

1 **Evaluating Magnetic Stimulation as an Innovative Approach for Treating Dry**  
2 **Eye Syndrome: Safety and Efficacy Initial study**

3

4 Hadas Ben-Eli, PhD<sup>1,2</sup>, Shimon Perelman, MD<sup>1</sup>, Denise Wajnsztajn<sup>1</sup>, Abraham  
5 Solomon, MD<sup>1</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup>*Department of Ophthalmology, Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center, Jerusalem, Israel.*

8 <sup>2</sup>*Department of Optometry and Vision Science, Hadassah Academic College, Jerusalem, Israel.*

9

10 **Corresponding author:** Abraham Solomon, mail address: POB 1200, Jerusalem,  
11 Israel, 91120. Tel: +972-50-7874664. E-mail: [dr.avi.solomon@gmail.com](mailto:dr.avi.solomon@gmail.com)

12

13 **Meeting Presentation:** The ASCRS Annual Meeting, 2019, San Diego

14 **Conflict of Interest:** No conflicting relationship exists for any author.

15 **Running head: Magnetic Stimulation in Dry Eye Treatment: Initial Findings**

16 **Abstract**

17

18 **Objective:**

19 The objective of this study was to assess the safety and preliminary efficacy of  
20 repetitive magnetic stimulation (RMS) as an intervention for dry eye syndrome,  
21 focusing on symptom reduction.

22 **Methodology:**

23 This investigation involved 22 adult participants diagnosed with moderate to severe  
24 dry eye syndrome. These individuals were subjected to RMS treatment targeting one  
25 or both eyes using the VIVEYE - Ocular Magnetic Neurostimulation System Ver 1.0  
26 (Epitech-Mag LTD; NIH clinical trials registry #NCT03012698). A placebo-controlled  
27 group was also included for comparative analysis, with all subjects being monitored  
28 over a three-month period. The evaluation of safety encompassed monitoring changes  
29 in best corrected visual acuity, ocular pathology, and reporting of adverse events.  
30 Participant tolerance was gauged through questionnaires, measurements of intraocular  
31 pressure (IOP), Schirmer's test, and vital signs. The efficacy of the treatment was  
32 assessed by comparing pre- and post-treatment scores on fluorescein staining  
33 (according to the National Eye Institute (NEI) grading) and patient-reported outcomes.

34 **Results:**

35 The study found no significant changes in visual acuity, IOP, or Schirmer's test results  
36 between the RMS-treated and control groups ( $p < 0.05$ ), indicating RMS does not  
37 adversely affect these ocular functions. However, RMS treatment was associated with  
38 improved tear film stability ( $p = 0.198$  vs.  $p = 0.045$ ) and corneal health ( $p = 0.52$  vs.  
39  $p = 0.004$ ), with no improvements in the control group. Initial symptom improvement  
40 was observed in both RMS-treated and placebo groups ( $p = 0.007$  vs  $p = 0.008$ ),  
41 suggesting RMS's potential for treating ocular surface conditions.

42

43 **Conclusion:**

44 The findings of this study introduce repetitive magnetic stimulation (RMS) as a  
45 promising therapeutic option for dry eye syndrome, demonstrating its capability to  
46 promote corneal epithelium repair, enhance tear film stability, and improve subjective  
47 symptom evaluations without adversely affecting intraocular pressure, visual acuity, or  
48 tear production. This confirms the safety and suggests the efficacy of RMS therapy for  
49 dry eye conditions.

50 **Key words:** Dry eye; Magnetic Neurostimulation; Cornea; Treatment

51

52 **Introduction**

53 Dry Eye Disease (DED), also referred to as keratoconjunctivitis sicca (KCS), is  
54 identified by the International Dry Eye Workshop (DEWS, 2007) as a multifactorial  
55 disorder impacting the tears and ocular surface. This chronic condition leads to  
56 discomfort, visual disturbances, an unstable tear film, and possible ocular surface  
57 damage [1]. DED is a common diagnosis in ophthalmology, with a growing prevalence  
58 ranging from 5% to 33% in the adult population worldwide [1-3], and even higher, up to  
59 87%, in visual display terminal workers [4]. Notably, 78% of DED patients are women  
60 [2]. The symptoms, including irritation, stinging, and fluctuating visual disturbances,  
61 can progress to severe complications like vision impairment and corneal damage if left  
62 untreated [5], [6].

