



Essentials in Ophthalmology

Cornea and External Eye Disease

T. Reinhard F. Larkin

Editors

Essentials in Ophthalmology

G. K. Krieglstein R. N. Weinreb
Series Editors

Glaucoma

Cataract and Refractive Surgery

Uveitis and Immunological Disorders

Vitreo-retinal Surgery

Medical Retina

Oculoplastics and Orbit

Pediatric Ophthalmology, Neuro-Ophthalmology, Genetics

Cornea and External Eye Disease

Editors Thomas Reinhard
Frank Larkin

Cornea and External Eye Disease

Corneal Allotransplantation,
Allergic Disease and Trachoma

 Springer

Series Editors

Günter K. Kriegelstein, MD

Professor and Chairman
Department of Ophthalmology
University of Cologne
Joseph-Stelzmann-Straße 9
50931 Köln
Germany

Robert N. Weinreb, MD

Professor and Director
Hamilton Glaucoma Center
Department of Ophthalmology – 0946
University of California at San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, CA 92093-0946
USA

Volume Editors

Thomas Reinhard

Professor and Chairman
University Eye Hospital
Killianstraße 5
79106 Freiburg
Germany

Frank Larkin

Moorfields Eye Hospital
162 City Road
London EC1V 2PD
United Kingdom

ISBN: 978-3-540-85543-9

e-ISBN: 978-3-540-85544-6

DOI: 10.1007/978-3-540-85544-6

Library of Congress Control Number: 2009931341

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2010

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilm or in any other way, and storage in data banks. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the German Copyright Law of September 9, 1965, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Violations are liable to prosecution under the German Copyright Law.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

Product liability: The publishers cannot guarantee the accuracy of any information about dosage and application contained in this book. In every individual case the user must check such information by consulting the relevant literature.

Cover design: wmx Design, Heidelberg, Germany

Printed on acid-free paper

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

(www.springer.com)

Foreword

The Essentials in Ophthalmology series represents an unique updating publication on the progress in all subspecialties of ophthalmology.

In a quarterly rhythm, eight issues are published covering clinically relevant achievements in the whole field of ophthalmology. This timely transfer of advancements for the best possible care of our eye patients has proven to be effective. The initial working hypothesis of providing new knowledge immediately following publication in the peer-reviewed journal and not waiting for the textbook appears to be highly workable.

We are now in the third cycle of the Essentials in Ophthalmology series, having been encouraged by read-

ership acceptance of the first two series, each of eight volumes. This is a success that was made possible predominantly by the numerous opinion-leading authors and the outstanding section editors, as well as with the constructive support of the publisher. There are many good reasons to continue and still improve the dissemination of this didactic and clinically relevant information.

G.K. Krieglstein

R.N. Weinreb

Series Editors

Preface

This third *Cornea and External Eye Disease* volume comprises eleven reviews of moving points in corneal biology, disease pathogenesis and management.

In this volume we have gathered a number of chapters on and around the topic of cornea and limbus transplantation. Jerry Niederkorn reviews our increasing understanding of the components of immune privilege enjoyed by corneal transplants, a privilege unrivalled in the field of transplantation. This privilege is relative and is neither universal nor immutable. Rejection remains the major threat for corneal transplants, in the settings of conventional penetrating keratoplasty, of newer lamellar surgical techniques and of course especially in patients at high rejection risk.

Strategy on how to prevent immune rejection is controversial; differing analyses being described in the chapters by Douglas Coster and Alex Reis. Some benefit of HLA matching has been found in high rejection risk corneal transplantation, but transplantation antigen matching is undertaken only in European centres. Is use of systemic immunosuppressive drugs justified in corneal graft recipients, among whom are some in whom blind-

ness would result from loss of donor corneal transparency? Risks of drug adverse effects vs. benefits of maintaining a functioning transplant should be considered in any candidate for a corneal transplant at high rejection risk. It is noteworthy that quality of life in blind patients is significantly more compromised than in those renal failure patients requiring dialysis [1, 2]. We hope you enjoy reading this volume.

Thomas Reinhard
Frank Larkin

References

1. Brown MM, Brown GC, Sharma S, Kistler J, Brown H (2001) Utility values associated with blindness in an adult population. *Br J Ophthalmol* 85:327–331
2. Liem YS, Bosch JL, Hunink MG (2008) Preference-based quality of life of patients on renal replacement therapy: a systemic review and meta-analysis. *Value Health* 11:733–741

Contents

Chapter 1

Immune Privilege of Corneal Allografts

Jerry Y. Niederkorn

1.1	History of Corneal Transplantation and Immune Privilege	1
1.2	How Successful Is Corneal Transplantation?	2
1.3	Immune Rejection of Corneal Allografts	3
1.3.1	Role of CD4+ T Lymphocytes in Corneal Allograft Rejection.....	3
1.3.2	Role of CD8+ T Lymphocytes in Corneal Allograft Rejection.....	3
1.3.3	Role of Antibodies in Corneal Allograft Rejection	4
1.3.4	Role of Macrophages and NK Cells in Corneal Allograft Rejection.....	4
1.3.5	What are the Effectors of Corneal Allograft Rejection?	5
1.4	Role of Atopic Diseases in Corneal Allograft Rejection	5
1.5	Immune Privilege of Corneal Allografts Is a Tripartite Phenomenon	5
1.5.1	Afferent Blockade of the Immune Response to Corneal Allografts	6
1.5.2	Immune Deviation in the Central Processing Component of the Immune Reflex Arc.....	8
1.5.3	Efferent Blockade of the Immune Response to Corneal Allografts	9
	References	10

