerns are greatest.

In this article, we discuss the epidemiology of myopia and genetic background, treatment methods to slow down the progression and a summary of early clinical investigations of drugs for controlling myopia.

Methodology:

We conducted the literature search in following electronic database MEDLINE/PubMed, EMBASE, for published studies up to October, 2017. We have included most evidence based articles which were discussing the myopia control interventional. We then manually searched the references of the original studies and reviews to identify any potential studies omitted by our search concerned topic. And we applied restriction to only English language with human subjected studies to be included in our study.

Discussion:

- **Epidemiology**

Recent epidemiological information has identified outside activity as an essential environmental factor of myopia. In both Singaporean and Australian kids, complete time spent outdoors was related to less myopic refraction, independent of inside task, reading, and engagement in sports [9].

Previous reports of rural- urban distinctions in myopia prevalence have additionally been confirmed, with inner-city urban areas having greater probabilities of myopia than external suburban areas. This information recommended that small to moderate ecological distinctions might influence myopia advancement, even within an usual mainly urban environment [10].

- **Genetics of Ocular Refractive Components**

Refraction is identified by coordinated contributions of eye biometric parts such as axial length (AL), anterior chamber depth (ACD), corneal curvature (keratometry readings in diopters), and lens density. The inverted relationship of AL and ACD to refraction is well documented (the longer the eye, the much more myopic the refractive error). Myopes have longer axial sizes, much deeper glasslike chambers, thinner lenses, and flatter corneas [11].In the large majority of situations, the architectural reason for myopia is an excessive axial length of the eye, or more especially, the vitreous chamber depth. AL is estimated to be the best determinant of refractive error; heritability estimations for AL variety from 40% to 94%, and most just recently were reported to be 81% in an entire genome twin research study in Australia [12].This research was the initial to determine a locus linked in eye axial size, on chromosome 5q, and it determined additional areas with suggestive multipoint logarithm of the probabilities (LOD) proportions on chromosomes 6, 10, and 14 linked to axial size [12].

Treatments to Slow the Progression of Myopia

Therapies that are currently readily available for slowing down the development of nearsightedness consist of spectacle lenses, contact lenses, and pharmaceutical representatives. Many of the treatment research studies evaluating these therapies have had technical limitations, and their results should be translated with caution. In order for cause be offered severe consideration, the treatment test ought to consist of the adhering to functions: a concurrent control group, random assignment to the treatment and control groups, masking of private investigators who gather the outcome data, standardized dimensions, a big adequate example dimension, and a tiny loss to follow-up. The mass of evidence from well-designed researches with proper controls reveals that most therapies for nearsightedness have little treatment benefits that last for a reasonably brief time period or have significant adverse effects. This evaluation of

treatment choices for nearsightedness will certainly highlight recent results from well-designed professional studies.

Single Vision Lenses

An energetic emmetropization device regulated by optical defocus is sustained by results of various research studies (evaluated in [13]. Solid proof is supplied by offsetting ocular development seen in feedback to lens-induced defocus in animal models [14] Based on these results, it has been recommended that phenomenon treatment in myopic youngsters with the frequently suggested single vision lenses (SVLs) could lead to raised progression and axial prolongation. Patterns of lens wear in nearsighted patients can differ from permanent wear, to using lenses for distance viewing just, to non-wear of suggested lenses. Minimal data are readily available on myopia progression by pattern of lens wear, though pilot information recommend that progression is similar for the different patterns [15] Additional examination utilizing a huge example of children randomly designated to a lens wear regimen is necessitated.

Under-correction of nearsightedness with SVLs is a treatment alternative supported by some clinicians. Just one concealed, randomized medical test has been conducted to evaluate this therapy [16] Ninety-four of 106 (89%) myopic children aged 9-14 years finished two years of spectacle wear in SVLs, half randomized to complete adjustment and fifty percent to under-correction by about 0.75 D. Two-year progression in the fully dealt with team was 0.77 D, substantially less than the 1.0 D in the under-corrected team ($p < 0.01$). This finding was unanticipated, based upon the results from animal studies gone over over, and more research is required.

Bifocals and Progressive Addition Lenses

Using bifocals or dynamic enhancement lenses (PALs), often called no-line bifocals, for reducing the development of myopia has generated reasonably small treatment results on the whole, like 0.15 to 0.50 D over 1.5 to 3 years [17], although treatment results are reported to be bigger in specific subgroups of myopic youngsters, as defined below.