63 It is assumed that all the intrinsic and extrinsic etiology and risk factors that initiate  
64 DED development are associated with the disruption of the structure or function of one  
65 or more of the tear film layers, which leads to Corneo-conjunctival epithelial  
66 damage[1], [2]. Since the cornea is one of the most highly innervated tissues in the  
67 body, with terminal nerves ending in superficial layers of the epithelium in close  
68 contact with the environment, a wide spectrum of stimuli trigger the trigeminal

69 pathway to the somatosensory cortex and limbic system, resulting in the sensation of  
70 pain[3].

71 Traditional treatments largely involve topical lubricants and anti-inflammatory drops.  
72 Despite their widespread use, these methods pose economic challenges and often have  
73 limited efficacy, particularly in severe cases, necessitating long-term use [3], [9], [10].  
74 Recent advancements have introduced treatments based on heating and massaging the  
75 eyelids and meibomian glands, but these can be painful and provide only short-term  
76 relief [11-13]. As of today there are no therapeutic options that are significantly useful  
77 in the treatment of dry eye disorders. A novel non-invasive treatment based on  
78 repetitive magnetic stimulation (RMS) was recently studied in a pre-clinical trial and  
79 was reported to be extremely useful in protection of the corneal epithelium in short-  
80 term exposure keratopathy in a rabbit model[4]. Based on these preliminary results, a  
81 first-in-human study was performed by our group. The current study was the first  
82 clinical trial using this method of treatment on human subjects with DED.

83 Neuromodulation is a recent approach that utilizes electrical signals to modulate  
84 abnormal neural function through neurostimulation. This newly developed technique  
85 stimulates the nervous system via electrical currents[5], either by external electric  
86 field[4] or intranasal neurostimulation therapy, to stimulate tear production[5], [6].

87 The RMS treatment was developed based on the transcranial magnetic stimulation  
88 (TMS) approach, which is based on neurostimulation and neuromodulation and is in  
89 clinical use (FDA approved since 2008) for treatment of a variety of neurological and  
90 psychiatric disorders such as obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD)[7], depressive  
91 disorders[8], schizophrenia, and Parkinson's disease[9]. Neuromodulation, as defined  
92 by the International Neuromodulation Society, involves altering nerve activity through  
93 stimuli like electrical stimulation or chemical agents to a specific neurological site [17].  
94 Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) is thought to modulate neuronal  
95 systems through various mechanisms. These include altering neurotransmitter and ion  
96 channel activities, inducing intra-cortical inhibition and long-term potentiation, and  
97 affecting gene expression and growth factor production. It also impacts signaling

98 pathways and the glutamate-mediated blood-brain barrier. Additionally, rTMS is  
99 believed to stimulate parasympathetic innervation to the lacrimal glands [11][12].  
100 The current study focuses on the application of RMS in humans, following its efficacy  
101 in decreasing epithelial corneal erosions in a rabbit model of exposure keratopathy [4].  
102 This study aims to assess the safety and efficacy of a novel non-invasive instrument  
103 designed for treating Dry Eye Disease (DED) patients, marking the first human trial of  
104 the RMS procedure.

105

106

107

108

109        **Methods**

110        **Study design**

111        Prospective, hospital-based, interventional, open-label, single group assignment  
112        study (#ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT03012698)[10].

113        ***Study aims***

114        The primary objective of this study was to evaluate the safety of repetitive magnetic  
115        stimulation (RMS) as a treatment for dry eye disease. The secondary objectives were to  
116        assess the tolerability of the treatment and to determine its preliminary efficacy in  
117        reducing signs and symptoms of dry eye.

118        ***Study endpoints***

119        The primary endpoint of this study was the evaluation of successful RMS treatment for  
120        dry eye disease measured by a lack of deterioration in the best corrected visual acuity  
121        (BCVA) and reduction in DED signs and symptoms. The secondary endpoints were  
122        based on safety and tolerability measures: pathological ocular changes observed in a  
123        slit lamp bio microscopy assessment, any adverse events, questionnaire-based  
124        tolerability assessment, intraocular pressure, Schirmer's test, and vital signs (heart rate,  
125        blood pressure and body temperature) are all indications for trial termination. Efficacy  
126        secondary endpoints include clinically and statistically significant reduced fluorescein  
127        staining scores between baseline and post-treatment visits at any of the follow-up time  
128        point, reduced ocular discomfort between baseline and post treatment visits at any of  
129        follow up time points (questionnaire score) and an improvement in tear film as  
130        measured in Tear Break out Time (TBUT).

