Endothelial alterations in 712 keratoconus patients

Susanne Goebels,[1] [iD] Timo Eppig,[2] [iD] Berthold Seitz,[1] Nòra Szentmàry,[1,3] Alan Cayless[4] and Achim Langenbucher[2]

[1]Department of Ophthalmology, Saarland University Medical Center, Homburg, Germany
[2]Department of Experimental Ophthalmology, Saarland University, Homburg, Germany
[3]Department of Ophthalmology, Semmelweis University, Budapest, Hungary
[4]Department of Physical Sciences, Open University, Milton Keynes, UK

ABSTRACT.

Purpose: To investigate the effect of the severity of keratoconus on the corneal endothelium using specular microscopy.

Methods: Seven hundred and twelve eyes from the Homburg Keratoconus Center (HKC) database were included in this retrospective study. Corneal endothelium was evaluated using the Tomey EM-3000 specular microscope. Keratoconus-related topographic and tomographic data were obtained from Scheimpflug-based tomography (Oculus Pentacam® HR). Eyes were classified into stages 0 (healthy) to 4 (severe keratoconus) according to the Topographic Keratoconus Classification (TKC). Subgroups were analysed based on contact lens (CL) type (none/rigid/soft).

Results: The frequencies of keratoconus stages 0/1/2/3/4 according to TKC were 169/94/206/166/77. The endothelial cell density (ECD) for the endothelial cell area for TKC 0/1/2/3/4 was 2611/2624/2557/2487/2401 cells per mm² and the coefficient of variation (CV) was 40.9/40.0/41.6/46.2/49.0%, respectively. The more severe the keratoconus stage, the lower the endothelial cell count ($p < 0.001$) and the higher the CV ($p < 0.001$). No contact lens wearing was noted in 207 eyes (NoCL), rigid CL in 200 (RCL) and soft CL in 54 (SCL). CD for NoCL/RCL/SCL was 2523/2533/2644 per mm² and CV was 41.8/54.1/43.1%, respectively. A significant difference in CV was found between NoCL and RCL ($p = 0.02$), and no significant difference in CV was found between NoCL and SCL ($p = 0.07$). Endothelial cell density (ECD) did not differ significantly between NoCL and RCL or SCL.

Conclusion: Endothelial cell density (ECD) decreases and CV increases significantly with increasing tomographic severity of keratoconus. In patients with RCL compared to eyes without CL wear, we found a statistically significantly higher CV in the endothelial cell size.

Key words: contact lens – corneal endothelium – EM-3000 – keratoconus – specular microscopy

Introduction

Keratoconus is an ectatic non-inflammatory corneal disorder, in which the cornea forms a conic shape due to thinning of the corneal stroma (Rabinowitz 1998; Goebels et al. 2015). These changes normally induce irregular astigmatism, myopia and protrusion, leading to a mild to marked deterioration of visual performance (Rabinowitz 1998; Goebels et al. 2015) and loss of quality of life (Kymes et al. 2008). Keratoconus is usually bilateral, mostly diagnosed in the 2nd or 3rd decade of life with an annual incidence of 2 per 100.000 a year (Wagner et al. 2007) and a prevalence of 55:100.000 (Bühren et al. 2011; Nielsen et al. 2013; Goebels et al. 2015) and more prominent in males than in females. The last resort in therapy for severe keratoconus is still keratoplasty, either penetrating keratoplasty (PKP) or deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty (DALK) (El-Agha et al. 2014) with the benefit of avoiding endothelial immune reactions. For DALK, the endothelial cell function of the host is the main determinant for the survival of the graft (El-Agha et al. 2014). In corneal buttons removed from PKP for keratoconus, histopathological changes in the endothelium such as pleomorphism and polymegalism have been found, as well as endothelial cell degeneration (Sturbaum & Peiffer 1993; El-Agha et al. 2014).

Several studies in the literature have investigated changes in corneal endothelium in eyes with keratoconus. Analysis of the endothelial cell layer was based on either specular or confocal microscopy. However, these studies provided non-uniform results. Eight different studies found either increased (Hollingsworth et al. 2005), decreased (Uçakhan et al. 2006; Mocan et al. 2008; Niederer et al. 2008) or normal (Weed et al. 2007; Yeniad et al. 2010; Timucin et al. 2013; El-Agha et al. 2014) endothelial cell densities (ECDs) in keratoconus patients. The sample sizes of these

studies ranged between 29 and 68 cases.

