

1 **Repeatability of a Dual-Scheimpflug Placido Disc Corneal Tomographer/Topographer in**
2 **Eyes with Keratoconus**

3
4 Anne Poulsen MD¹, Diane Jang BS², Mahmood Khan MD³, Zaina Nabil Al-Mohtaseb MD³,
5 Michael Chen MD¹, Xiang Zhan PhD⁴, Kalins Banerjee⁴, Ingrid U Scott MD MPH^{1,4}, Seth M
6 Pantanelli MD MS¹

7
8 ¹Penn State Eye Center, ²Penn State College of Medicine, Hershey, PA, USA; ³Department of
9 Ophthalmology, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston TX, USA; ⁴Department of Public Health
10 Sciences, Penn State College of Medicine, Hershey, PA, USA.

11
12
13
14

15 **Correspondence:**

16 Seth M. Pantanelli, MD, MS (orcid.org/0000-0003-4992-9606)
17 Penn State Eye Center
18 500 University Drive, HU19
19 Hershey, PA 17033
20 Tel: (717) 531-5690
21 Fax: (717) 531-5009
22 E-mail: spantanelli@pennstatehealth.psu.edu

23
24

25 **ABSTRACT**

26 *Purpose:* To investigate the repeatability of a combined Dual-Scheimpflug placido disc corneal
27 topographer (Zeimer Galilei G4) with respect to keratometric indices used to monitor
28 progression of keratoconus (KCN).

29 *Methods:* Patients with KCN were prospectively enrolled. For each eye lacking history of corneal
30 surgery, 5 measurements were taken in succession. Eyes in which 3 or more measurements
31 could be obtained (defined by the device's 4 image quality metrics) were included in the
32 analysis. The repeatability limits (RL) and interclass correlation coefficients (ICC) were
33 calculated for various parameters.

34 *Results:* 32 eyes from 25 patients met all image quality metrics, and 54 eyes from 38 patients
35 met at least 3/4 criteria (all except the placido image quality metric). RLs for key parameters
36 when 4/4 or $\geq 3/4$ image quality metrics were met included: 0.37 and 0.77 diopters (D) for steep
37 simulated keratometry, 0.79 and 1.65 D for maximum keratometry, 13.80 and 13.88 degrees for
38 astigmatism axis, 0.64 and 0.56 μm for vertical coma magnitude, and 3.76 and 3.84 μm for
39 thinnest pachymetry, respectively. The ICCs for all parameters were excellent [above 0.87
40 except for spherical aberration (0.77)].

41 *Conclusions:* The dual-Scheimpflug placido disc corneal topographer is highly repeatable in
42 quantifying parameters used in monitoring KCN. Excellent placido images are difficult to capture
43 in eyes with KCN, but when available, increase the reliability of the measurements. The RLs
44 may be especially helpful in detecting progression in mild KCN when interventions such as
45 corneal cross-linking or intrastromal corneal ring segments are most beneficial.

46 **Keywords:** keratoconus, topography, tomography, keratoconus progression, Scheimpflug
47 imaging

48

49 **Introduction**

50 Keratoconus is the most common corneal degeneration, with an estimated prevalence of
51 54.5 per 100,000 in the general population¹. The degeneration results in significant visual
52 impairment secondary to irregular astigmatism and high myopia. In the age of corneal cross-
53 linking, early diagnosis and detection of progression are essential elements of management that
54 limit morbidity associated with the disease. Achieving a consensus in the definition of
55 progression in keratoconus is limited by the requirements that such indices be based upon high
56 quality data (which is often difficult to obtain in keratoconic corneas) and long-term follow-up in
57 eyes that progress but do not have a surgical intervention (which may be impractical or
58 unethical). One recent study by Gupta et al evaluated the change in several keratometric
59 indices over time and determined that variation in best fit sphere radius was one of the most
60 sensitive predictors of progression². Another study by Martinez-Abad followed patients with
61 keratoconus for 6 years and proposed a “Progression Index” equation, but this study was limited
62 in that it was based only upon anterior surface indices³.