The largest of the therapy tests with this kind of lens was the Correction of Myopia Evaluation Trial (COMET), a multi-center, randomized, double-masked clinical test to assess whether PALs slow the rate of development of myopia compared to traditional SVLs [18] COMET registered 469 youngsters aged 6 -11 years who were ethnically diverse (46% white, 26% African-American, 14% Hispanic, and 8% Asian) and had standard nearsightedness in between − 1.25 D and − 4.50 D. The primary end result measure was development of myopia by cycloplegic autorefraction with tropicamide. Retention was great, with 462/469 (98.5%) of the children finishing the three-year check out. Changed mean myopia raised from standard to 3 years by 1.28 ± 0.06 D in the PAL group and 1.48 ± 0.06 D in the SVL group. The overall adjusted 3-year therapy result of 0.20 ± 0.08 D was statistically significant (p = 0.004) however not clinically significant. All of the treatment impact occurred in the first year. Added analyses showed that there were significant 3-year treatment impacts in youngsters with bigger lags of accommodation in mix with close to esophoria (0.64 D ± 0.21), shorter reading ranges (0.44 D ± 0.20), or reduced baseline myopia (0.48 D ± 0.15) that became bigger from 1 to 3 years of follow-up [19] These results support a duty for retinal defocus in myopia development and suggest that myopic youngsters with big accommodative lags and near esophoria could take advantage of wearing

PALs. The COMET2 research is presently underway to assess PALs vs. SVLs for slowing myopia progression in kids with these characteristics.

Contact Lenses

Numerous early examinations of rigid gas absorptive contact lenses (RGP) for myopia control struggled with absence of randomization and a high leave rate from the contact lens group [20].In an effort to eliminate the high loss to follow-up discovered in previous researches, a recent randomized medical test, the Contact Lens and Myopia Progression (CLAMP) research study, implemented a run-in duration to ensure good conformity with rigid contact lens wear [21].One hundred and sixteen children who effectively finished the run-in duration were randomized to use either RGP or soft contact lenses for 3 years. Results showed a statistically considerable distinction in 3-year myopia development in the RGP versus soft lens group (− 1.56 ± 0.95 D for RGP users vs. − 2.19 ± 0.89 D for the soft lens group, $p<0.001$). A lot of the slowed progression with RGP lenses was located in the initial year. Corneal curvature steepened significantly much less over 3 years in the RGP team (0.62 ± 0.60 D compared to the disposable lens team (0.88 ± 0.57 D, $p=0.01$), once more with most of the distinction discovered in the initial year. Three-year axial elongation was not significantly various between therapy teams. These outcomes, taken together, recommend that the slowed myopia progression was generally as a result of corneal flattening, which could be reversible with discontinuation of RGP lens wear. In the lack of distinctions in axial elongation and with the majority of the treatment impact happening in the first year, the authors of the CLAMP study concluded that RGP lenses should not be suggested mainly for myopia control.

Anecdotal reports and evidence from pilot studies have suggested that using soft call lenses accelerate myopia progression [22].Nevertheless, a recent randomized trial examining the result of soft contact lenses on myopia development in youngsters reported no substantial difference in development between soft contact lens and spectacle wearers [23].

- **Interventions related to altering peripheral refraction**

Scientifically, human eyes react with peripheral myopic defocus with retardation of axial size development. This appears with medical trials on daytime-use peripheral defocus modifying tools and night-wear orthokeratology[24].High cost and dangers of infection may be of interest in contact lenses. It is unclear whether there is comparable rebound impact after cessation of wear, but the condition of being spectacle complimentary is an extra reward for patients to be certified.

Prism bifocal spectacle lenses

Prism bifocal spectacle lenses are bifocal spectacles with 3-Δ base-in prism in near addition of + 1.50 D. With this device, the effort for convergence and accommodation during close to job can be attenuated. It appears to function best for myopic children with low delays of accommodation. In these patients, 0.99 D/year of myopia retardation as compared with control was observed[25].

- **Pharmaceutical Agents**

Atropine

Recent well-designed research studies using topical atropine, a non-selective muscarinic antagonist, have demonstrated statistically and medically considerable reductions in the development of myopia [26].Shih et alia [26] reported that myopia development was significantly

