Original articles

Assessment of Corvis ST biomechanical parameters in diagnosing primary open-angle glaucoma in high myopia

Running title: Corvis ST and POAG in high myopia

Bing Zhang[1] MD, Yune Zhao[1] MD

Author affiliations: 1.Eye Hospital and School of Ophthalmology and Optometry, Wenzhou Medical University, Wenzhou, Zhejiang, China

Correspondence to:

Dr. Bing Zhang,

Zhejiang Eye Hospital, Fengqidong Road #618, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China, 310020

E-mail: bing.zhang@eye.ac.cn, Tel: (+86) 0571-88185666

Prof. Yune Zhao,

Zhejiang Eye Hospital, Fengqidong Road #618, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China, 310020

E-mail: zye@mail.eye.ac.cn, Tel: (+86) 0571-88185666

Funding/Support: This study was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of Zhejiang Province (Grant No. LQ22H120003) and the Basic Research Project of Wenzhou City, Wenzhou Municipal Science and Technology Bureau (Grant No. Y20210985).

Presented at a meeting: None

Competing interest declaration: None.

Author Contributions: BZ and YEZ contributed to the design of the study have full access to the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data. BZ performed the data analyses. BZ and YEZ contributed to data interpretation, and critically revised and approved the final manuscript.

*Number of Pages:**10**, Number of Figures:**2**, Word Counts for Abstract: **250**, Word Counts for text: **1642***

ABSTRACT

Purpose: To investigate the diagnostic value of the Corvis ST parameters in primary open-angle glaucoma (POAG) in high myopes.

Methods: A total of 49 eyes (33 POAGs and 16 controls) of 49 high myopes (axial length⩾26 mm) from open online datasets were anlayzed. The Corvis ST parameters were compared between the POAG and the control eyes after adjusting for age and sex. The association between POAG and each Corvis ST parameter were analyzed with the logistic regression models, after adjusting for age and sex. The receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves were applied to verify the diagnostic value of the positive parameters in the logistic models. The linear supporting vector machine (SVM) model was fitted with the parameters with diagnostic values in the ROC analyses.

Results: The means of the following biomechanical parameters were significantly lower in the POAG patients, A1 time (P=0.004), A1 length (P=0.011), A2 length (P=0.035), Concavity curvature radius (P=0.035) and Peak distance (PD, P<0.001), and the mean A1 velocity was significantly higher in the POAG eyes (P<0.001). In the logistic regression models, POAG was significantly associated with the A1 time (P=0.014), A1 velocity (P=0.003), A1 length (P=0.043) and PD (P=0.004). The ROC analyses showed diagnostic values of A1 time (Area Under Curve, AUC, 0.77), A1 velocity (AUC, 0.78) and PD (AUC, 0.87). In the SVM model, the separating line performed well with a classification accuracy of 0.898.

Conclusion: In high myopia patients, Corvis ST parameters, including A1 time and peak distance, showed potential diagnostic value for POAG.

Keywords: Corvis ST, Primary open-angle glaucoma, High myopia

INTRODUCTION

Diagnosis of glaucoma in high myopia can be a clinical challenge [1]. On the one hand, the risk of glaucoma increases in myopic patients, with an estimated 20% higher odds per diopter and the risk increases even more steeply in high-degree myopia [2, 3]. This indicates it's more common to encounter glaucoma patients in high myopia sufferers. On the other hand, high myopia may complicate the diagnosis of glaucoma. Besides intraocular pressure (IOP), the morphology of the optic disc, the thickness of the retinal nerve fibre layer (RNFL), and the visual field are 3 important indicators of glaucoma [4], which may be atypical in high myopia patients. Firstly, in high myopia patients, the optic nerve changes may mimic glaucomatous findings and interpreting optic disc can be difficult [5]. Secondly, both high myopia and glaucoma feature with thinner RNFL thickness, and the alteration pattern may resemble each other[6]. Thirdly, the visual field defect in high myopia can mimic glaucomatous defect in some patients, a study in young Chinese high myopes was 16.1% [7]. Therefore, it's important to find new biomarkers to support the diagnosis of glaucoma in high myopia. The corneal biomechanical parameters have been associated with the risk of glaucoma[8], which are independent of IOP [9].