The purpose of this study was to assess whether the severity of keratoconus and/or the use of contact lenses affect corneal endothelium in a large study population of 712 eyes from the HKC.

Patients and Methods

This retrospective cross-sectional study was conducted at the Department of Ophthalmology, Saarland University Medical Center in Homburg/Saar, Germany. The study was approved by the local ethics committee (Ethik-Kommission der Ärztekammer des Saarlandes, Nr. 157/10) and followed the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki. Informed written consent was obtained from all patients.

Patients

Seven hundred and twelve eyes from the database of our HKC were included in this study. The aims of the HKC include research in diagnostics, longitudinal course of keratoconus, therapy options and influencing factors, such as the effect of thyroid gland function on keratoconus (Gatzioufas & Thanos 2008; Gatzioufas et al. 2014; Thanos et al. 2016) and have been described in detail previously (Goebels et al. 2013, 2015). In the HKC, patients from the outpatient service with unilateral or bilateral keratoconus were included, as well as patients with possible corneal abnormality and patients without noticeable ocular abnormality but with thyroid diseases. Therefore, patients from the outpatient service of the Department of Endocrinology, Internal Medicine II, Saarland University Medical Center, were also recruited. Exclusion criteria were previous ocular surgery or history of hydrops. All patients underwent a complete ophthalmological examination, including visual acuity (VA) test, refraction and slit-lamp biomicroscopy. Medical history as well as history of CL wear was documented with respect to CL, and the CL type (rigid or soft contact lens) as well as the time-point starting with CL was noted.

Up to now, the database of HKC includes records of more than 800 patients. Incomplete records were excluded. If multiple records were available for one patient, we consequently considered the last examination.

Specular microscopy

Measurements of the corneal ECD were taken using the EM-3000 specular microscope (Tomey Corporation, Nagoya, Japan). With this non-contact photographic technique, the corneal endothelium could be imaged with an optical magnification of 190 (Luft et al. 2015). Light is projected onto the cornea and the instrument captures the image which is reflected from the optical interface between the corneal endothelium and the aqueous humour. A sequence of 15 images is automatically captured during each measurement and up to 300 cells per image are counted within the region of interest by an automated image processing algorithm, implemented in the device (Luft et al. 2015). The image with the highest quality in terms of contrast and illumination is automatically selected by the instrument and subsequently verified manually by the examiner. We used the automated cell detection and counting implemented in the built-in manufacturer's software. Data collected from specular microscopy included cell size (minimum, maximum, average and standard deviation (SD), CV), ECD and corneal thickness (CT).

Scheimpflug tomography

Scheimpflug-based corneal tomography was performed using Pentacam® HR (Oculus Optikgeräte GmbH, Wetzlar, Germany). For classification of keratoconus stages, we used the TKC from Pentacam® HR, which is analogous to the Amsler–Krumeich classification.

In the Oculus Pentacam®, a rotating camera captures the diffuse volume scattering of a monochromatic slit light source projected onto the cornea and the anterior eye segment. The software provides a series of keratoconus-specific indices derived from topographic data. We selected the categorical TKC for keratoconus classification into grade 0 (normal) to grade 4 (severe). For intermediate stages provided by the Pentacam software (e.g. 2.5), we rounded the value up. In addition, we recorded metric parameters, such as the Keratoconus Index (KI) and Index of Surface Variance (ISV).

The data were collected between November 2010 and January 2015. Endothelial and topographic/tomographic measurements were taken by five trained nurses who are working as medical staff in our department. The ophthalmological examinations, medical history and informed consent of the patients to participate in the study were performed by certified ophthalmologists in our outpatient service.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS software (SPSS version 19.0, IBM, New York). Descriptive evaluation of the data was performed using mean, standard deviation (SD), median and minimum/maximum values. Correlations were tested using Pearson's rank correlation coefficient. p-values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant. A nonparametric test was performed using the Mann–Whitney U-test.

Logistic regression analysis was used to investigate the effect of keratoconus (TKC stage) and contact lenses on the corneal endothelium.