Chapter 2

Mechanisms of Corneal Allograft Rejection and the Development of New Therapies

Douglas J. Coster, Claire F. Jessup, and Keryn A. Williams

2.1	Status of Corneal Transplantation.....	13
2.2	Success Rate of Corneal Transplantation	13
2.3	Maintenance and Erosion of Corneal Privilege	14

2.4	The Corneal Allograft Response.....	15
2.5	Antigen Uptake in the Eye	15
2.6	Antigen Processing.....	16
2.7	Antigen Presentation.....	16
2.8	T Cell Activation, Proliferation, and Clonal Expansion	17
2.9	Effector Arm of the Allograft Response	17
2.10	Current Management of Corneal Transplants	17
2.11	Prevention of Allograft Rejection	17
2.12	Stratification of Risk	18
2.13	Protecting Immune Privilege	18
2.14	Minimizing Antigenic Differences Between Donor and Recipient	18
2.15	Systemic Immunosuppression	18
2.16	Surgical Techniques and Postoperative Management.....	18
2.17	Management of Acute Rejection Episodes.....	19
2.18	New Therapies with Novel Mechanisms	19
2.19	Antibody-based Immunosuppressive Agents in Transplantation	19
2.20	Engineered Antibodies for Eye Disease ...	19
2.21	Gene Therapy of the Donor Cornea	20
2.22	Vectors for Gene Therapy of the Cornea	20
2.23	Transgenes for Prolonging Corneal Graft Survival	20
2.24	Future Prospects	20
	References	22

Chapter 3

New Developments in Topical and Systemic Immunomodulation Following Penetrating Keratoplasty

Alexander Reis and Thomas Reinhard

3.1	Introduction	25
3.2	Immunology	26
3.2.1	Acute Rejection	26
3.2.2	Major Histocompatibility Complex (MHC)	26

3.2.2.1	Direct Pathway of Allorecognition	26	4.1.1	Anterior Chamber-Associated Immune Deviation (ACAID)	38
3.2.2.2	Indirect Pathway of Allorecognition	26	4.1.2	The Th1/Th2 Paradigm	38
3.2.3	Chronic Rejection	26	4.2	Pitfalls in the Determination of Cytokine Levels from Aqueous Humor	38
3.3	Normal-risk vs. High-risk Transplantation	27	4.3	Relevance of Individual Cytokines in Corneal Transplantation	40
3.3.1	Normal-risk Transplantation	27	4.3.1	Interleukin 1b	40
3.3.2	High-risk Transplantation	27	4.3.1.1	General Functions from In Vitro Experiments	40
3.3.3	Rationale for Systemic Immunosuppression	27	4.3.1.2	Effects in Animal Models of Corneal Transplantation	40
3.3.4	Why Is Immunomodulation with Topical Steroids Not Sufficient to Prevent Immunologic Graft Rejection in High-Risk Patients?	27	4.3.1.3	Interleukin 1b Levels in Human Aqueous Humor	40
3.3.5	Rationale for Topical Immunomodulation	27	4.3.2	Interleukin 2	40
3.4	Immunosuppressive Agents	28	4.3.2.1	General Functions from In Vitro Experiments	40
3.4.1	History	28	4.3.2.2	Effects in Animal Models of Corneal Transplantation	40
3.4.2	Corticosteroids	28	4.3.2.3	Interleukin 2 Levels in Human Aqueous Humor	40
3.4.3	Cyclosporine A	28	4.3.3	Interleukin 6	41
3.4.3.1	CSA in Corneal Transplantation	29	4.3.3.1	General Functions from In Vitro Experiments	41
3.4.4	Tacrolimus (fk506)	29	4.3.3.2	Effects in Animal Models of Corneal Transplantation	41
3.4.4.1	Tacrolimus in Corneal Transplantation	29	4.3.3.3	Interleukin 6 Levels in Human Aqueous Humor	41
3.4.5	Mycophenolate Mofetil (MMF)	29	4.3.4	Interleukin 10	41
3.4.6	Rapamycin (Sirolimus)	30	4.3.4.1	General Functions from In Vitro Experiments	41
3.4.7	RAD (Everolimus)	30	4.3.4.2	Effects in Animal Models of Corneal Transplantation	41
3.4.8	FTY 720	31	4.3.4.3	Interleukin 10 Levels in Human Aqueous Humor	41
3.4.9	FK788	31	4.3.5	Interferon Gamma (IFN- γ)	42
3.5	Pimecrolimus	31	4.3.5.1	General Functions from In Vitro Experiments	42
3.5.1	Pimecrolimus in Corneal Transplantation	31	4.3.5.2	Effects in Animal Models of Corneal Transplantation	42
3.5.2	Biologic Agents	31	4.3.5.3	INF- γ Levels in the Aqueous Humor	42
3.5.2.1	Basiliximab and Daclizumab	31	4.3.6	Tumor Necrosis Factor Alpha (TNF- α)	42
3.6	Guidelines for Practitioners	32	4.3.6.1	General Functions from In Vitro Experiments	42
3.6.1	Systemic Immunosuppression with Drugs with Proven Efficacy in Corneal Transplantation	32	4.3.6.2	Effects in Animal Models of Corneal Transplantation	42
3.6.1.1	Preoperative Evaluation	32	4.3.6.3	TNF- α Levels in Human Aqueous Humor	42
3.6.1.2	How to Use Cyclosporine in High-risk Corneal Transplantation	32	4.3.7	Transforming Growth Factor Beta (TGF- β)	43
3.6.1.3	How to Use MMF in High-risk Corneal Transplantation	32	4.3.7.1	General Functions from In Vitro	
3.6.2	Topical Immunosuppression	33			
3.7	Conclusion	33			
	References	33			
Chapter 4					
Cytokines Analysis of the Aqueous Humor in the Context of Penetrating Keratoplasty					
Philip Maier and Thomas Reinhard					
4.1	Immune Privilege of the Anterior Ocular Segment	38			