In this study, we explored the diagnostic values of Corvis ST parameters in primary open-angle glaucoma (POAG) in high myopia, with logistic models, receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves and the supporting vector machine (SVM) model.

METHODS

This study is based on the online open datasets by Ryo Asaoka *et al.* via CC BY license.[10, 11]

Participants⩾20 years with axial length (AL) over 26 mm were enrolled, while diabetics and contact lens wearers were excluded since the corneal biomechanics may be affected. POAG was diagnosed clinically by experienced eye doctors. Participants with a history of other ocular diseases were excluded, except for those with clinically insignificant senile cataracts.[10, 11] . The studies to generate the original datasets was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the Graduate School of Medicine and Faculty of Medicine at The University of Tokyo, Saneikai Tsukazaki Hospital, and Hiroshima University Hospital, and adhered to the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Corvis ST (OCULUS Optikgeräte GmbH, German) measurements were performed three times per eye at a time interval of about 1 minute, and the mean value of three measurements was analyzed. During each measurement, the cornea will move inwards and then outwards after the air-puff pulse, which generates two applanations (hereafter referred to as A1 and A2). The parameters by Corvis ST in this study are as follows, 1. A1/A2 time, the period from the release of the air-puff to each application; 2.A1/A2 length, the length of the flattened cornea at each application; 3.A1/A2 velocity, the speed of the apex of the cornea at each application; 4. 'highest concavity time (HC time)', the period taken to reach the maximum deformation; 5.Deformation amplitude (DA), the length at which the apex of the cornea moves from the start to the highest concavity; 6.Peak distance (PD), the distance between the two peaks at the highest concavity; 7.Concavity curvature radius (CCR), the curvature radius at the apex at the highest concavity; 8. Central corneal thickness (CCT) at rest [10]. The axial length (AL), and mean corneal curvature were measured with IOL master 500 (Carl Zeiss Meditec., German). Goldmann application tonometry (GAT) was carried out after topical anaesthesia with fluorescein staining to obtain IOP.

The logistic regression models were applied to explore the association between Corvis ST biomechanical parameters after adjusting for age and sex. For the Corvis ST parameters which were significantly associated with the state of glaucoma, the ROC curve analyses were performed. Then a supervised learning algorithm, the linear SVM, was applied to build a diagnostic model with multi-parameters. The linear SVM analysis was performed with the SVM package from the Scikit-Learn (Python 3.9). All the other analyses and the figure plotting were performed with STATA 18 (College Station, Texas USA).

RESULTS

As shown in Table 1, 49 eyes of 49 participants (16 health controls and 33 POAG patients) were enrolled for analysis. For the Corvis ST biomechanical parameters, the mean A1 time in the whole sample and P value between the two eye groups were 7.23±0.28 ms (P=0.004), the mean A1 length was 1.75±0.10 mm (P=0.011), the mean A2 length was 1.69±0.34 m/s (P=0.035), the mean PD was 3.41±0.92 mm (P<0.001), and all the above parameters were significantly lower in the POAG eyes. The mean A1 velocity was significantly (P<0.001) higher in the POAG eyes (0.16±0.01 m/s) than in the controls (0.14±0.01 m/s), and the mean CCR was 7.25±0.61 mm in the POAG group and significantly lower (P=0.035) in the control eyes (6.59±0.63 mm). All the other analyzed parameters showed no significant discrepancy.

The possible corneal biomechanical indicators of POAG in high myopia were analyzed in Table 2. Of the 10 analyzed Corvis ST parameters, 4 showed a significant association with the state of glaucoma. After adjusting for age and sex, the odds ratios per standard deviation (SD) increase in the parameter were as follows, the A1 time was 0.25 (95% CI, 0.08 to 0.75, P=0.014), the A1

velocity was 6.09 (95% CI, 1.84 to 20.16, P=0.003), the A1 length was 0.27 (95%CI, 0.07 to 0.96, P=0.043), and the PD was 0.22 (95% CI, 0.08 to 0.61, P=0.004).