63 The Global Consensus on Keratoconus and Ectatic Disease defined ectatic progression
64 by a consistent change, where the magnitude of the change is above the noise of the testing
65 system⁴. In conforming to these guidelines, a study was published by de Luis Eguileor et al,
66 which investigated the repeatability of measurements pertinent to the monitoring of progression
67 in eyes with keratoconus using a Scheimpflug system (Pentacam HR)⁵. This study found that
68 sequential measurements differing by more than 1.54 D, 1.08 D, and 0.71 μm in the steep
69 keratometry, maximum keratometry, and vertical coma, respectively, likely represented real
70 change. Of note, this study only included eyes for which high quality data were available in the
71 analysis. The study results are interesting and immediately applicable for eye care providers
72 who have a Pentacam HR available. However, at least two previous studies have shown that
73 the measured indices from one device are not interchangeable with those of another, like the

74 Orbscan II (Bausch & Lomb, Rochester, NY, USA) or Galilei Dual Scheimpflug Analyzer
75 (Zeimer, Port, Switzerland)^{6,7}. It is therefore unclear how these repeatability limits reported by de
76 Luis Eguileor et al would translate for use with a different device, particularly a device employing
77 placido-based or a combination of keratometric technologies. Furthermore, it is unclear whether
78 such repeatability limits can be applied in the setting of sub-optimal image quality, which
79 commonly occurs when measuring keratoconic eyes.

80 The objective of the current study was to assess the repeatability of measurements
81 obtained using the Galilei Dual Scheimpflug Analyzer (Zeimer, Port, Switzerland) and, thus, to
82 determine which of these measurements have repeatability limits that may allow accurate
83 monitoring of keratoconus progression over time. Since the Galilei captures placido images and
84 the Pentacam HR does not, we also sought to investigate the contribution good placido images
85 have on reliability of these measurements.

86

87 **Methods**

88 We conducted a prospective observational study of patients seen at either the Penn
89 State Eye Center (Penn State College of Medicine, Hershey, PA) or the Cullen Eye Institute
90 (Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX). The study was approved by the Institutional Review
91 Board at both academic institutions. Patients with keratoconus being seen in routine follow-up
92 were provided with information about the study and written signed consent was obtained prior to
93 inclusion. All keratoconus patients over the age of 18 were offered the opportunity to participate.
94 A diagnosis of keratoconus was made with slit lamp examination and topographic confirmation,
95 and met criteria for at least Stage I Amsler-Kreimeich classification⁸. Exclusion criteria included
96 history of any corneal or intra-ocular surgery (i.e. corneal cross linking, LASIK, corneal

97 transplant, or cataract surgery). If a surgery had been performed in one eye, the fellow eye was
98 still eligible for inclusion.

99 The Galilei G4 is a combined dual-Scheimpflug tomographer / placido disc topographer
100 that employs monochromatic light sources at 470 nm and 750 nm for Scheimpflug and placido
101 disc illumination, respectively. Each scan generates over 122,000 data points. The placido and
102 Scheimpflug data are integrated using a proprietary algorithm to generate information about the
103 anterior surface of the cornea, while only the Scheimpflug data are used to generate information
104 about the posterior surface.

105 Before starting the study, the Galilei G4 was calibrated at both institutions. Each eye was
106 aligned to the visual axis via the fixation light on the machine. Patients were instructed to blink
107 between measurements. Five consecutive measurements were obtained in each eligible eye,
108 using the standard resolution setting. All images for an individual patient were captured by a
109 single examiner, but given the multi-center nature of this study, multiple examiners were used to
110 obtain data from different patients. The instrument defines 4 image quality metrics to qualify the
111 integrity of the data collected. Satisfactory metrics include a motion compensation value > 85%,
112 placido image quality > 85%, Scheimpflug image quality > 90%, and motion distance > 70%.

113 For each captured image, the following keratometric indices were assessed: flat and
114 steep simulated keratometry (SimK) magnitudes, steep SimK axis, maximum keratometry
115 values in the central zone (Kmax), anterior (BFS_anterior) and posterior (BFS_posterior) radius
116 best fit sphere of the cornea with the diameter set to 8 mm, maximum anterior (max_BFS_ant)
117 and posterior elevations (max_BFS_post), area of thinnest pachymetry (TCT), corneal
118 asphericity (Q) at 6 mm, spherical aberration (Z_4^0), vertical (Z_3^{-1}) and horizontal (Z_3^1) coma,
119 coma axis, root-mean-square (RMS) of coma measurements, and root-mean-square of higher
120 order aberrations (HOA RMS) at 6 mm.

121 Repeatability limits (RL) for the above indices were calculated, and represent the value
122 over which a change is likely to be real and not due to noise or variability inherent to the
123 machine⁹. The intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) was also calculated for each index, which
124 estimates the percentage of the total variability in the results that can be attributed to real
125 differences between measurements. The RLs and ICCs were calculated for two different
126 conditions: 1) eyes with at least 3 measurements that met all four of the devices image quality
127 metrics and 2) eyes with at least 3 measurements that met 3 or more of the devices 4 image
128 quality metrics (an excellent placido image was not required). In the instance where 4 or 5 high
129 quality images were obtainable, all of the available data was used in the analysis. Statistical
130 analyses were carried out using R programming language.