Results

The mean age of the 712 patients was 38 ± 15 (range 11–81) years. 66.7% eyes belonged to male patients; 48.7% were left eyes. Mean uncorrected visual acuity (UCVA) was 0.39 ± 0.34, and mean best-corrected visual acuity (BSCVA) was 0.72 ± 0.29.

According to TKC, 169 eyes (23.7%) were classified as normal and 543 (76.3%) as keratoconus or keratoconus suspect. Of these, 94 (13.2%) were classified as stage 1, 206 (28.9%) as stage 2, 166 (23.3%) as stage 3 and 77 (10.8%) as stage 4.

In Table 1, the descriptive data are shown for ECD, CV, mean, SD, minimum and maximum cell area, corneal thickness, as well as the selected Pentacam® parameters KI, ISV and TKC (stages 0–4).

Data relating to CL wear were available in approximate 65% (461 of 712) cases. Three groups of patients were specified wearing either no ($n = 207$), rigid ($n = 187$) or soft ($n = 41$) contact lenses. Thirteen patients reported wearing both soft and hard contact lenses –

Table 1. Mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum of age, specular microscopy data and tomographic relevant data separated for the different keratoconus stages (0 = healthy to 4 = severe keratoconus).

	TKC 0 $n = 169$	TKC 1 $n = 94$	TKC 2 $n = 206$	TKC 3 $n = 166$	TKC 4 $n = 77$
Age	42 ± 18	40 ± 14	35 ± 13	37 ± 13	34 ± 12
	11–81	11–76	11–81	11–78	15–54
EM-3000					
Minimum in μm^2	123 ± 25	126 ± 35	126 ± 25	128 ± 31	139 ± 39
(cell size)	73–223	35–348	71–215	41–253	85–336
Maximum in μm^2	1029 ± 340	1010 ± 971	1081 ± 387	1154 ± 534	1200 ± 478
(cell size)	588–2836	614–2144	602–2953	552–4967	589–2701
Mean in μm^2	391 ± 65	386 ± 47	399 ± 70	411 ± 80	437 ± 120
(cell size)	293–691	316–545	299–965	248–879	286–991
SD in μm^2	164 ± 78	156 ± 50	170 ± 79	199 ± 124	223 ± 125
(cell size)	89–818	88–426	78–717	98–1289	105–614
Cell density per	**2611 ± 356**	**2624 ± 300**	**2557 ± 327**	**2487 ± 379**	**2401 ± 464**
mm²	**1448–3413**	**1834–3165**	**1036–3347**	**1138–3406**	**1009–3503**
Coefficient of	**40.9 ± 11.2**	**40.0 ± 9.7**	**41.6 ± 11.8**	**46.2 ± 17.1**	**49.0 ± 17.0**
variation [%]	**27–119**	**24–85**	**23–94**	**27–179**	**30–111**
Corneal thickness [μm]	526.6 ± 35.3	511.22 ± 44.06	479.4 ± 43.4	460.2 ± 45.0	447.1 ± 46.3
	449–638	329–609	317–602	349–574	349–568
Pentacam					
Central corneal thickness [μm]	544 ± 34	523 ± 48	495 ± 37	471 ± 44	448 ± 59
	471–686	266–613	375–583	225–591	241–512
Minimum thickness [μm]	538 ± 35	507 ± 60	480 ± 36	452 ± 46	425 ± 56
	449–665	191–609	371–574	187–579	227–544
ISV	18.4 ± 7.2	42.2 ± 28.7	65.76 ± 2.1	104.94 ± 17.1	152.45 ± 28.4
	7–44	17–226	46–134	33–190	54–269
KI	1.0 ± 0.02	1.1 ± 0.09	1.2 ± 0.05	1.3 ± 0.08	1.4 ± 0.14
	0.9–1.1	0.95–1.7	1.0–1.37	0.9–1.5	1.0–2.1

TKC, topographic keratoconus classification; ISV, index of surface variance; KI, keratoconus index. The data for cell density and coefficient of variation are shown in bold.

they were excluded from the subsequent calculations.