131

132

133

134        **Participants**

135        This study included 22 male and female adult patients with moderate to severe dry  
136        eye syndrome classified by severity of signs and symptoms[11] with different  
137        etiologies (meibomian gland Dysfunction (MGD), Sjogren’s Syndrome (SS),  
138        aqueous tear deficiency (ATD) and graft versus host disease (GVHD)), recruited at  
139        the Ophthalmology Clinics of Hadassah Medical Center. Patients received one-  
140        time treatment with the VIVEYE - Ocular Magnetic Neurostimulation System Ver  
141        1.0 (Epitech-Mag LTD., Israel, 2016).

142

143        The follow up period was 12 weeks and involved 10 evaluations (screening,  
144        baseline, treatment, 1 day, 1 month, 2 months, 3 months, and bi-weekly phone  
145        calls). At each visit, patients were examined for treatment safety and efficacy, as  
146        well as symptomatic grading, as will be detailed. Contact lens wearers were asked  
147        to refrain from using contact lenses for the duration of the study.

148        The study was approved by the national Ministry of Health (#20162621) and by the  
149        institutional Helsinki committees of Hadassah Medical Center ( #HMO-0405-  
150        19).This study was also registered in the NIH clinical trials registry  
151        (#ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT03012698 [10]). Recruitment started on  
152        December 4, 2017 and ended on April 25, 2021. All participants signed a consent  
153        form prior to enrollment after receiving a verbal and written explanation on the  
154        study, and all data was coded and analyzed anonymously.

155

156        ***Inclusion / exclusion criteria***

157        This study included males and females between the ages of 18-80 years, who have been  
158        diagnosed with moderate to severe dry eyes and were able to understand the

159 requirements of the study protocol and providing informed consent. Individuals with  
160 other ocular surface pathologies requiring treatment beyond ocular lubricants and  
161 conventional eyelid hygiene, concurrent ocular diseases such as ocular infection or  
162 pterygium, recent ocular surgery (within the last 6 months) or LASIK (within the past  
163 year prior the recruitment), ocular injury or ocular herpes infection within the last 3  
164 months were excluded. Also, patients who have recently taken central nervous system  
165 drugs, require contact lenses during the study, have thyroid disorders, alcoholism, are  
166 pregnant or nursing, have HIV, or have various implants like pacemakers or cochlear  
167 implants. Additionally, patients with significant heart or brain diseases, a history of  
168 neurological conditions, or those who have recently participated in another ophthalmic  
169 trial are also excluded.

170

### 171 ***Instrument***

172 The VIVEYE - Ocular Magnetic Neurostimulation System Ver 1.0 (Epitech-Mag  
173 LTD., Israel, 2016) is a non-invasive stimulation device intended for the application  
174 of localized electromagnetic stimulation to the cornea in adult patients with dry eye  
175 disorders (device overview at Supplementary Table S1). Its main components are a  
176 Rapid2 stimulator unit and a pair of coil applicators. The applicators are attached to  
177 a positioning device for adjustment of their position relative to the patient's eyes.  
178 At any given time, only one coil can be connected to the stimulator so only one eye  
179 is treated. The system uses a commercial ophthalmic table (CE marked) and chin  
180 rest to adjust to various patient sizes. The Rapid2 stimulator is the central  
181 component of the system and controls the various properties of the magnetic  
182 stimulation, such as intensity and rate. It consists of a generator unit, a touchscreen  
183 for selecting the treatment parameters and triggering the stimulation, and a set of  
184 coils. This device was approved and standardized by the international harmonized  
185 standards for clinical investigation of medical devices (ISO 14155, Clinical  
186 investigation of medical devices for human subjects).



187 Each eye is treated separately in the VIVEYE - Ocular Magnetic Neurostimulation  
188 System, taking about 11 minutes to complete a set of magnetic pulses. Each  
189 participant received demo magnetic pulses on the hand and the eye prior the  
190 treatment to understand the sensation of the light vibration stimulated by the  
191 device. Any metallic objects around the face were removed before treatment. Each  
192 participant completed a set of 32 magnetic pulses in gradually increasing power,  
193 reaching a maximal intensity of 45%.