Experiment 43

4.3.7.2 Effects in Animal Models of Corneal Transplantation 44

4.3.7.3 TGF-β2 Levels in Human Aqueous Humor 44

4.3.8 Fas, Fas Ligand and Soluble Fas Ligand 44

4.3.8.1 General Functions from In Vitro Experiments 44

4.3.8.2 Effects in Animal Models of Corneal Transplantation 45

4.3.8.3 sFasL Levels in Human Aqueous Humor 45

4.3.9 Further Cytokines and Immunomodulative Factors 45

4.3.9.1 Interleukin 1 Receptor Antagonist 45

4.3.9.2 Interleukin 4 46

4.3.9.3 Interleukin 5 46

4.3.9.4 Interleukin 8 46

4.3.9.5 Interleukin 12 46

4.3.9.6 Alpha-Melanocyte-Stimulating Hormone/Calcitonin Gene-Related Peptide/Thrombospondin/Somatostatin 46

4.4 Cytokine Profiles in the Context of Corneal Transplantation 49

4.4.1 Cytokine Profiles in Animal Models 49

4.4.2 Cytokine Profiles in Humans 49

4.4.2.1 Cytokines in the Serum of Patients Following PK 49

4.4.2.2 Cytokines in Human Corneas 49

4.4.2.3 Cytokines in Human Aqueous Humor 49

References 50

Chapter 5
Limbal Stem Cell Transplantation: Surgical Techniques and Results

Alex J. Shortt, Stephen J. Tuft, and Julie T. Daniels

5.1 Introduction 53

5.1.1 The Corneal Epithelium 53

5.1.2 The Limbus and Corneal Epithelial Homeostasis 53

5.2 Corneal LESC Deficiency 55

5.2.1 Diagnosis and Classification of Corneal LESC Deficiency 55

5.3 Management of Patients with Limbal Stem Cell Deficiency 57

5.3.1 Conservative Options 57

5.3.2 Surgical Options for Partial Limbal Stem Cell Deficiency 57

5.3.3 Surgical Options for Total Limbal Stem Cell Deficiency 57

5.4 Surgical Techniques for Transplanting Corneal Limbal Stem Cells 58

5.4.1 Conjunctival Limbal Autograft (CLAU) 58

5.4.2 Living-Related Conjunctival Limbal Allograft Transplant (Ir-CLAL) 58

5.4.2.1 Clinical Outcomes of CLAU and Ir-CLAL 59

5.4.3 Keratolimbal Allograft Transplant 59

5.4.4 Ex Vivo Expansion and Transplantation of Cultured Limbal Stem Cells 60

5.4.5 Regulations Governing the Clinical Use of Ex vivo Cultured Tissue 60

5.4.6 Evidence of the Presence of Stem Cells in Ex vivo Cultures and Grafts 61

5.4.7 Assessing Outcomes Following LESC Transplantation 61

5.4.8 Evidence for Donor Cell Survival Following Ex Vivo Cultured LESC Transplantation 61

5.4.9 Role of Tissue Matching in Transplantation of Allogeneic Tissue or Cells 62

5.4.10 Alternative Sources of Autologous Stem Cells 62

5.4.11 Issues Surrounding Ex Vivo Cultured LESC Transplantation that Require Further Investigation 62

5.5 Conclusion 63

References 63

Chapter 6
Cell Cycle Control and Replication in Corneal Endothelium

Nancy C. Joyce

6.1 Relationship of Endothelial Barrier Function to Corneal Transparency 70

6.2 Corneal Endothelial Cell Loss and Repair Mechanisms 71

6.2.1 Causes of Cell Loss 71

6.2.2 Repair of the Endothelial Monolayer 71

6.3 Are Human Corneal Endothelial Cells Able to Divide? 71

6.3.1 Proliferative Status In Vivo 71

6.3.2 Evidence that HCEC Retain Proliferative Capacity 71

6.4 The Cell Cycle 72

6.4.1 Positive Regulation of the Cell Cycle 72

6.4.2 Negative Regulation of G1-Phase of the Cell Cycle 73

6.5	Potential Causes for Inhibition of HCEC Proliferation In Vivo	74	7.3.2.4	Hybrid Lenses	89
6.5.1	Cell–Cell Contacts Inhibit Division	74	7.3.3	Fitting Techniques	89
6.5.2	Endothelium In Vivo Lacks Effective Paracrine or Autocrine Growth Factor Stimulation	75	7.3.3.1	The Reshape and Splint Method	89
6.5.3	TGF-Beta2 Has a Suppressive Effect on S-phase Entry	75	7.3.3.2	The Three-Point Touch Method	89
6.6	Proliferative Capacity of HCEC Differs with Donor Age	76	7.3.3.3	The Apical Clearance Method	90
6.6.1	Analysis of pRb Hyperphosphorylation	77	7.3.3.4	Scleral Fitting Method	90
6.6.2	Analysis of Replication Competence	77	7.3.4	GP Fitting Following Cross Linking	90
6.6.3	Analysis of CKI Protein Expression	77	7.4	CL Fitting Following Penetrating Keratoplasty	91
6.7	Efforts to Stimulate Corneal Endothelial Proliferation by Interfering with G1-phase Inhibition	78	7.4.1	Indications for CLs Following PK	91
6.7.1	Overcoming G1-phase Inhibition	79	7.4.2	Indications for CLs Following PK in Comparison with Newer Techniques	91
6.7.2	Bypassing G1-phase Inhibition	79	7.4.3	PK Peculiarities in Conjunction with CLs	92
6.8	Endothelial Topography Affects the Proliferative Capacity of HCEC	79	7.4.3.1	Corneal Sensitivity, Fitting Quality, and Frequent Follow-Ups	92
6.8.1	Differences in Proliferative Capacity	79	7.4.3.2	The Endothelium and Choice of GP Materials	92
6.8.2	Differences in Senescence Characteristics	80	7.4.3.3	Immune Reactions	92
6.9	Identification of Mechanisms Responsible for Decreased Proliferative Capacity	80	7.4.4	When to Fit?	92
6.9.1	Are Critically Short Telomeres Responsible for Decreased Proliferative Capacity?	81	7.4.5	Fitting Techniques	93
