



Journal of Optometry

www.elsevier.com/locate/joptom

Journal of Optometry	
July 2010 Volume 3, No. 3	
123	Editorial
124	125
126	127
128	129
130	131
132	133
134	135
136	137
138	139
140	141
142	143
144	145
146	147
148	149
150	151
152	153
154	155
156	157
158	159
160	161
162	163
164	165
166	167
168	169
170	171
172	173
174	175
176	177
178	179
180	181
182	183
184	185
186	187
188	189
190	191
192	193
194	195
196	197
198	199
200	201
202	203
204	205
206	207
208	209
210	211
212	213
214	215
216	217
218	219
220	221
222	223
224	225
226	227
228	229
230	231
232	233
234	235
236	237
238	239
240	241
242	243
244	245
246	247
248	249
250	251
252	253
254	255
256	257
258	259
260	261
262	263
264	265
266	267
268	269
270	271
272	273
274	275
276	277
278	279
280	281
282	283
284	285
286	287
288	289
290	291
292	293
294	295
296	297
298	299
300	301
302	303
304	305
306	307
308	309
310	311
312	313
314	315
316	317
318	319
320	321
322	323
324	325
326	327
328	329
330	331
332	333
334	335
336	337
338	339
340	341
342	343
344	345
346	347
348	349
350	351
352	353
354	355
356	357
358	359
360	361
362	363
364	365
366	367
368	369
370	371
372	373
374	375
376	377
378	379
380	381
382	383
384	385
386	387
388	389
390	391
392	393
394	395
396	397
398	399
400	401
402	403
404	405
406	407
408	409
410	411
412	413
414	415
416	417
418	419
420	421
422	423
424	425
426	427
428	429
430	431
432	433
434	435
436	437
438	439
440	441
442	443
444	445
446	447
448	449
450	451
452	453
454	455
456	457
458	459
460	461
462	463
464	465
466	467
468	469
470	471
472	473
474	475
476	477
478	479
480	481
482	483
484	485
486	487
488	489
490	491
492	493
494	495
496	497
498	499
500	501
502	503
504	505
506	507
508	509
510	511
512	513
514	515
516	517
518	519
520	521
522	523
524	525
526	527
528	529
530	531
532	533
534	535
536	537
538	539
540	541
542	543
544	545
546	547
548	549
550	551
552	553
554	555
556	557
558	559
560	561
562	563
564	565
566	567
568	569
570	571
572	573
574	575
576	577
578	579
580	581
582	583
584	585
586	587
588	589
590	591
592	593
594	595
596	597
598	599
600	601
602	603
604	605
606	607
608	609
610	611
612	613
614	615
616	617
618	619
620	621
622	623
624	625
626	627
628	629
630	631
632	633
634	635
636	637
638	639
640	641
642	643
644	645
646	647
648	649
650	651
652	653
654	655
656	657
658	659
660	661
662	663
664	665
666	667
668	669
670	671
672	673
674	675
676	677
678	679
680	681
682	683
684	685
686	687
688	689
690	691
692	693
694	695
696	697
698	699
700	701
702	703
704	705
706	707
708	709
710	711
712	713
714	715
716	717
718	719
720	721
722	723
724	725
726	727
728	729
730	731
732	733
734	735
736	737
738	739
740	741
742	743
744	745
746	747
748	749
750	751
752	753
754	755
756	757
758	759
760	761
762	763
764	765
766	767
768	769
770	771
772	773
774	775
776	777
778	779
780	781
782	783
784	785
786	787
788	789
790	791
792	793
794	795
796	797
798	799
800	801
802	803
804	805
806	807
808	809
810	811
812	813
814	815
816	817
818	819
820	821
822	823
824	825
826	827
828	829
830	831
832	833
834	835
836	837
838	839
840	841
842	843
844	845
846	847
848	849
850	851
852	853
854	855
856	857
858	859
860	861
862	863
864	865
866	867
868	869
870	871
872	873
874	875
876	877
878	879
880	881
882	883
884	885
886	887
888	889
890	891
892	893
894	895
896	897
898	899
900	901
902	903
904	905
906	907
908	909
910	911
912	913
914	915
916	917
918	919
920	921
922	923
924	925
926	927
928	929
930	931
932	933
934	935
936	937
938	939
940	941
942	943
944	945
946	947
948	949
950	951
952	953
954	955
956	957
958	959
960	961
962	963
964	965
966	967
968	969
970	971
972	973
974	975
976	977
978	979
980	981
982	983
984	985
986	987
988	989
990	991
992	993
994	995
996	997
998	999
1000	1001

EDITORIAL

Innovation in contact lenses: basic research and clinical science

Innovación en lentes de contacto: investigación básica y ciencia clínica

Eric Papas^{a,*}, James S. Wolffsohn^{b,**} and Lyndon Jones^{c,**}

^aBrien Holden Vision Institute, Vision CRC and School of Optometry and Vision Science, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

^bOphthalmic Research Group, Life and Health Sciences, Aston University, Birmingham, UK