131

132 **Results**

133 Eighty-six eyes from 51 patients were measured; 32 eyes from 25 patients met all four
134 image quality metric criteria and 54 eyes from 38 patients met at least 3 of 4 criteria. The
135 severity of keratoconus for eyes included in each of the analyses is detailed in Table 1. The RLs
136 and ICCs for all parameters are shown in Table 2. We found that obtaining measurements that
137 met all four image quality metrics was challenging - the placido image criterion was the most
138 difficult to meet. Dropping the requirement for a good placido image and forcing the device to
139 rely more heavily upon the Scheimpflug data lead to higher (worse) RLs. The ICC for all
140 parameters was found to be excellent (above 0.87) except for spherical aberration (0.77).

141 For the 54 eyes that had less than 3 images captured that met all four of the image
142 quality metrics, the Kmax was 56.02 ± 6.44 . Of these, all 54 had poor quality placido images
143 and 27 also had poor Scheimpflug images. An inverse relationship with moderately strong
144 correlation was found between Kmax and the device's interpretation of the placido (Figure 1a;

145 $R^2 = 0.68$), but not Scheimpflug (Figure 1b; $R^2 = 0.08$) image quality. This suggests that the
146 placido image was more sensitive to degradation from corneal steepening in moderate or
147 advanced keratoconic disease.

148

149 **Discussion**

150 There are at least two previous studies that have investigated the repeatability of the
151 Galilei in a keratoconic population. Previously, Shetty et al evaluated 55 keratoconic eyes on
152 three different devices and found that the Galilei was the least repeatable when compared to the
153 Pentacam HR and the Sirius (Costruzione Strumenti Oftalmici, Florence, Italy)⁷. However, these
154 investigators only compared performance with respect to three keratometric indices (anterior
155 keratometry, thinnest corneal thickness, and posterior keratometry). More recently, Meyer et al
156 evaluated 50 keratoconic eyes and found the Pentacam to be superior to the Galilei with respect
157 to keratometry measurements, but found the reverse to be true with respect to pachymetry
158 measurements⁶. It is important to note, however, that all eyes, including those for which high
159 quality measurements could not be obtained, were included in the Meyer study analysis, and
160 that 25% of eyes on the Galilei and 12% on the Pentacam HR were reported to have poor
161 quality scans. The rationale for including these data is understandable; especially in abnormal
162 eyes, high quality measurements may not be obtainable. However, the disparate proportions of
163 poor quality data included in the analysis could also skew the results in favor of one device over
164 the other. It is well understood that poor quality data leads to less repeatable measurements,
165 but the present study is the first to quantify how much these repeatability limits are influenced by
166 image quality.

167 In the present study, RLs and ICCs were excellent when all four of the image quality
168 metrics were met. However, when a good placido image was not necessarily available, the

169 device was still able to use available Scheimpflug data to reliably report on various keratometric
170 indices. Dropping the requirement for a good placido image appeared to affect the RLs for the
171 magnitude of various keratometric indices more than it did the axes. For example, the RLs for
172 steep keratometry in the central zone (SimK; 0.37 and 0.77 D), maximum keratometry (Kmax;
173 0.79 and 1.65 D), and maximum anterior elevation (max_BFS_anterior; 3.66 and 7.17 μm) all
174 worsened when dropping the requirement for a good placido image; in contrast, RLs for steep
175 keratometry axis in the central zone (SimK axis; 13.80 and 13.88 degrees) and coma axis
176 (32.65 and 25.62 degrees) remained relatively unchanged. We therefore propose that poor
177 placido images do not warrant dismissal of the measurement altogether, assuming Scheimpflug
178 and other image quality metrics are met. The data must just be interpreted in a different context.

179 Many of the RLs found in the present study were lower than those in the de Luis
180 Eguileor study⁵. This was especially true when all four of the devices image quality metrics were
181 met. We hypothesize that this is due to the Pentacam HR's reliance upon a single Scheimpflug
182 camera. In contrast, the Galilei G4 employs placido disc video keratography and combines it
183 with two Scheimpflug cameras. Having two Scheimpflug cameras might also make the Galilei
184 less susceptible to motion artifact and parallax, since every point on the cornea is being viewed
185 from two different perspectives at any given time. Alternatively, the differences in RLs and ICCs
186 reported in the de Luis Eguileor study and current study may be due to differences in the
187 severity of keratoconus in the two study populations. A relationship between keratoconus
188 severity and measurement reliability was previously investigated by Hashemi et al, who found
189 that reliability of measurements was acceptable for all tested devices when mild keratoconics
190 were considered, but that reliability dropped off significantly when the maximum K reading was
191 greater than 55.0 D¹⁰. Many moderate and severe keratoconic eyes were imaged in the present
192 study, but were excluded from the analysis due to poor image quality. It would follow that
193 inclusion of these eyes would have increased RLs and ICCs.