The 4 biomechanical parameters which were significantly associated with the state of glaucoma in the logistic models were further analyzed with the ROC curves in Table 2. The Corvis ST parameter with the largest AUC was PD, which was 0.87 (95% CI, 0.77 to 0.97), the cutoff point for diagnosis was 3.26 mm. The A1 time and the A1 velocity were with similar AUC, which was 0.77 (95% CI, 0.63 to 0.92) and 0.78 (95% CI, 0.62 to 0.94) respectively. For A1 length, although it was significantly associated with the state of POAG in the logistic model (P=0.043), the AUC was only 0.52 with a 95% CI containing 0.5 (95% CI, 0.30 to 0.74), which indicated it was not a good indicator of POAG in high myopia. Figure 1 shows the ROC curves of the 4 parameters, which support the findings in Table 2.

After analyzing the diagnostic value of each parameter with the ROC curve, a multivariate model (linear SVM) was built with the 3 candidate predictors, A1 time, A1 velocity and PD. The fitting separating superplane was 1.97×A1 time-0.17×A1 velocity+PD-18.2=0. Considering the coefficient of A1 velocity was small (-0.17), A1 velocity was removed from the model, and a linear SVM model with A1 time and PD was built. As shown in Figure 2, the separating line was 1.97×A1 time+PD-18.26=0**,** which made a good distinction between the two eye groups and the classification accuracy was 0.898 (=44/49) in the sample.

The sample size was analyzed based on the linear diagnosed models in this study (Logistic and linear SVM). The events per predictor (EPP) was calculated, which was 33 events/3 predictors=11 in this study, which was satisfied with the rule of minimum EPP at 10[(12)].

DISCUSSION

This study focused on the challenging problem of diagnosing glaucoma in high myopia, with a new perspective of corneal biomechanics. Table 1 showed significantly smaller A1 time, Al length, A2 length, PD, and higher Al velocity in the POAG eyes, which indicated in the high myopes, the cornea of the POAG eye was stiffer than the normal eyes. The findings were supported by previous publications[13, 14]. Stiffer cornea in glaucoma has been reported since the era of the Ocular Response Analyzer,[15] which was reported as a risk factor independent of IOP.[9] This study indicated in high myopes, the cornea was significantly stiffer in POAG patients than in the controls.

In this study, A1 time, A1 velocity, A1 length and PD were significantly associated with POAG, which indicated the 4 parameters may serve as diagnostic indicators in high myopia. In the ROC analyses, the AUC of PD was the biggest, which was the most effective predictor in this study, followed by two parameters with similar AUCs, A1 velocity and A1 time. The diagnostic values were evaluated based on the AUCs, which were acceptable of A1 velocity and A1 time (between 0.7 to 0.8) and excellent of PD (over 0.8).[16] According to previous publications, the diagnostic value of Corvis ST parameters has been indicated in various types of glaucoma[17, 18], which supports our findings in this study.

The separating line of the linear SVM was then fitted as 1.97×A1 time+PD-18.26=0, based on which we put forward a Q-value that Q=1.97×A1 time (ms)+PD (mm)-18.26. As shown in Figure 2, If the Q is <0, the eye is classified as POAGs, else if the Q>0 then the controls are. Considering the SD of Q is 1.1, the value of Q could be roughly considered as how many SDs from the separating line. On the other hand, the cases close to the board line, or the Q value was close to 0, maybe more prone to misclassification. The AUC of the Q value was 0.94 (95% CI,

0.88 to 1.0), which indicated excellent diagnostic value in the sample.[16] Considering only 2 predictors were included in the SVM model, the risk of overfitting is low.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we found the Corvis ST parameters were significantly different between the POAG and the controls in high myopes, and the direction of the changes indicated a stiffer alteration of the cornea in POAG patients. The logistic and ROC analyses indicated several Corvis ST parameters as candidate disease indicators. The SVM model showed sound ability to separate the POAG and control groups in the sample. This study indicates the Corvis ST parameters as candidate biomechanical biomarkers in the diagnosis of POAG in high myopes.