In 207 eyes, the use of no contact lenses was documented (NoCL). Rigid contact lenses (RCL) were found in 200 eyes and were distributed as follows, according to TKC stage 0/1/2/3/4: 23/19/68/65/25. The wear of SCL was found in 54 eyes; according to TKC stage 0/1/2/3/4, the distribution was 17/9/19/6/3. In Table 2, the descriptive data for ECD, CV, mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum of cell area, CT, as well as the selected Pentacam® parameters KI, ISV and TKC are shown for the three CL groups separately.

In 189 patients (27%), information was available about the total interval of CL use. The mean duration of soft CL use was 176 ± 128 (12–375) months; the mean duration of RGP CL use was 113 ± 129 (1–620) months.

Evaluation of all eyes

Endothelial cell size, SD and CV increased with increasing keratoconus

Table 2. Mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum of age, specular microscopy data and tomographic relevant data separated according to the wearing of no/rigid/soft contact lenses.

	No CL (NoCL) $n = 207$	Soft CL (SCL) $n = 41$	Rigid CL (RCL) $n = 187$
EM-3000			
Minimum in μm^2	128.9 ± 30.3	119.8 ± 31.1	128.9 ± 32.2
(cell size)	41–336	35–209	64–285
Maximum in μm^2	1068 ± 384	1035.0 ± 288.9	1148.5 ± 517.5
(cell size)	552–2930	707–2237	602–4967
Mean in μm^2	405.5 ± 70.6	385.9 ± 58.3	410.0 ± 101.1
(cell size)	248–762	293–554	294–991
SD in μm^2	175.2 ± 88.6	144.7 ± 276.5	194.2 ± 131.7
(cell size)	88–717	88–214	78–1298
Cell density per mm²	2523 ± 361	2644 ± 368	2533 ± 418
	1313–3298	1805–3413	1009–3406
Coefficient of variation [%]	41.8 ± 12.4	43.12 ± 9.8	45.1 ± 17.2
	24–94	31–77	26–179
Corneal thickness [μm]	493.7 ± 44.8	498.7 ± 50.1	472.7 ± 49.9
	382–608	389–602	333–638
Pentacam			
ISV	64.4 ± 45.5	54.5 ± 35.6	84.9 ± 41.6
	7–296	13–145	11–226
TKC	1.5 ± 1.2	1.2 ± 1.0	2.1 ± 1.0
	0–4	0–4	0–4
KI	1.2 ± 0.2	1.1 ± 0.1	1.2 ± 0.1
	1.0–1.7	1.0–1.5	0.9–1.7

CL, contact lens; TKC: topographic keratoconus classification; ISV, index of surface variance; KI, keratoconus index.

Fig. 1. Endothelial cell density related to Topographic Keratoconus Classification (TKC, 0 healthy to 4 severe keratoconus). Cell density decreases with increasing severity of keratoconus ($n = 712$).


Fig. 2. Coefficient of variation (CV) related to Topographic Keratoconus Classification (TKC, 0 healthy to 4 severe keratoconus). The coefficient of variation increases with increasing severity of keratoconus ($n = 712$). Extreme values are marked as (*).

stage. Cell density (CD) and CT decrease with increasing keratoconus stage (Table 1, Fig. 1–2).

A significant correlation was found between keratoconus stage and all endothelial parameters. The keratoconus-related indices TKC, ISV and KI correlated with minimum, maximum and mean cell size, standard deviation of cell size, CD, CV and CT (all $p < 0.01$).

Evaluation of eyes regarding contact lens type

The correlations between the endothelial parameters and keratoconus indices separated into the three groups regarding CL wear (i.e. wearing (1) RGP or (2) soft contact lenses or (3) patients without contact lenses) are presented in Table 3.

In patients without contact lenses, a significant correlation was found between all endothelial parameters and the tested keratoconus indices ($p < 0.05$). Also here endothelial cell size, SD and CV increase with keratoconus stage, and ECD and CT decrease with increasing keratoconus stage.

In patients with rigid contact lenses, CV does not change significantly with increasing severity of keratoconus ($p = 0.094$). Also no significant correlation was found between TKC/KI and maximum cell size ($p = 0.24$/ $p = 0.104$). Endothelial cell density (ECD) and CT do decrease with increasing keratoconus stage. In the SCL group, only CT and minimum cell

size show a significant correlation with keratoconus parameters of the Pentacam ($p < 0.05$).