slowed (p<0.0001)over 18 months in 6-13 year old children randomized to 0.5% atropine with multi-focal glasses (0.41 D) compared with multi-focal glasses alone (1.19 D) or SVLs alone (1.40 D). Chua et alia [27] reported comparable cause a two-year study of 400 6-12 year-old myopic youngsters in Singapore, although this research study used a different speculative standard. Children were randomly designated to either the atropine or the placebo-control group, with just one eye of each child managed with either 1% atropine or vehicle eye drops when nightly. Two-year development in the atropine-treated eyes was located to be − 0.28 D, considerably less than development in the control eyes (− 1.20 D). Myopia development in the untreated eyes of both teams resembled that of the control eyes. This result meant that a lot of the youngsters in the atropine team were efficiently anisometropic at the end of the research study. The research did not report follow-up data to show whether a rebound result (boosted development in the atropine-treated eyes after cessation of therapy) could have happened. A new clinical test is currently underway in Singapore that evaluates various focus of atropine applied to both eyes and that additionally will certainly measure progression of myopia after treatment is stopped. Although atropine is made use of in lots of countries in Asia for reducing the progression of myopia, it is seldom used in the United States for this objective. The negative effects associated with atropine (e.g., photophobia, cycloplegia) are thought about by many clinicians to be unacceptable for long-term treatment.

Pirenzepine

Pirenzepine, like atropine, is a muscarinic antagonist yet it is less most likely to generate mydriasis and cycloplegia. 2 clinical tests of pirenzepine have been conducted, one in Singapore, Hong Kong, and Thailand [28] and the other in the United States [29].In the Singapore research study, myopia in children raised over an one-year duration by 0.47 D for those utilizing pirenzepine ophthalmic gel two times a day, 0.70 D for those using it once a day, and 0.84 D for

the control group [28].In the United States study, myopia enhanced over one year by 0.26 D in the pirenzepine group (utilized daily) and 0.53 D in the control group [29].Just recently, two-year data from the very same research were published, showing an increase in the dimension of the treatment result from 0.30 to 0.41 in between one and two years [30].Nonetheless, these arise from the U.S. research study have to be interpreted with caution given that the research was created as an one-year research and only 84 of the initially enlisted 174 topics (48%) consented to continue for a second year.

Conclusion:

Parental myopia may be both hereditary and environmental cause for myopia. Kids with myopic parents have the tendency to spend less time outdoors and do more near tasks. However, myopia development can be considerably reduced if kids with both myopic parents spend more time outside. Longer overall hours under the sun are defensive measures, and the small distance for near work and the duration for reading are worsening elements for myopia. While atropine is a strongly efficient treatment for myopia in randomized control trials, it is not well tolerated in medical setting due to its noticeable negative effects, especially with high dose. Rebound impact might alleviate and even reverse its myopia control impact. Low-dose atropine is perhaps much more well approved and has proven to be very efficient in myopia control. Of all the methods studied to slow the development of myopia, topical pharmaceutical agents, orthokeratology contact lenses, and soft bifocal contact lenses were found to be the most efficient, commercially accessible modalities. Orthokeratology contact lenses and soft bifocal contact lenses slow down the myopic progression of myopia in a debatable way, so the most effective method should be determined by the eye care specialist and parent, based on the lifestyle of the certain kid.

Reference:

1. Ghafour IM, Allan D, Foulds WS. Common causes of blindness and visual handicap in the west of Scotland. Br. J. Ophthalmol. 1983;67(4):209–213.
2. Iwase A, Araie M, Tomidokoro A, Yamamoto T, Shimizu H, Kitazawa Y. Prevalence and causes of low vision and blindness in a Japanese adult population: the Tajimi Study. Ophthalmology. 2006;113(8):1354–1362.
3. Aller T. Myopia progression with bifocal soft contact lenses – a twin study. Optom. Vis. Sci. 2000;77(S79)
4. Aller T, Grisham D. Myopia progression control using bifocal contact lenses. Optom. Vis. Sci. 2000;77(S187)
5. Cho P, Cheung SW, Edwards M. The longitudinal orthokeratology research in children (LORIC) in Hong Kong: a pilot study on refractive changes and myopic control. Curr. Eye Res. 2005;30(1):71–80.
6. Myopia control moves forward. Optician. 2010 April 9;
7. Gwiazda J, Hyman L, Hussein M, et al. A randomized clinical trial of progressive addition lenses versus single vision lenses on the progression of myopia in children. Invest. Ophthalmol. Vis. Sci. 2003;44(4):1492–1500.
8. Fan DS, Lam DS, Chan CK, Fan AH, Cheung EY, Rao SK. Topical atropine in retarding myopic progression and axial length growth in children with moderate to severe myopia: a pilot study. Jpn. J. Ophthalmol. 2007;51(1):27–33.
9. Saw SM, Chua WH, Hong CY, et al. Near-work in early-onset myopia. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2002;43:332–339.
10. Ip JM, Rose KA, Morgan IG, et al. Myopia and the urban environment: Findings in a sample of 12-year-old Australian school children. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2008;49:3858–3863.
11. Zhu G, Hewitt AW, Ruddle JB, et al. Genetic dissection of myopia: evidence for linkage of ocular axial length to chromosome 5q. Ophthalmology. 2008;115:1053–1057.
12. Gwiazda J, Hyman L, Hussein M, et al. A randomized clinical trial of progressive addition lenses versus single vision lenses on the progression of myopia in children. Invest OphthalmolVis Sci. 2003;44:1492–1500.
13. Wallman J, Winawer J. Homeostasis of eye growth and the question of myopia. Neuron. 2004;43:447–68.
14. Hung LF, Crawford ML, Smith EL., 3rd Spectacle lenses alter eye growth and the refractive status of young monkeys. Nat Med. 1995;1:761–5.
15. Ong E, Grice K, Held R, Thorn F, Gwiazda J. Effects of spectacle intervention on the progression of myopia in children. Optom Vis Sci. 1999;76:363–9.
16. Chung K, Mohidin N, O'Leary DJ. Undercorrection of myopia enhances rather than inhibits myopia progression. Vision Res. 2002;42:2555–9.
17. Leung JT, Brown B. Progression of myopia in Hong Kong Chinese schoolchildren is slowed by wearing progressive lenses. Optom Vis Sci. 1999;76:346–54.