6.9.2	Is Sub-lethal Oxidative DNA Damage Responsible for Decreased Proliferative Capacity?	81	7.4.5.1	PK with One or Two Sutures	93
6.10	Future Directions	82	7.4.5.2	CL Fitting Following Suture Removal	93
	References	83		Abbreviations	94
				References	94
Chapter 7					
Current State of the Art of Fitting Gas-Permeable (GP) Contact Lenses					
Silke Lohrengel and Dieter Muckenhirn					
7.1	Corneal Topography and Automatic Fitting Programs	87			
7.2	Fitting CLs	88			
7.3	The Keratoconus	88			
7.3.1	KC Peculiarities in Conjunction with CL	88			
7.3.1.1	Corneal Sensitivity and Maximum Resilience	88			
7.3.1.2	Corneal Contour: KC Stage: KC Type	89			
7.3.2	Forms of Correction	89			
7.3.2.1	Soft Lenses	89			
7.3.2.2	GP Contact Lenses	89			
7.3.2.3	Piggyback	89			
Chapter 8					
Allergic Disease of the Conjunctiva and Cornea					
Andrea Leonardi					
8.1	Introduction and Classification	97			
8.2	Clinical Forms	98			
8.2.1	Seasonal and Perennial Allergic Conjunctivitis	98			
8.2.2	Vernal Keratoconjunctivitis	98			
8.2.3	Atopic Keratoconjunctivitis	100			
8.2.4	Giant Papillary Conjunctivitis	101			
8.2.5	Contact Blepharoconjunctivitis	101			
8.2.6	Drug-Induced Conjunctivitis or Keratoconjunctivitis	101			
8.2.7	Urban Eye Allergy Syndrome	102			
8.3	Differential Diagnosis	103			
8.4	Diagnostic Tests in Ocular Allergy	104			
8.5	Ocular Immunity and the Allergic Reaction	104			
8.5.1	Innate Immunity and Ocular Allergy	104			
8.5.2	The Allergic Process	105			
8.5.3	Allergic Inflammation	106			
8.6	The Cornea in Allergic Diseases	107			
8.6.1	Corneal Immunology	107			
8.6.2	Allergic Inflammation and Corneal Damage	107			
8.6.3	Tear Instability and Corneal Involvement	107			
8.6.4	Corneal Clinical Manifestations				

8.6.5	in Ocular Allergy	108	9.7.1	The Stimulus for Inflammation and Scarring in Trachoma	127
8.6.5	Confocal Microscopy and Allergic Keratoconjunctivitis	108	9.7.2	Histopathology	128
8.6.6	Keratoconus and Allergic Conjunctivitis	109	9.7.3	The Immune Response in Trachoma	128
8.6.7	Keratoglobus	109	9.7.4	Immunopathogenesis of Conjunctival Scarring	129
8.6.8	Allergic Keratoconjunctivitis and Corneal Infection	110	9.8	Trachoma Control	130
8.6.9	Allergy and Corneal Transplant	110	9.8.1	The SAFE Strategy	130
8.6.9.1	Immunology	110	9.8.2	Surgery for Trichiasis	130
8.6.9.2	Clinical Outcomes	111	9.8.3	Antibiotics	130
8.7	Treatment of Ocular Allergy	111	9.8.4	Face Washing	132
8.7.1	Nonpharmacological Management	112	9.8.5	Environmental Improvements	132
8.7.2	Treatment of Allergic Conjunctivitis	112	9.10	Conclusion	132
8.7.2.1	Topical Ocular Pharmacological Treatment	112		References	133
8.7.2.2	Topical Nonocular Pharmacological Treatment	113			
8.7.2.3	Systemic Pharmacological Treatment	113			
8.7.2.4	Specific Immunotherapy	114			
8.7.3	Treatment of GPC	114			
8.7.4	Treatment of Vernal Keratoconjunctivitis	114			
8.7.4.1	Corticosteroids	114			
8.7.4.2	Cyclosporine and Other Immunosuppressive Treatments	115			
8.7.5	Treatment of AKC	115			
8.7.5.1	Cyclosporine and Other Immunosuppressive Treatments	115			
8.7.6	Surgical Treatment of Keratoconjunctivitis	116			
	References	116			
Chapter 9			Chapter 10		
Trachoma			Keratoprosthesis		
Matthew J. Burton			Jason J. Jun, Donna E. Siracuse-Lee, Mary K. Daly, and Claes H. Dohlman		
9.1	Introduction	121	10.1	Introduction	137
9.1.1	Overview	121	10.2	Prognostic Hierarchy	138
9.1.2	History	121	10.3	Defining Patient Subtypes	138
9.2	Clinical Features	122	10.3.1	Patient Subtype A: The Noninflamed Eye	138
9.2.1	Symptoms and Signs	122	10.3.2	Patient Subtype B: The Inflamed Eye	138
9.2.2	Trachoma Grading Systems	123	10.4	Experience with Kpro in Patient Subtype A	138
9.2.3	Differential Diagnosis	123	10.4.1	Boston Type 1 Kpro	138
9.3	Chlamydia Trachomatis	123	10.4.1.1	Pediatric Application of Boston Type 1 Kpro	139
9.4	Laboratory Diagnosis	124	10.4.2	AlphaCor Kpro	140
9.5	Clinical Signs and Infection	125	10.5	Experience with Kpro in Patient Subtype B	140
9.6	Epidemiology	125	10.5.1	Osteo-Odonto Keratoprosthesis (OOKP)	140
9.6.1	Prevalence and Distribution	125	10.5.2	Boston Type 2 Kpro	141
9.6.2	Age and Gender	126	10.6	Other Kpro Designs	141
9.6.3	Risk Factors for Active Trachoma and <i>C. Trachomatis</i> Infection	126	10.6.1	Pintucci Kpro	141
9.7	Pathophysiology of Trachoma	127	10.6.2	Seoul-Type Kpro	141
			10.6.3	Worst-Singh Kpro	141
			10.6.4	Russian/Ukrainian Experience	142
			10.7	New Directions in Kpro Research	142
			10.7.1	Hydroxyapatite Biologic Haptics	142
			10.7.2	Biologic Coatings	142
			10.7.3	Biologic Scaffolds and Enhanced Hydrogels	142
			10.8	Conclusion	142
				References	143
Chapter 11			Chapter 11		
Posterior Lamellar Keratoplasty in Perspective			Posterior Lamellar Keratoplasty in Perspective		
Arnalich-Montiel F and Dart JKG			Arnalich-Montiel F and Dart JKG		
11.1	Introduction	145			

