Corneal Biomechanical Changes and Tissue Remodeling After SMILE and LASIK
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Purpose. To evaluate transient corneal tissue healing and biomechanical changes between laser in situ keratomileusis (LASIK) and small incision lenticule extraction (SMILE) eyes.

Methods. In each patient, one eye underwent LASIK and the other underwent SMILE. Optical coherence tomography (OCT) and dynamic Scheimpflug imaging (Corvis-ST) was used to assess tissue healing and biomechanics, respectively. Analyses of OCT scans yielded corneal speckle distribution (CSD) and Bowmann’s roughness index (BRI). Waveform analyses of deformation amplitude yielded corneal stiffness. Further, corneal force versus corneal deformation data helped compare the two procedures.

Results. BRI increased and then decreased transiently after both treatments (P < 0.05). However, SMILE eyes had BRI similar to that of their preoperative state compared to LASIK eyes at 6-month follow-up. CSD indicated a marked increase in the number of bright pixels and a decrease in the number of dark pixels after SMILE (1-month follow-up) and LASIK eyes (3-month follow-up), respectively. CSD returned to near preoperative state thereafter, respectively. Corneal stiffness change from preoperative state was similar between LASIK and SMILE eyes. However, deformation at discrete values of corneal force indicated some recovery of biomechanical strength after SMILE, but not in LASIK eyes.

Conclusions. BRI and CSD indicated earlier tissue healing in SMILE eyes than in LASIK. CSD results may indicate delayed cell death in LASIK eyes and increased light scatter due to interface fluid in SMILE eyes. Corneal biomechanical strength remodeled better in SMILE. This may indicate some hydration-related recovery.
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quantifications were performed before and after refractive surgery, where one eye of the patient underwent LASIK and the other eye underwent SMILE. Thus, the study design was contralateral.

**METHODS**

The research study was longitudinal and prospective. The ethics committee of Narayana Nethralaya Multi-Specialty Eye Hospital, Bangalore, India, approved the study. The study followed the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants provided written informed consent. The study included a total of 31 patients. One eye underwent SMILE while the other underwent LASIK. A random number generator assigned either SMILE or LASIK to an eye. Inclusion criteria were stable refraction (less than –10 diopter [D] equivalent refraction with astigmatism not more than –5 D) for a period of 1 year (change less than 0.25 D). Patients with less than 480-μm central corneal thickness (CCT) or history of keratoconus, diabetes, collagen vascular disease, pregnancy, breastfeeding, and any prior corneal surgery or trauma were excluded from the study. In all the eyes, calculated residual stromal thickness was greater than 250 μm. All patients underwent refractive error assessment (sphere, cylinder, and axis). Corvis-ST measurement, and high-resolution OCT imaging (Envisu; Leica Microsystems, Buffalo Grove, IL, USA). If the patients were contact lens users, then contact lens use was discontinued for at least 2 weeks before measurements. Corvis-ST measurements were performed preoperatively and at 1-, 3-, and 6-month follow-up. This was avoided at 1 week to avoid any patient discomfort. OCT imaging was performed preoperatively and 1 week, 1 month, and once between the 3- and 6-month follow-up periods. In our earlier study, OCT imaging had revealed near normalization of BRI by the 3-month follow-up in SMILE patients. Therefore, OCT imaging was repeated only once between the 3- and 6-month follow-up periods to avoid unnecessary imaging.

**Surgical Procedure**

A single experienced surgeon performed all the surgeries under topical anesthesia using 0.5% proparacaine hydrochloride (Paracain; Sunways Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai, India) four times a day for 3 months.

**Corneal Biomechanical Analyses**

An analytical biomechanical model analyzed the deformation amplitude waveform from Corvis-ST. The analyses yielded the corneal stiffness. The model reported two measures of stiffness: a linear corneal stiffness [Kc (constant), unit N/m] and a mean corneal stiffness [Kc (mean), unit N/m]. In classical biomechanics, analyses of the ex vivo stress versus strain curves provided the tissue biomechanical properties. Therefore, we analyzed the air-pressure force absorbed by the cornea, named the corneal force, and the corneal deformation response for the two cohorts (LASIK and SMILE). Using the mean corneal force versus corneal deformation data, the mean corneal deformation at a mean corneal force of 0.10, 0.15, 0.20, and 0.25 N was calculated at each time point. These were compared between the treatment cohorts.