18. Gwiazda J, Hyman L, Hussein M, Everett D, Norton TT, Kurtz D, Leske MC, Manny R, Marsh-Tootle W, Scheiman M. A randomized clinical trial of progressive addition lenses versus single vision lenses on the progression of myopia in children. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2003;44:1492–500.
19. Gwiazda JE, Hyman L, Norton TT, Hussein ME, Marsh-Tootle W, Manny R, Wang Y, Everett D. Accommodation and related risk factors associated with myopia progression and their interaction with treatment in COMET children. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2004;45:2143–51.
20. Khoo CY, Chong J, Rajan U. A 3-year study on the effect of RGP contact lenses on myopic children. Singapore Med J. 1999;40:230–7.
21. 20. Walline JJ, Jones LA, Mutti DO, Zadnik K. A randomized trial of the effects of rigid contact lenses on myopia progression. Arch Ophthalmol. 2004;122:1760–6.
22. Fulk GW, Cyert LA, Parker DE, West RW. The effect of changing from glasses to soft contact lenses on myopia progression in adolescents. Ophthalmic Physiol Opt. 2003;23:71–7.
23. Walline JJ, Jones LA, Sinnott L, Manny RE, Gaume A, Rah MJ, Chitkara M, Lyons S. A randomized trial of the effect of soft contact lenses on myopia progression in children. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2008;49:4702–6.
24. Huang J, Wen D, Wang Q, McAlinden C, Flitcroft I, Chen H, et al. Efficacy comparison of 16 interventions for myopia control in children: A network meta-analysis. Ophthalmology. 2016;123:697–708.
25. Cheng D, Woo GC, Drobe B, Schmid KL. Effect of bifocal and prismatic bifocal spectacles on myopia progression in children: Three-year results of a randomized clinical trial. JAMA Ophthalmol. 2014;132:258–64.
26. Shih YF, Hsiao CK, Chen CJ, Chang CW, Hung PT, Lin LL. An intervention trial on efficacy of atropine and multi-focal glasses in controlling myopic progression. Acta Ophthalmol Scand. 2001;79:233–6.
27. Chua WH, Balakrishnan V, Chan YH, Tong L, Ling Y, Quah BL, Tan D. Atropine for the treatment of childhood myopia. Ophthalmology. 2006;113:2285–91.
28. Tan DT, Lam DS, Chua WH, Shu-Ping DF, Crockett RS. One-year multicenter, double-masked, placebo-controlled, parallel safety and efficacy study of 2% pirenzepine ophthalmic gel in children with myopia. Ophthalmology. 2005;112:84–91.
29. Siatkowski RM, Cotter S, Miller JM, Scher CA, Crockett RS, Novack GD. Safety and efficacy of 2% pirenzepine ophthalmic gel in children with myopia: a 1-year, multicenter, double-masked, placebo-controlled parallel study. Arch Ophthalmol. 2004;122:1667–74.
30. Siatkowski RM, Cotter SA, Crockett RS, Miller JM, Novack GD, Zadnik K. Two-year multicenter, randomized, double-masked, placebo-controlled, parallel safety and efficacy study of 2% pirenzepine ophthalmic gel in children with myopia. J AAPOS. 2008;12:332–9.