11.2	Choosing Endothelial Keratoplasty Procedures.....	146	11.3.7.3	Anterior Chamber Lens.....	153
11.2.1	Indications.....	146	11.4	Clinical Results and Complications.....	153
11.2.2	Preoperative Considerations.....	146	11.4.1	Visual Acuity.....	153
11.2.2.1	Confirming the Extent of Endothelial Dysfunction.....	146	11.4.2	Astigmatism.....	153
11.2.2.2	Corneal Scarring.....	147	11.4.3	Spherical Equivalent.....	153
11.2.2.3	Cataract and Intraocular Lens Status.....	147	11.4.4	Endothelial Cell Loss.....	154
11.2.2.4	Lens/Iris Diaphragm Status.....	147	11.4.5	Corneal Donor Dislocation (Fig. 11.4a–c)	155
11.2.2.5	Intraocular Pressure.....	148	11.4.6	Pupillary Block.....	156
11.2.2.6	Retinal Function.....	148	11.4.7	Primary Graft Failure.....	156
11.3	PLK Surgical Technique.....	148	11.4.8	Rejection.....	156
11.3.1	Donor Preparation.....	148	11.4.9	Other Complications.....	156
11.3.2	Host Dissection for DSEK/DSAEK.....	148	11.5	Conclusion.....	157
11.3.3	Donor Insertion.....	149		References.....	157
11.3.4	Techniques for Graft Centration.....	149	Index		161
11.3.5	Techniques for Promoting Donor Adhesion.....	150			
11.3.6	Post-operative Care.....	151			
11.3.7	Surgery for Complex Cases.....	151			
11.3.7.1	Failed Grafts.....	151			
11.3.7.2	Aniridics, Vitrectomised and Aphakic Eyes (Fig. 11.3e).....	153			

Contributors

Matthew Burton

Department of Infectious and Tropical Diseases,
International Centre for Eye Health,
London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine,
Keppel Street,
London WC1E 7HT, UK

Douglas Coster

Department of Ophthalmology, NHMRC Centre for
Clinical Eye Research, Flinders Medical Centre,
Bedford Park, Adelaide, SA 5042, Australia

Mary Daly

Boston University Eye Associates Inc.,
Albany Street, Boston, MA 02118, USA
Veterans Affairs Boston Healthcare System,
Jamaica Plain, MA, USA
Department of Ophthalmology, Boston University
School of Medicine, Boston, MA, USA

Julie T. Daniels

Department of Ocular Biology and Therapeutics,
UCL Institute of Ophthalmology, 11-43 Bath Street,
London, EC1V 9EL, UK

John Dart,

Moorfields Eye Hospital,
162 City Road, London EC1V 2PD,
UK

Claas Dohlman

Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary,
Harvard Medical School, MA, USA

Claire F. Jessup

Transplantation Immunology Laboratory,
University of Adelaide, SA 5005, Australia
Queen Elizabeth Hospital, 28 Woodville Road,
Woodville South SA 5011, Australia

Nancy C. Joyce

Schepens Eye Research Institute, 20 Staniford Street,
Boston, MA 02114, USA
Department of Ophthalmology, Harvard Medical School,
20 Staniford Street, Boston, MA 02114, USA

Jason J. Jun

Veterans Affairs Boston Healthcare System,
Jamaica Plain, MA, USA

Andrea Leonardi

Ophthalmology Unit, University of Padua, Via Giustiniani
2, I-35128 Padua, Italy

Silke Lohrengel

Hecht-Contactlinsen GmbH, Dorfstraße 2, 79280 Au,
Germany

Philipp Maier

University Eye Hospital Freiburg, Killianstraße 5,
79106 Freiburg, Germany

Dieter Muckenhirn

Hecht Contactlinsen GmbH, Dorfstraße 2-4,
79280 Au, Germany

Jerry Young Niederkorn

UT Southwestern Medical School, 5323 Harry Hines Blvd,
Dallas, TX 75390-9057, USA