Comparing these three groups among each other, the following results could be shown: regarding ECD, there was no significant difference between patients without contact lenses and patients wearing rigid or soft lenses.

The CV was significantly higher in patients with rigid contact lenses ($45.1 \pm 17.2\%$) compared to patients without contact lenses ($41.8 \pm 12.4\%$) ($p = 0.022$), but not compared to patients with soft contact lenses.

Discussion

Specular and confocal microscopic studies with small numbers of eyes show inconsistent results concerning the effect of keratoconus on corneal ECD (Hollingsworth et al. 2005; Uçakhan et al. 2006; Weed et al. 2007; Mocan et al. 2008; Niederer et al. 2008; Timucin et al. 2013; El-Agha et al. 2014). The literature results vary from lower to higher ECD in keratoconus. To our knowledge, this is the first study which investigates the effect of keratoconus severity on the corneal endothelium in a large study population of 712 eyes.

In the present study, we found a significant decrease in ECD with progression of keratoconus. In addition, we found a significant increase in CV of endothelial cell size with progression of the disease. The sizes of the smallest and largest cells both increased significantly. These results are comparable to the results from Ucakhan, Niederer and Mocan (Uçakhan et al. 2006; Mocan et al. 2008; Niederer et al. 2008).

The most recent study from El-Agha et al. reporting specular microscopy data of 40 keratoconic eyes showed a tendency to lower ECD and higher CV with advanced stages of keratoconus, but without statistically significant correlation (El-Agha et al. 2014). Using specular microscopy, Matsuda found an increase in the extent of polymegathism and increase in various cell shapes (Goebels et al. 2013) and pleomorphism in a study population of 21 keratoconic eyes.

Confocal microscopy in keratoconus shows controversial findings for endothelial changes (El-Agha et al. 2014). In one of the earlier

Table 3. Correlations between cell size, cell density, coefficient of variation, number of cells and central pachymetry and the keratoconus-specific indices in all eyes separated into three groups.

	NO CL (NoCL) (n = 207)			Soft CL (SCL) (n = 41)			Rigid CL (RCL) (n = 187)		
	TKC	ISV	KI	TKC	ISV	KI	TKC	ISV	KI
Cell size [μm^2]									
Minimum	**p = 0.05**	**p = 0.001**	**p = 0.02**	p = 0.098	**p = 0.044**	**p = 0.007**	**p = 0.015**	**p = 0.001**	**p = 0.03**
Maximum	**p = 0.01**	**p = 0.001**	**p = 0.04**	p = 0.842	p = 0.694	p = 0.773	p = 0.24	**p = 0.049**	p = 0.104
Mean	**p ≤ 0.01**	**p ≤ 0.001**	**p ≤ 0.001**	p = 0.688	p = 0.598	p = 0.391	**p = 0.007**	**p < 0.001**	**p = 0.001**
Standard deviation	**p ≤ 0.01**	**p ≤ 0.001**	**p ≤ 0.001**	p = 0.878	p = 0.619	p = 0.819	**p < 0.047**	**p = 0.05**	**p < 0.001**
Cell density per mm²	**p ≤ 0.01**	**p ≤ 0.001**	**p ≤ 0.001**	p = 0.496	p = 0.46	p = 0.378	**p = 0.004**	**p < 0.001**	**p < 0.001**
Coefficient of variation [%]	**p = 0.05**	**p ≤ 0.001**	**p = 0.001**	p = 0.760	p = 0.336	p = 0.851	p = 0.094	**p = 0.022**	p = 0.038
Central pachymetry [μm]	**p = 0.01**	**p ≤ 0.001**	**p ≤ 0.001**	**p = 0.11**	**p = 0.012**	**p = 0.003**	**p ≤ 0.001**	**p < 0.001**	**p < 0.001**

CL, contact lens; TKC, topographic keratoconus classification; ISV, index of surface variance; KI, keratoconus index. Parameters marked in bold are the parameters with significant correlations.

studies, Hollingsworth et al. investigated 29 keratoconic corneas using confocal microscopy and found a 6% increase in ECD compared to normal control corneas (Hollingsworth et al. 2005). In contrast, two studies published in 2008 by Niederer et al. with a sample size with 52/52 eyes and Mocan et al. with 68 eyes found even lower ECD in keratoconic eyes compared to normal eyes (Mocan et al. 2008; Niederer et al. 2008). Three studies report an unaffected ECD: Ucakhan et al. found a lower ECD without statistical significance in a series of 48 keratoconic and 44 normal eyes (Uçakhan et al. 2006). Weed et al. compared 19 keratoconic eyes with 38 normal eyes including 15 CL wearers and found normal ECD in moderate and severe keratoconus (Weed et al. 2007), and Timucin et al. described normal ECD in 65 keratoconus patients without contact lenses compared to 40 controls (Timucin et al. 2013).