**OCT Image Analyses**

Analyses of the OCT images yielded BRI and speckle distribution. BRI was a measure of roughness of the Bowman’s layer. Postoperatively, this roughness was expected to be higher in the acute healing phase after surgery. To analyze the speckle distribution, only the raw OCT images were used. The scan size was limited to 3 mm in the high-resolution mode. The procedure to acquire the OCT images was discussed previously. The Biopitgen InVivo Vue 2.2.22 reader software (Biopitgen, Inc., Morrisville, NC, USA) exported the raw images for further analyses. The aspect ratio of the exported images was maintained for the analyses. Preoperatively, the cornea had a healthy tear film. However, postoperative dryness, along the anterior surface, caused additional scattering in the total image. Therefore, the analyses of the speckle distribution were performed using two methods.

In the first method, a pdf, without any noise correction, mapped the speckle distribution. Figure 1a shows a grayscale representation of the uncorrected image. The image region within the anterior and posterior corneal edge was selected (Fig. 1b). The regions above (air) and below (aqueous humor) the cornea are shown in Figure 1c with pseudocoloring. The pdfs mapped the speckle distribution of air, cornea, and aqueous humor (Figs. 1d–f, respectively). Here, the pdf calculated for the uncorrected corneal image was the first method. This method was applied to both pre- and postoperative time points. In the second method, a corrected corneal image resulted from subtraction of the speckle distribution of the air and aqueous humor from the “whole image” speckle distribution (Figs. 1g, 1h in grayscale and pseudocoloring, respectively). The same pdf mapped the speckle distribution of corrected corneal image (Fig. 1i). From Figures 1g and 1h, it was evident that the air and aqueous humor had negligible speckle after correction. The second method was also applied to both pre- and postoperative states. Thus, at any given time point, two pdfs for the cornea were calculated, one for the uncorrected and the other for the corrected OCT image.
The generalized extreme value (GEV) pdf (Equation 1) captured the tails (i.e., speckle distribution at or near the highest intensity of 255) of different shapes accurately. Pixel intensity ranged from 0 to 255 in the OCT images. Therefore, it was necessary to model both extremes of intensity with a suitable mathematic function. The GEV was a three-parameter function:

\[
\begin{align*}
    f(x) &= \begin{cases} 
        \frac{1}{\sigma} \left( 1 + \frac{(x-\mu)}{\sigma} \right)^{-1-\frac{1}{k}} e^{-\left(1+\frac{(x-\mu)}{\sigma} \right)^{-1/k}} & \text{for } k \neq 0 \\
        \frac{1}{\sigma} e^{-\left( \frac{x-\mu}{\sigma} \right)^2} & \text{for } k = 0
    \end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

Here, these parameters represent location, scale, and shape, respectively. The value of \( k \) described the shape of the distribution; for example, \( k = 0 \) represented the Gumbel distribution, \( k > 0 \) represented the Frechet distribution, and \( k < 0 \) represented the Weibull distribution. The tail of the pdf described the number of the pixels with higher intensity. The Gumbel distribution, also known as GEV type 1 distribution, described an exponentially decreasing tail better, similar to a normal distribution. The Weibull distribution (type 3) described a tail of finite length. The Frechet distribution (type 2) was suited for distributions with very small tails. Scale parameter (\( \sigma \)) influenced the maximum height of the pdf. When \( \sigma \) decreased, the number of high-intensity pixels decreased and low-intensity pixels increased. Location parameter (\( \mu \)) influenced the location of the peak of the pdf along the x-axis of the distribution. If \( \mu \) increased, the peak moved toward the highest intensity (pixel value of 255), and the converse held as well.

The GEV distribution parameters (\( \sigma, k, \mu \)) were computed using maximum likelihood estimation. For each eye, three scans were acquired at each time point to assess repeatability of BRI, \( \sigma, k, \) and \( \mu \). To analyze the difference between the cohorts of LASIK and SMILE eyes, the means of the GEV distribution parameters (\( \sigma, k, \) and \( \mu \)) were used. These mean values yielded the mean speckle distributions for the LASIK and SMILE cohort at different time points.

The normality of the data was confirmed with Shapiro-Wilk test. Repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to study the change after the surgery in the LASIK and SMILE cohorts. Repeatability of the data was analyzed with intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC). The mean ± standard error of the parameters was calculated. A \( P \) value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant. All statistical calcula-
Table 1. Optical Coherence Tomography (OCT) Speckle Parameters From Uncorrected and Corrected Corneal Images