194

195 ***Safety and efficacy tests:***

196 Safety and efficacy of the VIVEYE - Ocular Magnetic Neurostimulation System  
197 was based on ophthalmic and vital signs that were evaluated at each follow up  
198 visit. Safety tests included assessment of treatment-related adverse or serious  
199 adverse events, best corrected visual acuity (BCVA, ETDRS chart, LogMAR  
200 units), intra-ocular pressure (IOP) measurement, Schirmer II test (with local  
201 anesthesia, measuring mm/5 min)[12], external eye examination by slit lamp  
202 biomicroscopy assessment, fundus examination (with dilation at baseline visit, 1  
203 day, 1 week and 12 weeks post treatment) and SD-OCT[13] at baseline visit, 1  
204 week and 12 weeks post treatment.

205 Treatment efficacy tests included TBUT[14], [15] which was repeated three times  
206 with the mean result recorded, and corneal fluorescein staining photography (BI  
207 900), in which two strips of fluorescein were diluted in 500 $\mu$ l of saline solution for  
208 1.5 minutes, and then inserted of 0.2 $\mu$ l to the conjunctival fornix. Subjective  
209 grading of the corneal erosion and fluorescein staining was done using the well-  
210 validated National Eye Institute (NEI) grading scale, commonly used in clinical  
211 settings[16], [17]. The NEI scale divides the cornea into five different areas, and  
212 each area is given a subjective score between 0 and 3 based on the number, size and  
213 confluence of the superficial punctate erosions. To fully evaluate the efficacy for  
214 the novel approach for treating Dry Eye Disease, we employed a comprehensive

215 approach to understand the full impact of our intervention on participants'  
216 symptoms and quality of life. For this purpose, we selected two distinct  
217 questionnaires, each with a unique focus and strength, to ensure a comprehensive  
218 evaluation. At each visit the patients answered Quality of life (QoL) and eye  
219 dryness symptoms questionnaires (modified SPEED questionnaire [18] and  
220 PROWL questionnaire [19]) and the visual analog scale (VAS) for eye dryness [20]  
221 and monitoring of use of ophthalmic lubricants. Quality of Life (QOL) surveys  
222 were assessed for each participant throughout the three-month follow-up duration.  
223 To normalize the outcomes, a scoring system was applied where the minimum  
224 QOL scores were allocated a value of 1, and the maximum scores were given a  
225 value of 5. This method of scoring was crucial for integrating the results from the  
226 different QoL questionnaires used in our study, allowing for a unified analysis of  
227 the data.

228

229 ***Course of experiment:***

230 Patients consulting the cornea clinics at Hadassah Medical Center with  
231 complaints of dry eyes were approached for participation. Those who  
232 potentially qualified to participate in the study underwent a screening test to  
233 ensure they met the inclusion criteria and to grade the severity of eye dryness  
234 with a validated scaling approach of signs and symptoms[11] Only patients  
235 with moderate to severe levels of eye dryness were included in the current  
236 study. The severity grading and all the ophthalmic clinical evaluations were  
237 done by cornea specialists (A.S, D.W ). A detailed systemic and ophthalmic  
238 history was documented for each participant.  
239 The follow-up period was 12 weeks and included 8 visits: screening, baseline,  
240 treatment, 1 day, 1 week, 4 weeks, 8 weeks and 12 weeks post-treatment, as well  
241 as bi-weekly phone calls at 2, 6 and 10 weeks (see study visit scheme at  
242 Supplementary Table S2). Each follow-up by phone included an eye dryness  
243 questionnaire and drug intake monitoring. Follow up visits in the clinic also

244 included many safety and efficacy tests, as was detailed above. The study was  
245 divided into two phases. In the first phase, therapy was administered to only  
246 one eye per patient, leaving the other eye with no treatment (n=7), and patients  
247 were not informed about which eye was treated. Although both eyes underwent  
248 identical procedures, only one eye received magnetic stimulation, while the  
249 other eye received a placebo treatment. In the following phase, the participants  
250 were divided into two groups: one received treatment for both eyes during the  
251 same session (n=9), whereas the other group received placebo treatments for  
252 both eyes (n=6). Several participants failed to complete all the planned follow-  
253 up visits, resulting in their exclusion from the study's statistical evaluation  
254 (n=2).