From these, the studies of El Agha et al., Niederer et al. and Timucin et al. explicitly included keratoconus patients without CL affection (Niederer et al. 2008; Timucin et al. 2013; El-Agha et al. 2014).

Four of these studies correlated ECD with staging of keratoconus. El-Agha et al. concluded that up to stage 3 keratoconus does not significantly affect the endothelium. Niederer et al. and Timucin et al. found no significant differences between mild to moderate and severe keratoconus (Niederer et al. 2008; Timucin et al. 2013). Only Ucakhan et al. found lower ECD in severe keratoconus (Uçakhan et al. 2006).

A decrease in ECD is amongst others reported to be related to CL wear (Bruce & Brennan 1990; Liesegang 2002). Stromal hypoxia, hypercapnia and thinning are well known to be associated with CL with low oxygen permeability, which should explain the relationship between CL and changes in corneal endothelium (Liesegang 2002; Timucin et al. 2013). Additional factors such as CL-induced mechanical trauma may contribute to endothelial alteration (McMonnies 2014).

Our data show that in patients with keratoconus, CV is significantly higher with RCL, whereas ECD does not differ significantly. With SCL, the ECD is higher compared to eyes either with or without RCL, but this difference is not significant. Coefficient of variation (CV) does not differ significantly between our group with SCL and both other groups.

Other studies have demonstrated endothelial changes in patients using contact lenses in the 1980s (Lee et al. 2001): for example, Matsuda compared the data of 14 keratoconic eyes with rigid contact lenses with keratoconic eyes without CL, and examination of the endothelium of the CL wearers showed a significantly higher CV accompanied with a significant decrease in ECD in CL wearers (Matsuda et al. 1989). In a recent study by Lee et al., a significant decrease in ECD and a significant increase in the CV between healthy eyes and eyes using soft contact lenses were found (Lee et al. 2001).

In this study, we have shown in a large number of patients that all endothelial parameters significantly correlate with the keratoconus stage in patients in which the cornea was unaffected by a CL and in the entire group of eyes.

The present study shows solid data concerning keratoconus patients, which are not affected by contact lenses.

Further studies are necessary with respect to detailed information about the specific impact of CL use such as special lens type, wearing time duration per day and the starting point of CL wearing.

In conclusion, we found significant changes in the corneal endothelium in a large keratoconus population of 712 eyes using specular microscopy. As ECD and CT decrease, the CV in cell area, the minimum and maximum size of cells increase with the progression of keratoconus. In patients with rigid contact lenses compared to eyes without CL wear, there is a statistically significant difference in the CV but ECD decreases in both groups significantly with increasing severity of keratoconus.

References

Bruce AS & Brennan NA (1990): Corneal pathophysiology with contact lens wear. Surv Ophthalmol **35**: 25–58.

Bühren J, Bischoff G & Kohnen T (2011): Keratoconus: clinical aspects, diagnosis, therapeutic possibilities. Klin Monbl Augenheilkd **228**: 923–940.

El-Agha MS, El Sayed YM, Harhara RM & Essam HM (2014): Correlation of corneal endothelial changes with different stages of keratoconus. Cornea **33**: 707–711.

Gatzioufas Z & Thanos S (2008): Acute keratoconus induced by hypothyroxinemia

during pregnancy. J Endocrinol Invest **31**: 262–266.

Gatzioufas Z, Panos GD, Brugnolli E & Hafezi F (2014): Corneal topographical and biomechanical variations associated with hypothyroidism. J Refract Surg **30**: 78–79.