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preoperative</th>
<th>1 wk</th>
<th>1 mo</th>
<th>3 mo and Beyond</th>
<th>Preoperative</th>
<th>1 wk</th>
<th>1 mo</th>
<th>3 mo and Beyond</th>
<th>LASIK</th>
<th>SMILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corneal probability density function parameters from uncorrected image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k)</td>
<td>0.41 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.37 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.44 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.44 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.37 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.37 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.37 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma)</td>
<td>8.72 ± 0.54</td>
<td>8.36 ± 0.47</td>
<td>10.05 ± 0.65</td>
<td>9.68 ± 0.64</td>
<td>8.36 ± 0.47</td>
<td>8.36 ± 0.47</td>
<td>10.05 ± 0.65</td>
<td>9.68 ± 0.64</td>
<td>9.68 ± 0.64</td>
<td>8.36 ± 0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mu)</td>
<td>4.57 ± 1.02</td>
<td>44.82 ± 1.29</td>
<td>48.31 ± 1.50</td>
<td>46.13 ± 1.44</td>
<td>44.82 ± 1.29</td>
<td>44.82 ± 1.29</td>
<td>48.31 ± 1.50</td>
<td>46.13 ± 1.44</td>
<td>46.13 ± 1.44</td>
<td>44.82 ± 1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preoperative</th>
<th>1 wk</th>
<th>1 mo</th>
<th>3 mo and Beyond</th>
<th>Preoperative</th>
<th>1 wk</th>
<th>1 mo</th>
<th>3 mo and Beyond</th>
<th>LASIK</th>
<th>SMILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corneal probability density function parameters from corrected image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k)</td>
<td>0.41 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.37 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.44 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.37 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.37 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.37 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma)</td>
<td>8.72 ± 0.54</td>
<td>8.36 ± 0.47</td>
<td>10.05 ± 0.65</td>
<td>9.68 ± 0.64</td>
<td>8.36 ± 0.47</td>
<td>8.36 ± 0.47</td>
<td>10.05 ± 0.65</td>
<td>9.68 ± 0.64</td>
<td>9.68 ± 0.64</td>
<td>8.36 ± 0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mu)</td>
<td>4.57 ± 1.02</td>
<td>44.82 ± 1.29</td>
<td>48.31 ± 1.50</td>
<td>46.13 ± 1.44</td>
<td>44.82 ± 1.29</td>
<td>44.82 ± 1.29</td>
<td>48.31 ± 1.50</td>
<td>46.13 ± 1.44</td>
<td>46.13 ± 1.44</td>
<td>44.82 ± 1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates statistically significant difference.
The SMILE eyes showed the same trends (Table 2; \( P = 0.47 \) and 0.12, respectively). In LASIK eyes, the trend was the same at higher corneal forces of 0.20 and 0.25 N. However in SMILE eyes, there was a significant decrease in change in corneal deformation from 1 month (approximately \(-0.1 \) mm) to 6 months (approximately \(-0.022 \) mm). This could indicate a better remodeling of the collagen matrix in SMILE eyes than in LASIK eyes (similar to BRI). These results were also evident upon careful visual examination of Figures 4a and 4b.

**DISCUSSION**

The cornea is a complex tissue, where a delicate balance between mechanical and fluid stresses determines its shape.
and function. This complexity impacts the transient wound healing and deformation response after LASIK and SMILE. We presented novel applications of OCT imaging biomarkers to assess tissue-level changes in the cornea. Based on BRI and corneal speckle distribution, both LASIK and SMILE caused structural changes. Figures 5a and 5b provide a schematic representation of the transient wound healing and biomechanical changes in SMILE and LASIK eyes, respectively. In SMILE eyes, postoperative corneal speckle changed up to 1 week and was nearly back to preoperative distribution by 1 month (Fig. 5a). In the case of BRI, the return to preoperative levels was achieved by the third month. However, corneal deformation continued to remodel up to the 6-month follow-up and possibly beyond (Fig. 5a). In LASIK eyes, corneal speckle normalized by the 3-month follow-up (Fig. 5b). However, BRI and corneal deformation possibly continued to remodel even

**Figure 3.** Corrected mean speckle probability distribution function (pdf) in LASIK (a) and SMILE (b) eyes. The magnified peak and tail section of LASIK (c, e, respectively) and SMILE (d, f, respectively) eyes are shown as well.
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after the 6-month follow-up. This is the first study to present these interesting features of in vivo corneal wound healing and biomechanics.

A recent study used corneal densitometry from Scheimpflug imaging to analyze transient healing of the cornea after photorefractive keratectomy (PRK), LASIK, and SMILE.12 The mean postoperative total corneal densitometry values were 15.53 ± 1.65, 16.53 ± 1.94, and 16.10 ± 1.54, respectively.26 Thus, the procedures caused similar densitometry changes.12 Scheimpflug imaging uses visible light for biomechanics. These interesting features of in vivo corneal wound healing and biomechanics.

Our analytical model revealed interesting results between myopic eyes from different populations.23–25 In this study, our analytical model revealed interesting results between myopic eyes from different populations.23–25 In this study, transient changes in BRI, corneal speckle, and corneal deformation in SMILE eyes indicated a strong interdependence between these corneal properties; for example, BRI and corneal deformation in SMILE eyes showed a clear trend toward some recovery of the biomechanical strength at follow-up (Fig. 4). Interestingly, at high forces, the collagen fibers bear some of the mechanical stress. This could be correlated to differences between SMILE and LASIK eyes with respect to transient changes in BRI.