Thomas Reinhard

Professor and Chairman of the University Eye Hospital,
Killianstraße 5, 79106 Freiburg, Germany

Alexander Reis

Augenwerk Optik, Landstraße 310,
FL-9495 Triesen/Vaduz, Principality of Liechtenstein

Alex J. Shortt

UCL Institute of Ophthalmology, 11-43 Bath Street,
London EC1V 9EL, UK

Donna E. Siracuse-Lee

Veterans Affairs Boston Healthcare System,
Jamaica Plain, MA, USA
Department of Ophthalmology, Boston University School
of Medicine, Boston, MA, USA

Stephen J. Tuft

Moorfields Eye Hospital, City Road,
London EC 1V 2PD, UK

Keryn A. Williams

Department of Ophthalmology, Flinders University,
Flinders Medical Centre, Bedford Park SA 5042, Australia

Immune Privilege of Corneal Allografts

1

Jerry Y. Niederkorn

Core Messages

- Multiple anatomical, physiological, and immunoregulatory factors contribute to the immune privilege of corneal allografts. These factors conspire to prevent the induction and expression of immune responses to the histocompatibility antigens on the corneal allograft.
- Corneal allografts also elicit a dynamic immunoregulatory process that deviates the immune response from a destructive pathway to one of tolerance. Together, these conditions create an immune privileged environment and promote corneal allograft survival.
- Corneal allografts enjoy immune privilege that is unrivaled in the field of transplantation. However, this immune privilege is neither universal nor immutable. This has led some to dismiss immune privilege of corneal allografts out of hand. Moreover, the success of renal, cardiac, and liver transplants has improved over the past 3 decades and has reached levels similar to corneal allografts – an observation that has further fueled protests that corneal allografts are no different than other organ allografts, and that immune privilege is a misnomer. However, comparing survival rates among these categories of allografts is a bit like comparing an apple to an orange. For the comparisons to be valid, we must either compare the survival of corneal allografts in patients treated with the same intense systemic immunosuppressive agents that are used in renal, cardiac, or liver transplant patients, or compare all four categories of patients when the only treatment is topical corticosteroids (i.e., the standard prophylactic therapy in keratoplasty patients). The latter proposition, of course, is absurd, but does emphasize the importance of including all of the parameters when making comparisons relating to immune privilege.
- Prospective studies in animal models have unequivocally shown that in the absence of anti-rejection drugs, corneal allografts have dramatically higher acceptance and long-term survival rates than other categories of allografts such as skin transplants.

1.1 History of Corneal Transplantation and Immune Privilege

The notion that corneal tissues could be successfully transplanted was proposed three centuries ago by Erasmus Darwin, the grandfather of Charles Darwin. The first reported attempt at experimental corneal transplantation was performed in 1835 by Bigger, who transplanted a corneal allograft to a pet gazelle [1]. In 1838, Kissam attempted the first corneal transplant in a human subject and grafted a pig cornea onto a patient's eye using four interrupted sutures and without the use of anesthesia [2]! Almost half a century later corneal transplantation was once again attempted on humans when May transplanted rabbit

corneal xenografts to humans and noted that the 24 attempts failed due to “imperfect technique and the inability to keep the eyes properly bandaged” [3]. It took almost seven decades before the first successful corneal transplant was grafted from a human donor to a human recipient [4, 5]. Since then, corneal transplantation has emerged as the most common form of solid tissue transplantation in the United States and the United Kingdom [6, 7].

The concept that the cornea and the anterior segment of the eye might be endowed with unusual immunological properties can be traced to Sir Peter Medawar, who noted the remarkable survival of orthotopic corneal allografts transplanted to the ocular surface and heterotopic skin allografts placed into the anterior chamber

Table 1.1 Immune rejection of corneal allografts and skin allografts in rats

Histocompatibility barrier	Incidence of rejection	
	Skin allograft (%)	Corneal allograft (%)
MHC + multiple minor histocompatibility antigens	100	38 to >90
MHC class I only	100	18–35
MHC class II only	100	0–10

(AC) of the rabbit eye. Medawar recognized the significance of the unusual properties of the corneal transplant and the anterior chamber over which it was transplanted, and coined the term “immune privilege” [8]. Clinical observations in human keratoplasty patients and results from experimental animal studies support the notion that corneal allografts enjoy immune privilege [5, 6, 9]. In routine human keratoplasty, no HLA matching is performed and topical corticosteroids are the only immunosuppressive agents administered. This is in sharp contrast to all other forms of solid tissue transplantation. Animal studies have provided perhaps the most compelling evidence for the immune privilege of orthotopic corneal allografts [5]. In rodent models of penetrating keratoplasty, the incidence of immune rejection of corneal allografts differing from the hosts at all known histocompatibility gene loci (i.e., MHC plus minor histocompatibility loci) can be as low as 38%, with the average being approximately 50%, even though immunosuppressive drugs are not used [5]. Corneal allograft survival is even more impressive when histocompatibility matching is applied. Corneal allografts mismatched with the host only at MHC class I loci enjoy long-term survival in 65 and 72% of the rat and mouse hosts, respectively [5]. Corneal allograft survival in rodents mismatched with the corneal allograft donor only at MHC class II loci display the most pronounced example of immune privilege, with graft rejection occurring in less than 10% of the hosts. In contrast, skin allografts in each of these categories are invariably rejected (Table 1.1). These remarkable findings have led to the misconception that the immune privilege of corneal transplants is universal and immutable.