Goebels S, Seitz B & Langenbucher A (2013): (Diagnostics and stage-oriented therapy of keratoconus: introduction to the Homburg Keratoconus Center (HKC)). Ophthalmologe **110**: 808–809.

Goebels S, Eppig T, Wagenpfeil S, Cayless A, Seitz B & Langenbucher A (2015): Staging of keratoconus indices regarding tomography, topography, and biomechanical measurements. Am J Ophthalmol **159**: 733–738.

Hollingsworth JG, Efron N & Tullo AB (2005): *In vivo* corneal confocal microscopy in keratoconus. Ophthalmic Physiol Opt **25**: 254–260.

Kymes SM, Walline JJ, Zadnik K, Sterling J, Gordon MO & Collaborative Longitudinal Evaluation of Keratoconus Study Group (2008): Changes in the quality-of-life of people with keratoconus. Am J Ophthalmol **145**: 611–617.

Lee JS, Park WS, Lee SH, Oum BS & Cho BM (2001): A comparative study of corneal endothelial changes induced by different durations of soft contact lens wear. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol **239**: 1–4.

Liesegang TJ (2002): Physiologic changes of the cornea with contact lens wear. CLAO J **28**: 12–27.

Luft N, Hirnschall N, Schuschitz S, Draschl P & Findl O (2015): Comparison of 4 specular microscopes in healthy eyes and eyes with cornea guttata or corneal grafts. Cornea **34**: 381–386.

Matsuda M, MacRae SM, Inaba M & Manabe R (1989): The effect of hard contact lens wear on the keratoconic corneal endothelium after penetrating keratoplasty. Am J Ophthalmol **107**: 246–251.

McMonnies CW (2014): Corneal endothelial assessments with special references to keratoconus. Optom Vis Sci **91**: 124–134.

Mocan MC, Yilmaz PT, Irkec M & Orhan M (2008): *In vivo* confocal microscopy for the evaluation of corneal microstructure in keratoconus. Curr Eye Res **33**: 933–939.

Niederer RL, Perumal D, Sherwin T & McGhee CN (2008): Laser scanning *in vivo* confocal microscopy reveals reduced innervation and reduction in cell density in all layers of the keratoconic cornea. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci **49**: 2964–2970.

Nielsen K, Hjortdal J, Pihlmann M & Corydon TJ (2013): Update on the keratoconus genetics. Acta Ophthalmol **91**: 106–113.

Rabinowitz YS (1998): Keratoconus. Surv Ophthalmol **42**: 297–319.

Sturbaum CW & Peiffer RL Jr (1993): Pathology of corneal endothelium in keratoconus. Ophthalmologica **206**: 192–208.

Thanos S, Oellers P, Meyer zu Hörste M, Prokosch V, Schlatt S, Seitz B & Gatzioufas Z. (2016): Role of thyroxine in the development of keratoconus. Cornea **10**: 1338–1346.

Timucin OB, Karadag MF, Cinal A, Asker M, Asker S & Timucin D (2013): Assessment of corneal endothelial cell density in patients with keratoconus not using contact lenses. Cont Lens Anterior Eye **36**: 80–85.

Uçakhan OO, Kanpolat A, Ylmaz N & Ozkan M (2006): *In vivo* confocal microscopy findings in keratoconus. Eye Contact Lens **32**: 183–191.

Wagner H, Barr JT & Zadnik K (2007): Collaborative Longitudinal Evaluation of Keratoconus (CLEK) Study: methods and findings to date. Cont Lens Anterior Eye. **30**: 223–232.

Weed KH, MacEwen CJ, Cox A & McGhee CN (2007): Quantitative analysis of corneal microstructure in keratoconus utilising *in vivo* confocal microscopy. Eye **21**: 614–623.

Yeniad B, Yilmaz S & Bilgin LK (2010): Evaluation of the microstructure of cornea by *in vivo* confocal microscopy in contact lens wearing and non-contact lens wearing keratoconus patients. Cont Lens Anterior Eye **33**: 167–170.

Correspondence:
Susanne Goebels, MD
Department of Ophthalmology
Saarland University Medical Center
Kirrberger Str. 100
Bldg. 22, 66424
Homburg/Saar
Germany
Tel: +49 6841 1621240
Fax: +49 6841 1622440
Email: susanne.goebels@uks.eu