255

256

257 ***Statistical analysis:***

258

259 Quantitative variables are presented as mean and standard deviation, and changes  
260 across different time points were assessed using the Friedman nonparametric test.  
261 Comparison between two independent groups' quantitative variables was conducted  
262 using either the t-test or the non-parametric Mann-Whitney (M-W) test. Simultaneous  
263 evaluation of time, treatment effects, and their interaction was achieved through the  
264 application of the repeated measures ANOVA model, employing the greenhouse  
265 Geiser test. Associations between two categorical variables were tested using the Chi-  
266 square test and Fisher's exact test. The utilization of nonparametric tests was prompted  
267 by the limited sample size. All statistical tests were two-tailed, with a significance  
268 threshold set at p-value  $\leq 0.05$  to determine statistical significance. Statistical analysis  
269 was performed using JMP® Statistical Discovery software, version 14.3.0 from SAS®  
270 Institute Inc., Cary NC.

271

272

273

274

275        **Results**

276        A total of 20 patients were included in this study, with mean age [and SD] of 51.4 [18.6]  
277        for the treated group and 47.7 [17.9] for the non-treated group. The overall age range  
278        was 22-79 (Table 1). As expected, most of the study participants were women in both  
279        groups (N =16; 84% and N =22; 88% respectively.) Sjogern was the most common  
280        clinical manifestation among the treated and non-treated group. Other common  
281        etiologies were aqueous tear deficiency and meibomian gland dysfunction. While  
282        composing mostly of these 3 etiologies, there was no statistically significant  
283        differences in the dispersion of different etiologies between the treatment groups.  
284        [Table 1]. Baseline measurements of Intra-Ocular Pressure (IOP), Best Corrected  
285        Visual Acuity (BCVA) and Shirmer test exhibited no comparable values between the  
286        two groups.

287        We found no significant differences in baseline intraocular pressure, best-corrected  
288        visual acuity, or tear production between the group that received treatment and the  
289        control group [Table 1].

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

**Table 1. Basic characteristics study participants**

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

Characteristic	Treated eye (N=21) Mean±SD	Non-Treated eye (N=19) Mean±SD	P
Mean Age (years)	51.4±18.6	47.7±17.9	0.53 <sup>c</sup>
Age Range (years)	22-79	22-71	
Female gender N(%)	18 [85%]	16 [84%]	0.72 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Dry eye classification (N(%)):</b>			
• Sjogren's Syndrome	• 15 [57.9%] • 3 [12%]	• 11 [57.9%] • 5 [26%]	0.26 <sup>d</sup>
• Aqueous tear deficiency	• 3 [12%]	• 3 [15.8%]	
• MGD			
Treated eye RE N(%)	57.9%	68%	0.76 <sup>b</sup>
IOP at baseline (mmHg)	14.5 ±1.4	13.76 ±0.9	0.31 <sup>a</sup>
BCVA at baseline (LogMAR)	0.7 ±0.1	0.7 ±0.10	0.66 <sup>a</sup>
Schirmer test at baseline (mm)	4.5 ±1.5	5.2 ±1.6	0.69 <sup>a</sup>
<sup>a</sup> analyzed with Mann-Whitney test <sup>b</sup> Chi-square <sup>c</sup> T-Test <sup>d</sup> Fisher-Freeman-Halton Exact Test IOP=Intra-Ocular pressure; BCVA= Best Corrected Visual Acuity			

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

The safety of RMS was examined using various tests. One of them was Best corrected visual acuity (BCVA) over several time points of both treated and non-treated eyes were compared and presented at [Table 2]. The BCVA measurements were obtained for both treated and non-treated eyes at enrolment and subsequently at 1 week, 1 month, 2-month and 3-month intervals. The mean BCVA values demonstrated no statistically significant differences between the treated and non-treated eyes across different time points as shown in [Table 2].