1.2 How Successful Is Corneal Transplantation?

Although it is commonly stated that corneal allografts enjoy a first-year survival rate as high as 90%, the long-term

survival rate is considerably lower and drops to 74% at 5 years and 62% at 10 years [7]. Moreover, graft survival is even worse in patients who are considered “high-risk” based on the presence of preexisting corneal neovascularization, ongoing ocular inflammation, or a history of previous corneal graft rejection. In these conditions, 10-year graft survival plummets to 35% [10]. In recent years, the success rate for renal, cardiac, and liver transplants has improved and has reached a level similar to corneal transplants, with approximately 75% of the grafts surviving at 5 years [7]. Unlike other categories of solid organ transplants, which have demonstrated improved survival over the past 10–15 years, the long-term survival of corneal transplants has not changed [7]. The improved survival of other organ transplants is largely a result of improved immunosuppressive drugs. In contrast, topical steroids continue to be the only immunosuppressive agents routinely used for preventing corneal allograft rejection and have been the mainstay among prophylactic immunosuppressive agents for decades. Unlike the rejection of cardiac, renal, and hepatic transplants, which pose a risk for survival and justify more aggressive immunosuppressive therapy, rejection of corneal allografts has far less serious consequences, which explains the ophthalmologist’s reluctance to use systemic immunosuppressive drugs, which carry serious side effects and can significantly affect the patient’s quality of life.

Summary for the Clinician: Success of Corneal Allografts

- In the absence of risk factors, such as inflammation and neovascularization of the graft bed, corneal allografts enjoy immune privilege.
- Corneal allografts survive in the absence of HLA matching and without the use of systemic immunosuppressive drugs, which is further evidence of their immune privilege.
- Immune privilege of corneal allografts is not universal or immutable. Factors associated with corneal inflammation and neovascularization rob the cornea of its immune privilege and increase the risk for rejection.
- Topical application of corticosteroids is the mainstay prophylactic antirejection treatment. Risk to benefit ratio for keratoplasty patients precludes the use of more aggressive immunosuppressive protocols that have led to a steady improvement in the survival rates for kidney, liver, and heart transplants. In contrast, the success of corneal allografts has not improved over the past 3 decades.

1.3 Immune Rejection of Corneal Allografts

The beneficial effects of MHC matching in promoting the acceptance of other categories of allografts has been demonstrated, but remains controversial in corneal transplantation [7, 11]. One study has shown no benefit from MHC class I and class II matching on corneal allograft survival [6], while another study has reported a modest, albeit significant benefit of MHC class I matching, but an increased risk of rejection with MHC class II matching [12]. Studies in both humans and animals have clearly demonstrated that MHC class I antigens are expressed on all three layers of the cornea, while MHC class II antigens are conspicuously absent under nonpathological conditions. Minor histocompatibility antigens are also expressed in the cornea and can provoke corneal graft rejection [4, 5]. In fact, studies in both rats and mice suggest that minor histocompatibility antigens pose a greater barrier than MHC antigens for corneal allograft survival [13–15]. It has been estimated that 90% of the MHC antigens are expressed on the corneal epithelium, leading some to propose that removal of this layer might reduce the immunogenicity of corneal allografts and promote their survival. However, removal of donor epithelium prior to corneal transplantation did not enhance corneal allograft survival in 228 keratoplasty patients in one study [16]. Moreover, investigations in mice suggest that the corneal epithelium plays an active role in dampening inflammation, and that the removal of the corneal epithelium jeopardizes corneal allograft survival [9, 17].

Studies on the mechanisms of corneal graft rejection in patients have been largely inferential, as they have relied on in situ immunohistochemical phenotyping of cell surface markers on immune cells and the identification of cytokines in rejected corneal allografts. Animal studies, especially those in rodents, have provided the most useful insights into the mechanisms of immune rejection of corneal allografts. Maumenee was the first to unequivocally demonstrate that corneal allograft rejection was immune-mediated [18]. Using a rabbit model of penetrating keratoplasty, Maumenee demonstrated that rabbits that received skin grafts 2 weeks prior to the application of orthotopic corneal allografts from the same donor, rejected their corneal allografts at an accelerated tempo, thereby demonstrating immunological memory, and establishing the immunologic basis for corneal allograft rejection. In the late 1960s and mid 1970s, Khodadoust and Silverstein demonstrated that corneal allograft rejection was a cell-mediated process that could be adoptively transferred with lymphocytes that had been specifically sensitized to the corneal allograft donor's histocompatibility antigens [19, 20].

1.3.1 Role of CD4+ T Lymphocytes in Corneal Allograft Rejection

The development of the rat and, subsequently, the mouse model of penetrating keratoplasty paved the way for a series of studies exploring the immune mechanisms of corneal allograft rejection. Using these models, investigators have established that T cells, especially CD4+ T helper cells, were capable of mediating corneal allograft rejection [4]. Depletion of CD4+ T cells by in vivo antibody treatment or by gene deletion results in a steep reduction in the rejection of corneal allografts in rats and mice [4]. Likewise, there is a close correlation between corneal allograft survival and the down-regulation of CD4+ T cell immune responses [5]. CD4+ T cells can contribute to corneal allograft rejection in a number of ways. Delayed-type hypersensitivity (DTH) responses to alloantigens are mediated by CD4+ T cells and are closely correlated with corneal allograft rejection in mice. CD4+ T cells, especially the Th1 population, produce interferon- γ (IFN- γ) and tumor necrosis factor- α (TNF- α), which are known to induce apoptosis of corneal cells [4]. CD4+ T cells can also produce cell-contact-dependent apoptosis of corneal cells [21]. Although CD4+ T cells have been widely proclaimed as the sole mediators of corneal allograft rejection, it is noteworthy that depletion of CD4+ T cells by in vivo treatment with antibody or by deletion of the CD4 gene in mice does not abolish corneal allograft rejection; in fact, approximately 50% of the CD4+ T cell-deficient mice and rats go on to reject their corneal allografts [22–24]. In contrast, T cell-deficient mice do not reject corneal allografts, indicating that in addition to CD4+ T cells, one or more other T cell subsets can contribute to corneal allograft rejection.