REFERENCES

1. Sun MT, Tran M, Singh K, Chang R, Wang H, Sun Y. Glaucoma and Myopia: Diagnostic Challenges. Biomolecules. 2023;13(3).
2. Ha A, Kim CY, Shim SR, Chang IB, Kim YK. Degree of Myopia and Glaucoma Risk: A Dose-Response Meta-analysis. American journal of ophthalmology. 2022;236:107-19.
3. Marcus MW, de Vries MM, Junoy Montolio FG, Jansonius NM. Myopia as a risk factor for open-angle glaucoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Ophthalmology. 2011;118(10):1989-94.e2.
4. Gedde SJ, Vinod K, Wright MM, Muir KW, Lind JT, Chen PP, et al. Primary Open-Angle Glaucoma Preferred Practice Pattern®. Ophthalmology. 2021;128(1):P71-p150.
5. Chang RT, Singh K. Myopia and glaucoma: diagnostic and therapeutic challenges. Current opinion in ophthalmology. 2013;24(2):96-101.
6. Markeviciute A, Januleviciene I, Antman G, Siesky B, Harris A. Differences in structural parameters in patients with open-angle glaucoma, high myopia and both diseases concurrently. A pilot study. PloS one. 2023;18(6):e0286019.
7. Ding X, Chang RT, Guo X, Liu X, Johnson CA, Holden BA, et al. Visual field defect classification in the Zhongshan Ophthalmic Center-Brien Holden Vision Institute High Myopia Registry Study. The British journal of ophthalmology. 2016;100(12):1697-702.
8. Gaspar R, Pinto LA, Sousa DC. Corneal properties and glaucoma: a review of the literature and meta-analysis. Arquivos brasileiros de oftalmologia. 2017;80(3):202-6.
9. Zhang B, Shweikh Y, Khawaja AP, Gallacher J, Bauermeister S, Foster PJ. Associations with Corneal Hysteresis in a Population Cohort: Results from 96 010 UK Biobank Participants. Ophthalmology. 2019;126(11):1500-10.
10. Asaoka R, Nakakura S, Tabuchi H, Murata H, Nakao Y, Ihara N, et al. The Relationship between Corvis ST Tonometry Measured Corneal Parameters and Intraocular Pressure, Corneal Thickness and Corneal Curvature. PloS one. 2015;10(10):e0140385.
11. Matsuura M, Hirasawa K, Murata H, Yanagisawa M, Nakao Y, Nakakura S, et al. The Relationship between Corvis ST Tonometry and Ocular Response Analyzer Measurements in Eyes with Glaucoma. PloS one. 2016;11(8):e0161742.
12. Peduzzi P, Concato J, Kemper E, Holford TR, Feinstein AR. A simulation study of the number of events per variable in logistic regression analysis. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 1996;49(12):1373-9.
13. Li BB, Cai Y, Pan YZ, Li M, Qiao RH, Fang Y, et al. Corneal Biomechanical Parameters and Asymmetric Visual Field Damage in Patients with Untreated Normal Tension Glaucoma. Chinese medical journal. 2017;130(3):334-9.
14. Wu N, Chen Y, Sun X. Association Between Ocular Biomechanics Measured With Corvis ST and Glaucoma Severity in Patients With Untreated Primary Open Angle Glaucoma. Translational vision science & technology. 2022;11(6):10.
15. Liang L, Zhang R, He LY. Corneal hysteresis and glaucoma. International ophthalmology. 2019;39(8):1909-16.
16. Hosmer DW, Lemeshow S, Sturdivant RX. Assessing the Fit of the Model. Applied Logistic Regression2013. p. 153-225.
17. Chou CC, Shih PJ, Wang CY, Jou TS, Chen JP, Wang IJ. Corvis Biomechanical Factor Facilitates the Detection of Primary Angle Closure Glaucoma. Translational vision science & technology. 2022;11(10):7.

18. Pillunat KR, Herber R, Spoerl E, Erb C, Pillunat LE. A new biomechanical glaucoma factor to discriminate normal eyes from normal pressure glaucoma eyes. Acta ophthalmologica. 2019;97(7):e962-e7.