^cCentre for Contact Lens Research, University of Waterloo, Toronto, Canada

Contact lenses are among the fastest progressing topics in optometry and the last decade has seen a number of significant developments occurring in the field. Among these has been the increasing dominance of soft lens materials in the market, albeit with substantial differences between countries. Optical designs have improved, allowing the optimisation of distance vision through the use of aspherics, enhanced range of clear focus with multifocals and more predictable toric designs for astigmatic correction. Silicone hydrogel technology has increased oxygen permeability to the eye, with improved corneal and ocular surface physiology being the result. Due, however, to their mechanical properties, deposition profiles and care system interactions, clinical problems have not been entirely absent, especially with non-compliant wearers. Efforts to eliminate end of day discomfort, a major cause of drop-out, have included incorporating viscous solutions into lens materials, as well as manipulating both multipurpose care solutions and agents within the blister-packaging in which lenses are delivered. Finally, rigid gas permeable (RGP) lenses have exhibited a resurgence, founded on the use of materials with increased oxygen permeability, the development of sclera and semi-scleral designs that can be fitted in a relatively systematic manner, and sophisticated reverse geometry strategies for reduction of refractive error.

As clinicians, we owe it to our patients to remain up-to-date with new developments and adapt our clinical practice based on evaluation of the peer-reviewed literature. In this way the benefits of the best evidence based approaches can be brought into the consulting room. This special issue brings together several such innovations in the contact lens field. Three basic research studies cover the optical design of a contact lens, microbiological testing of a new multipurpose solution and the effectiveness of antibacterial coatings for lens cases, while the performance and lipid deposition of silicone hydrogel lenses, fitting of hydrogel, silicone hydrogel and RGP contact lenses and the indications for use and efficacy of modern scleral lenses are addressed in clinical reports.

Xin Wei and Larry Thibos¹ propose the application of a technique termed "ocular wavefront tomography" to contact lens optics to correct off-axis wavefront aberrations, and demonstrate how this can be applied to complex optical designs. This has potential application not only for improving peripheral vision, but also in the diagnostic imaging of the retina and in the 'hot topic' of myopia retardation through manipulation of the peripheral optical field. An extensive study of a new soft contact lens multipurpose solution² shows it is safe and has broad spectrum activity when used in combination with 4 different silicone hydrogel lenses after 2-4 weeks of wear and the associated tear deposition.

*Topical Editor

**Guest Editor

Effectivity under 2x or 4x evaporation was also confirmed, unlike some of the other multipurpose solutions under test.

Another place in which contact lenses can rapidly become contaminated is in the lens case. Willcox et al.³ have assessed the ability of silver-impregnation to inhibit microbial growth in these circumstances and were able to show a dose-related reduction in growth of two bacterial species, as well as *Acanthamoeba*, on a hydrogel lens.

The Centre for Contact Lens Research in Waterloo, Canada, assess the visual and optical performance of silicone hydrogel lenses in patients with myopia ≥ -3.0 D in scotopic conditions.⁴ Despite differences in the aberrations of the eye/contact lens combinations, no differences in visual performance were evident. The authors acknowledge the need for the development of more precise vision measurements or new metrics related to visual performance, to further understand the clinical significance of optical lens design.

A study from Japan⁵ also examined several silicone hydrogel contact lenses, investigating deposition after 2 weeks of wear. While both lipids and cholesterol levels were similar between lens types, the quantity of deposited phospholipid, which may benefit wettability and hence increase comfort, did differ.

The final two papers examine lens fitting. The first, a hospital based investigation, describes the indications for fitting scleral lenses⁶ and the resulting visual outcomes. It shows an approximately 80% success rate across a wide range of corneal disorders, mainly involving irregular corneal surfaces, and provides an excellent alternative to corneal transplantation. Second and last, a paper from Spain retrospectively compares the number of visits and diagnostic lenses required to fit RGPs, hydrogel and silicone hydrogel

patients in non-pathological eyes.⁷ The authors conclude the number of visits and diagnostic lenses required were slightly higher with RGPs and suggest that the results could inform future clinical guidelines for fitting contact lenses.

Articles in this Special Issue of the *Journal of Optometry*, on recent innovations in contact lenses, will help to keep the reader abreast of the developments in this fast moving field and allow them to incorporate the benefits of these studies into the clinical care of their patients.

References

1. Wei X, Thibos L. Designing contact lenses for a wide field of view via ocular wavefront tomography. *J Optom.* 2010;3:124-132.
2. Kilvington S, Huang L, Kao E, Powel CH. Development of a new contact lens multipurpose solution: Comparative analysis of microbiological, biological and clinical performance. *J Optom.* 2010;3:133-141.
3. Willcox MDP, Hume EBH, Vijay AK, Petcavich R. Ability of silver-impregnated contact lenses to control microbial growth and colonization. *J Optom.* 2010;3:142-147.
4. Kier N, Simpson T, Fonn D. Visual and optical performance of silicone hydrogel contact lenses for moderate myopia. *J Optom.* 2010;3:149-157.
5. Hatou S, Fukui M, Yatsui K, Mochizuki H, Akune Y, Yamada M. Biochemical analyses of lipids deposited on silicone hydrogel lenses. *J Optom.* 2010;3:156-160.
6. Severinsky B, Millodot M. Current applications and efficacy of scleral contact lenses—a retrospective study. *J Optom.* 2010;3:150-155.
7. Martin R, Alonso E. Comparison of the number of visits and diagnostic lenses required to fit RGP, conventional hydrogel and silicone hydrogel contact lenses. *J Optom.* 2010;3:161-166.