1.3.2 Role of CD8+ T Lymphocytes in Corneal Allograft Rejection

CD8+ T cells are the other major subset of T lymphocytes that has been implicated in organ graft rejection. The notion that CD8+ cytotoxic T lymphocytes (CTL) mediate graft rejection has been embraced by numerous investigators. CD8+ CTL can kill allogeneic cells in vitro, including corneal cells. Moreover, CD8+ lymphocytes are among the mononuclear cells that are detected in rejected corneal allografts. However, rodent studies have shown that donor-specific CTL are not detected in hosts that have rejected corneal allografts. Moreover, corneal allograft rejection occurs unabatedly in CD8 knockout (KO) mice, perforin KO mice, or mice treated

with anti-CD8 monoclonal antibody [4]. Unlike the condition with other allografts, corneal allograft rejection does not culminate in the development of donor-specific CTL. However, hosts with prevascularized corneal graft beds have a dramatically increased incidence and tempo of corneal allograft rejection. In these hosts, corneal allograft rejection elicits robust donor-specific CTL responses [25]. Moreover, CD8+ CTL collected from “high-risk” hosts that have rejected corneal allografts can induce corneal allograft rejection when adoptively transferred to severe combined immune deficient (SCID) mice, indicating that under certain conditions, CD8+ T cells can mediate corneal allograft rejection [26].

1.3.3 Role of Antibodies in Corneal Allograft Rejection

Although the weight of evidence suggests that corneal allograft rejection is T cell-mediated, there are reports suggesting a role for cytotoxic antibody. Antibodies specific for the donor's histocompatibility antigens can be detected in the serum of keratoplasty patients. An interesting correlation between ABO incompatibility and corneal allograft rejection in high-risk patients has been reported [6]. The incidence of rejection in patients with ABO-incompatible corneal allografts was twice that found in recipients who received ABO-compatible corneal grafts. ABO hemagglutinins are IgM antibodies, which are excellent complement-fixing immunoglobulins with potent cytolytic activity. ABO blood group antigens are expressed on human corneal epithelial and endothelial cells [27], and in vitro studies have shown that corneal endothelial cells are highly susceptible to cytolysis by complement-fixing antibodies [4, 28]. This is consistent with the notion that under certain conditions, antibody might contribute to corneal allograft rejection. Results from experiments in mice lend further support for this hypothesis. Donor-specific alloantibodies have been detected in the serum of mice at the time of corneal allograft rejection [28]. Passive transfer of alloantibodies to T cell-deficient mice, which normally do not reject corneal allografts, results in corneal allograft rejection [29, 30]. In contrast, corneal allograft rejection occurs in both B cell-deficient mice and complement-deficient mice, indicating that complement-fixing antibodies are not required for corneal allograft rejection, and that other immune effector mechanisms can also mediate graft failure in the absence of alloantibody [28, 31].

1.3.4 Role of Macrophages and NK Cells in Corneal Allograft Rejection

The immune system is composed of two distinctly different components: the adaptive and the innate immune systems. The adaptive immune system is characterized by exquisite antigen specificity and the participation of an intact T cell repertoire. Adaptive immune responses require several days to develop, but display long-term memory, which is manifested by swift responses to subsequent encounters with the original antigen. T lymphocytes, B lymphocytes, and antibodies are the primary elements of the adaptive immune system. The innate immune system is comprised of granulocytes, macrophages, natural killer (NK) cells, and the alternate pathway of the complement system. In contrast to the adaptive immune system, the innate immune system is characterized by its rapid activation by pathogens via recognition of toll-like receptors and pathogen-associated molecular patterns (PAMP) that are expressed on various microorganisms. Although the innate immune responses are swift, the responding cells lack antigen specificity and do not display memory.

Animal studies have provided compelling evidence that elements of the innate immune system indirectly contribute to corneal allograft rejection. DTH reactivity to donor histocompatibility antigens is closely correlated with corneal allograft rejection [4]. Macrophages are a major cell population in DTH lesions and are present in rejected corneal allografts. Studies in both the mouse and rat models of penetrating keratoplasty have shown that elimination of periocular macrophages by subconjunctival injection of liposomes containing the macrophage-killing drug clodronate prevents corneal allograft rejection [4]. However, further analysis has revealed that macrophages do not act as effector cells by damaging the donor corneal graft, but appear to be crucial antigen presenting cells (APC) that activate CD4+ T cells, which enter the graft and function as the end stage effector cells that deliver the lethal hit to the corneal allograft [4]. Neutrophils are also present in the inflammatory infiltrate of rejected corneal allografts, but there is little evidence to support an important role for them in corneal allograft rejection.

NK cells act as “first responders” to viral infections, and are believed to play an important role in the immune surveillance of neoplasms. Recent studies in the rat model of penetrating keratoplasty suggest that NK cells might also participate in corneal allograft rejection [32, 33]. Cells with surface markers that are characteristic of NK cells have been detected in the corneal stroma and the aqueous humor of hosts with rejected corneal allografts.