194 The Global Consensus on Keratoconus and Ectatic Disease previously defined ectatic
195 progression by a consistent change in 2 of the 3 following parameters, where the magnitude of
196 the change is above the noise of the testing system: 1) steepening of the anterior corneal
197 surface, 2) steepening of the posterior corneal surface, or 3) thinning and/or an increase in the
198 rate of corneal thickness change from the periphery to the thinnest point⁴. With regards to
199 steepening of the anterior corneal surface, multiple authors have suggested a magnitude of
200 change in Kmax greater than 1.0 D as indicative of progression¹¹⁻¹³. Since the present study
201 found RLs for Steep SimK, Kmax, and BFS_anterior of 0.37 D, 0.79 D, and 0.04 mm (~ 0.25 D
202 change from mean BFS_anterior), respectively, we conclude that these three parameters may
203 be used to diagnose progression with the tested device. Similarly, the RL for the BFS_posterior
204 was 0.06 (~ 0.5 D change from mean BFS_posterior), and thus may also be a valid metric used
205 to satisfy the second criterion. With regards to thinning, Vinciguerra and Caporossi suggested a
206 change in thinnest corneal thickness (TCT) of 20 and 10 μ m, respectively, as a criterion for
207 defining progression after cross-linking^{14,15}. Since the present study's RL for this metric was
208 3.76 μ m, this metric can be used to satisfy the third criterion. It should be emphasized that these
209 metrics likely cannot be applied to poor quality images or those from moderate and severe
210 keratoconus, where RLs are likely higher.

211 The present study results also have implications with regards to the implantation of
212 ICRS. Alfonso et al previously proposed criteria for ICRS implantation which included 1) a
213 difference between the flat axis of the corneal cylinder measured with a Javal keratometer and
214 with an Orbscan IIz of less than 30 degrees and 2) a coma axis within 30 degrees of the flat
215 topographic axis¹⁶. The RL for the coma axis in the present study was high at 32.65 degrees,
216 suggesting that this metric cannot be relied upon to satisfy the Alfonso criteria when planning
217 ICRS orientation.

218 A limitations of this study includes the relatively small sample size, though similar to that
219 of previously published works in the same domain^{6,7}. Secondly, many eyes with clinically
220 moderate or severe keratoconus were scanned but not included in the data analysis since
221 neither good placido nor Scheimpflug images were unobtainable. As such, the results of this
222 study are most applicable to eyes with Stage I and II Amsler-Krumeich keratoconus. However,
223 detection of progression is also most important in this sub-population, in whom consideration for
224 ICRS or corneal cross-linking is most often applicable. It is much less important to know
225 whether progression is occurring in an eye with Stage III or IV keratoconus, where the only
226 option remaining for vision restoration is cornea transplant surgery.

227 In conclusion, we found that the Galilei Dual Scheimpflug Analyzer was highly
228 repeatable in quantifying parameters typically used in monitoring for keratoconus. Parameters
229 with especially low RLs included Steep SimK, anterior and posterior best fit sphere radius of
230 curvatures, and thinnest corneal thickness. Axis measurements and aberrometric parameters
231 (i.e. coma and spherical aberration) were less reliable, but may still be used to detect
232 progression when interpreted in the context of high image quality and milder keratoconic
233 disease. While the placido videokeratography information likely aids in the Galilei's sensitivity to
234 keratometric indices, it is also responsible for quickly degrading the quality of the data in more
235 advanced disease states. Poor quality placido images do not warrant dismissal of the
236 measurement altogether, assuming Scheimpflug and other image quality metrics are met. The
237 data must just be interpreted in the context of more relaxed repeatability limits.

238

239 **Acknowledgements**

240 The authors would like to acknowledge Drs. Tara O'Rourke and Donald Williams for their
241 assistance with patient recruitment.