327

**Table 2: Safety of Repetitive Magnetic Stimulation**

Treatment	Measurement	Time	Mean ± SD	P Value of Change Over Time
Treated N=21	BCVA	Enrolment	0.22±0.28	0.13 <sup>a</sup>
		1 Week	0.17±0.26	
		1 Month	0.15±0.26	
		2 Months	0.15±0.26	
		3 Months	0.19±0.26	
	IOP	Enrolment	13.76±2.57	0.16 <sup>a</sup>
		1 Week	12.40±2.68	
		1 Month	11.96±3.43	
		2 Months	11.96±2.65	
		3 Months	12.90±3.13	
	Schirmer	Enrolment	5.24±4.32	0.42 <sup>b</sup>
		1 Week	4.44±3.65	
1 Month		4.64±4.00		
2 Months		4.13±3.70		
3 Months		3.62±2.71		
Not Treated N=19	BCVA	Enrolment	0.14±0.27	0.39 <sup>a</sup>
		1 Week	0.15±0.28	
		1 Month	0.14±0.26	
		2 Months	0.14±0.26	
		3 Months	0.16±0.28	
	IOP	Enrolment	14.53±3.24	0.74 <sup>a</sup>
		1 Week	13.05±3.31	
		1 Month	13.84±3.43	
		2 Months	13.42±3.31	
		3 Months	13.89±3.13	
	Schirmer	Enrolment	4.53±3.65	0.51 <sup>b</sup>
		1 Week	3.89±2.76	
1 Month		3.47±2.95		
2 Months		4.5±4.1		
3 Months		4.47±3.60		

<sup>a</sup> Calculated using Freidman Test

<sup>b</sup> Calculated using Greenhouse-Geisser Test

IOP=Intra-Ocular pressure; BCVA= Best Corrected Visual Acuity

328

329

330

331 To further assess the safety of RMS, we compared IOP values over time between  
 332 treated and untreated groups. The IOP measurements at baseline (enrolment) and  
 333 subsequent time points (1 week, 1 month, 2 months, and 3 months) are presented in  
 334 table 2. Overall, while both groups exhibited decreases in mean IOP over the 3-  
 335 month period, both treated groups did not show consistent reduction. Nevertheless,  
 336 both groups exhibited stability in the IOP and showed no statistically significant  
 337 changes over time as shown in [Table 2].

338 Moreover, to further investigate the safety of RMS treatment, we tracked the  
339 change in Schirmer change over time in two distinct treatment groups: the Not  
340 Treated group and the Treated group over a three-month period. The standard  
341 deviation and mean values are summarized in [table 2]. In the non-treated group  
342 despite observable fluctuations, the change over time within this group did not  
343 achieve statistical significance ( $p = 0.51$ ). Similarly, in the Treated group the change  
344 over time within the Treated group did not show statistical significance ( $p = 0.417$ ).

345 When comparing the change over time between the two groups, no statistically  
346 significant difference emerged ( $p > 0.05$ ). Both the Not Treated and Treated groups  
347 displayed variable Schirmer test values over the study period, but with no  
348 statistically significant change between the groups.

349 For the evaluation of efficacy, over the span of 3 months we measured the National  
350 Eye Institute (NEI) for each eye at different time points. We have evaluated the total  
351 scores across different time points for both the treated and non-treated groups.  
352 Table 3 provides a summary of the mean NEI total scores along with corresponding  
353 sample sizes and the results of statistical comparisons as shown in [Table 2].

354 In the non-treated eyes group, the mean NEI scores displayed no statistically  
355 significant change across different time intervals. In contrast, the treated group  
356 exhibited a significant pattern of change). The statistical significance of these  
357 changes was evaluated and showed revealing a significant difference in the treated  
358 group's NEI total scores over time ( $P = 0.004$ ). However, the NEI total scores in the  
359 non-treated group did not show significant changes over time ( $P > 0.05$ ). These  
360 scores are presented in [Fig 1].

361

362

363



364 Efficacy of the RMS was also assessed by Tear Break-Up Time (TBUT) changes over  
 365 a three-month period in the two groups: a Non-Treated Group and a Treated Group.  
 366 [Table 3].