Our analytical model revealed interesting results between myopic eyes from different populations.23–25 In this study, transient changes in BRI, corneal speckle, and corneal deformation in SMILE eyes indicated a strong interdependence between these corneal properties; for example, BRI and corneal speckle returned to preoperative levels by the third month and coupled with transient changes in corneal deformation in SMILE eyes. In LASIK, this was not observed. Thus, flap and excimer ablation in LASIK could have caused these observations. Eximer ablation may result in greater hydration changes. Transient decrease in number of high-intensity pixels could indicate greater (detectable by OCT) keratocyte death in the long term, similar to SMILE (Fig. 5). By design, SMILE was a less invasive procedure than LASIK. Therefore, it was logical to hypothesize a significant biomechanical advantage of SMILE over LASIK. Studies have reported mixed results on change in corneal biomechanical parameters after SMILE and LASIK.3–10 A contralateral eye study on SMILE versus LASIK reported similar changes in CH and CRF between the eyes.26 In this study as well, change in corneal stiffness was similar between the eyes. However, stiffness was an aggregate marker of the nonlinear stress versus strain response of the patient cornea.23–25 Therefore, discrete locations on the mean corneal force versus corneal deformation curves (Fig. 4) were analyzed. At low corneal forces where the deformation response of the cornea may be linear, the change in deformation was barely different between the LASIK and SMILE eyes (Fig. 4). However, at higher forces, the SMILE corneas showed a clear trend toward some recovery of the biomechanical strength at follow-up (Fig. 4). Interestingly, at high forces, the collagen fibers bear some of the mechanical stress. This could be correlated to differences between SMILE and LASIK eyes with respect to transient changes in BRI.
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Our analytical model revealed interesting results between myopic eyes from different populations.23–25 In this study, transient changes in BRI, corneal speckle, and corneal deformation in SMILE eyes indicated a strong interdependence between these corneal properties; for example, BRI and cornea speckle returned to preoperative levels by the third month and coupled with transient changes in corneal deformation in SMILE eyes. In LASIK, this was not observed. Thus, flap and excimer ablation in LASIK could have caused these observations. Eximer ablation may result in greater hydration changes. Transient decrease in number of high-intensity pixels could indicate greater (detectable by OCT) keratocyte death in

TABLE 2. Change (Preoperative Minus Postoperative) in Corneal Deformation Levels at Different Applied Corneal Force Computed Using the Analytical Biomechanical Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corneal Force</th>
<th>LASIK</th>
<th>SMILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 mo, mm</td>
<td>3 mo, mm</td>
<td>6 mo, mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10 N</td>
<td>−0.07 ± 0.01</td>
<td>−0.06 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15 N</td>
<td>−0.06 ± 0.01</td>
<td>−0.04 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20 N</td>
<td>−0.07 ± 0.02</td>
<td>−0.05 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25 N</td>
<td>−0.09 ± 0.02</td>
<td>−0.06 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates statistically significant difference.
the stroma of LASIK eyes. In contrast, transient increase in high-intensity pixels in the SMILE eyes could indicate the presence of some interface fluid in the acute phase after surgery. This could lead to increased light scatter from the stroma and maybe transient complications after SMILE in a few eyes. These transient complications may not be visible on slit lamp, but OCT speckle distribution may detect these changes. There is evidence in the literature to support the speckle distribution results. SMILE generally caused less keratocyte apoptosis, less proliferation, less inflammation, and faster regeneration of nerve density than LASIK and PRK. Interestingly, keratocyte apoptosis was observed both above and below the flap interface deep in the tissue after LASIK. However, the same was localized to the lenticular interfaces only after SMILE, and the surrounding tissue showed a minimal apoptotic effect in the early phase of wound healing. Thus, regional analyses of speckle distribution within the stroma could be useful in highlighting these changes since OCT is noninvasive compared to confocal microscopy. Further, speckle distribution analyses can be performed with any commercial OCT scanner since all have access to the raw (nonaveraged) OCT images. Therefore, speckle distribution may have a role in the clinic. To conclude, this study introduced a better understanding of the transient healing process after LASIK and SMILE using noninvasive imaging in patient eyes and showed a better recovery after SMILE than LASIK, biomechanically and biophysically. A longer follow-up and analyses with advanced methods, such as inverse

FIGURE 5. A schematic representation of transient changes in study parameters between SMILE and LASIK eyes.

FIGURE 6. A schematic representation of remodeling of collagen fibers in the flap/cap region of the stroma showing the increase in microdistortions in Bowman’s layer and crimping of collagen fibers.
finite element models, could reveal more interesting features of wound healing.22
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