242

243 **Declaration of Interest Statement**

244 None of the authors have any relevant financial disclosures.

245 **References**

246

- 247 1. Rabinowitz YS. Keratoconus. *Surv Ophthalmol*. 1998 Jan-Feb;42(4):297-319.
- 248 2. Gupta N, Trindade BL, Hooshmand J, Chan E. Variation in the Best Fit Sphere Radius of Curvature
249 as a Test to Detect Keratoconus Progression on a Scheimpflug-Based Corneal Tomographer. *J*
250 *Refract Surg*. 2018 Apr;34(4):260-263.
- 251 3. Martínez-Abad A, Piñero DP, Chorro E, Bataille L, Alio JL. Development of a Reference Model for
252 Keratoconus Progression Prediction Based on Characterization of the Course of Nonsurgically
253 Treated Cases. *Cornea*. 2018 Dec;37(12):1497-1505.
- 254 4. Gomes, JA, Rapuano CJ, Belin MW, Ambrosio R Jr, Group of Panelists for the Global Delphi Panel
255 of Keratoconus and Ectatic Diseases. Global Consensus on Keratoconus Diagnosis. *Cornea*. 2015
256 Dec;34(12):e38-9.
- 257 5. de Luis Eguileor B, Escudero Argaluz J, Pijoan Zubizarreta JJ, Santamaria Carro A, Etxebarria
258 Ecenarro J. Evaluation of the Reliability and Repeatability of Scheimpflug System Measurement
259 in Keratoconus. *Cornea*. 2018 Feb;37(2):177-181.
- 260 6. Meyer JJ, Gokul A, Vellara HR, Prime Z, McGhee CN. Repeatability and Agreement of Orbscan II,
261 Pentacam HR, and Galilei Tomography Systems in Corneas With Keratoconus. *Am J Ophthalmol*.
262 2017 Mar;175:122-128.
- 263 7. Shetty R, Arora V, Jayadev C, Nuijts RM, Kumar M, Puttaiah NK, Kummelil MK. Repeatability and
264 agreement of three Scheimpflug-based imaging systems for measuring anterior segment
265 parameters in keratoconus. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2014 Jul;55(8):5263-8.
- 266 8. Krumeich JH, Daniel J, Knülle A. Live-epikeratophakia for keratoconus. *J Cataract Refract Surg*.
267 1998 Apr;24(4):456-63.
- 268 9. McAlinden C, Khadka J, Pesudovs K. Precision (repeatability and reproducibility) studies and
269 sample-size calculation. *J Cataract Refract Surg*. 2015 Dec;41(12):2598-604.
- 270 10. Hashemi H, Yekta A, Khabazkhoob M. Effect of keratoconus grades on repeatability of
271 keratometry readings: Comparison of 5 devices. *J Cataract Refract Surg*. 2015 May;41(5):1065-
272 72.
- 273 11. Henriquez MA, Izquierdo L Jr, Bernilla C, Zakrzewski PA, Mannis M. Riboflavin/Ultraviolet A
274 corneal collagen cross-linking for the treatment of keratoconus: visual outcomes and
275 Scheimpflug analysis. *Cornea*. 2011 Mar;30(3):281-6.
- 276 12. Magli A, Forte R, Tortori A, Capasso L, Marsico G, Piozzi E. Epithelium-off corneal collagen cross-
277 linking versus transepithelial cross-linking for pediatric keratoconus. *Cornea*. 2013
278 May;32(5):597-601.
- 279 13. Poli M, Cornut PL, Balmitgere T, Aptel F, Janin H, Burillon C. Prospective study of corneal
280 collagen cross-linking efficacy and tolerance in the treatment of keratoconus and corneal
281 ectasia: 3-year results. *Cornea*. 2013 May;32(5):583-90.
- 282 14. Caporossi A, Mazzotta C, Paradiso AL, Baiocchi S, Marigliani D, Caporossi T. Transepithelial
283 corneal collagen crosslinking for progressive keratoconus: 24-month clinical results. *J Cataract*
284 *Refract Surg*. 2013 Aug;39(8):1157-63.
- 285 15. Vinciguerra R, Romano MR, Camesasca FI, Azzolini C, Trazza S, Morengi E, Vinciguerra P.
286 Corneal cross-linking as a treatment for keratoconus: four-year morphologic and clinical
287 outcomes with respect to patient age. *Ophthalmology*. 2013 May;120(5):908-16.
- 288 16. Alfonso JF, Lisa C, Merayo-Llodes J, Fernandez-Vega Cuento L, Montes-Mico R. Intrastromal
289 corneal ring segment implantation in paracentral keratoconus with coincident topographic and
290 coma axis. *J Cataract Refract Surg*. 2012 Sep;38(9):1576-82.

291 **Figure Captions**


292

293 **Figure 1 – Placido (a) and Scheimpflug (b) image quality scores (%) as a function of**
294 **Kmax (D).** There was a strong correlation between increasing maximum keratometry and
295 degradation of the placido image, but not the Scheimpflug image.

296


a)

Placido Image Quality Score vs. Kmax



b)

Scheimpflug Quality Score vs. Kmax



Kmax (D)