Legends

Figure 1: The receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves of 4 Corvis ST parameters, the peak distance, A1 time, A1 length and A1 velocity.

Figure 2: The plotting of the separating superplane of the linear supporting vector machine (SVM) model.

Table 1: The descriptive analyses of the demographic variables and Corvis ST parameters and the comparisons between the POAG and control groups.

Table 2: The logistic models of the associations between POAG and the Corvis ST biomechanical parameters in high myopes and the corresponding receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analyses (AUC=area under curve).

Table 1: The descriptive analyses of the demographic variables and Corvis ST parameters and the comparisons between the POAG and control groups.

	Health controls	POAG patients	Total	P values
N	16	33	49	
Age, year	42.2 (20.9)	58.6 (7.8)	53.2 (15.4)	<0.001
Sex, n male (%)	5 (16.7%)	25 (83.3%)	30 (61.2%)	0.003
Axial length, mm	27.2 (1.4)	26.9 (0.8)	27.0 (1.0)	0.542
Corneal curvature, mm	7.7 (0.2)	7.8 (0.2)	7.8 (0.2)	0.137
CCT, μm	556.5 (36.1)	528.6 (29.3)	537.7 (34.0)	0.003
A1 time, ms	7.41 (0.28)	7.14 (0.23)	7.23 (0.28)	0.004
A1 length, mm	1.77 (0.16)	1.74 (0.05)	1.75 (0.10)	0.011
A1 velocity, m/s	0.14 (0.02)	0.16 (0.01)	0.15 (0.02)	<0.001
A2 time, ms	21.77 (0.42)	21.93 (0.37)	21.88 (0.39)	0.076
A2 length, mm	1.78 (0.41)	1.65 (0.30)	1.69 (0.34)	0.035
A2 velocity, m/s	-0.42 (0.08)	-0.43 (0.07)	-0.42 (0.08)	0.532
HC time, ms	16.60 (0.37)	16.84 (0.54)	16.76 (0.50)	0.134
Def. amp., mm	1.09 (0.10)	1.16 (0.10)	1.14 (0.10)	0.088
Peak distance, mm	4.21 (0.66)	3.02 (0.77)	3.41 (0.92)	<0.001
CCR, mm	6.59 (0.63)	7.25 (0.61)	7.03 (0.69)	0.035

Table 2: The logistic models of the associations between POAG and the Corvis ST biomechanical parameters in high myopes and the corresponding receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analyses (AUC=area under curve).

	Logistic models		**ROC curves**			
	Odds Ratios	P values	AUC (95% CI)	Cutoff points	Sensitivity	Specificity
A1 time	0.25 (0.08, 0.75)	0.014*	0.77 (0.63, 0.92)	7.35 ms	0.85	0.62
A1 velocity	6.09 (1.84, 20.16)	0.003*	0.78 (0.62, 0.94)	0.157 m/s	0.76	0.81
A1 length	0.27 (0.07, 0.96)	0.043*	0.52 (0.30, 0.74)	1.73 mm	0.79	0.56
A2 time	2.23 (0.89, 5.58)	0.086	-	-	-	-
A2 length	0.41 (0.16, 1.09)	0.075	-	-	-	-
A2 velocity	0.84 (0.4, 1.77)	0.644	-	-	-	-
HC time	1.73 (0.78, 3.85)	0.178	-	-	-	-
Def. amp.	2.02 (0.87, 4.73)	0.103	-	-	-	-
Peak distance	0.22 (0.08, 0.61)	0.004*	0.87(0.77, 0.97)	3.26 mm	0.73	1.00
CCR, mm	2.34 (0.91, 6.02)	0.077	-	-	-	-


1.00
0.75
0.50
0.25
0.00
Sensitivity
0.00
0.25
0.50
0.75
1.00
1-specificity
A1 time, area: 0.77
A1 velocity, area: 0.78
Peak distance, area: 0.87
A1 length, area: 0.52


Controls
POAGs
Separating line
Y+1.97X-18.26=0
Peak distance, mm
A1 time, ms
6
5
4
3
2
6.5
7
7.5
8