367

**Table 3. Comparative Analysis of NEI and TBUT Scores in treatment Groups Over Time**

Time Point	Group	NEI Mean (±SD)	TBUT Mean Rank (±SD)	NEI P value	TBUT P value
Enrolment	<b>Not Treated</b> <b>N=19</b>	6.68 ± 3.65	3.24 ± 2.72	0.52 <sup>a</sup>	0.19 <sup>b</sup>
Week 1		6.32 ± 3.71	3.64 ± 2.03		
Month 1		6.05 ± 3.29	2.7 ± 1.71		
Month 2		6.16 ± 3.16	4.22 ± 2.28		
Month 3		5.47 ± 3.85	3.99 ± 2.06		
Enrolment	<b>Treated</b> <b>N=21</b>	9.76 ± 3.80	2.94 ± 1.56	<b>0.004<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>0.04<sup>b</sup></b>
Week 1		7.62 ± 4.43	3.26 ± 1.19		
Month 1		6.67 ± 4.35	3.19 ± 1.29		
Month 2		5.19 ± 3.60	3.77 ± 0.99		
Month 3		7.24 ± 5.02	3.99 ± 1.24		

<sup>a</sup> Calculated using Greenhouse-Geisser Test.  
<sup>b</sup> Calculated using the Friedman Test  
 TBUT- Tear Break Out Time  
 NEI= National Eye Institute Grading Scale

368

369

370

371

372 For the non-treated group, no statistically significant changes in TBUT scores across  
 373 the designated time intervals (P=0.198). Contrarily, TBUT scores for the treated group  
 374 showed an improvement in the period tested with statistical significance (p=0.045).  
 375 These changes with the pattern of change of the testing period are showed in [Fig 2].

376

377

378

379

**Table 4. Subjective assessment Score Change Over Time by Treatment Group**

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

Treatment		Score Mean	P <sup>a</sup>
Group	Time	(±SD)	
<b>Not Treated</b>	Enrolment	12.50 (±1.55)	<b>0.008</b>
	Score		
	1 week score	8.27 (±1.36)	
	1 month score	8.09 (±1.62)	
	2-month score	7.27 (±1.61)	
<b>Treated</b>	3-month score	8.45 (±1.45)	<b>0.007</b>
	Enrolment	7.42 (±1.26)	
	Score		
	1 week score	5.95 (±1.07)	
	1 month score	5.65 (±1.23)	
	2-month score	6.65 (±1.38)	
	3-month score	5.81 (±1.45)	

<sup>a</sup>Calculated using the Friedman Test

393

394

395 In addition, an evaluation of the Subjective assessment scores was performed for both  
 396 the non-treated and the treated groups. Over a corresponding 3-month period and  
 397 matching time points, the Subjective score for each patient was measured [Table 4].

398 The Subjective assessment scores exhibited notable changes throughout the study.

399 Both the treated and non-treated groups had statistically significant changes (P<0.001

400 and  $P < 0.005$  respectively). These changes with the pattern of change of the testing  
401 period are showed in [Fig 3]

402

### 403 **Discussion**

404 In the present study, the safety and initial efficacy of repetitive magnetic  
405 stimulation (RMS) as a pioneering, first-in-human therapeutic intervention for dry  
406 eye syndrome was explored. This study encompassed 22 adult subjects diagnosed  
407 with moderate to severe dry eye syndrome, who underwent treatment utilizing the  
408 VIVEYE - Ocular Magnetic Neurostimulation System Ver 1.0. The primary  
409 endpoints of this research were the safety, tolerability, and preliminary  
410 effectiveness of the intervention. Our findings indicate that RMS is a safe and well-  
411 tolerated modality, which resulted in significant amelioration of dry eye symptoms,  
412 as evidenced by improved fluorescein staining scores and reduced patient-reported  
413 ocular discomfort, thereby underscoring the innovative potential of this treatment in  
414 managing dry eye disease.

415 Neurostimulation, as indicated in prior animal research, influences epithelial cells  
416 via the activation of trigeminal nerve endings [21][22][23]. The suggested mechanism  
417 for this activation is through secretion of neurotransmitters and neurotrophic factors  
418 [23], although the exact nature is unclear. RMS may have therapeutic effect on the  
419 parasympathetic innervation of the lacrimal gland and conjunctival goblet cells[24].  
420 In trials involving repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation, long-term impacts  
421 have been linked to alterations in gene and protein expression [25][26][27][28].  
422 Substance P, a trigeminal nerve neuropeptide has been observed to promote cell  
423 attachment through E-cadherin and stimulate DNA synthesis and growth in vitro  
424 [29][30] , leading to epithelial cell proliferation [31] Collectively, these findings  
425 suggest that RMS treatment in animal models may offer corneal protection,

426 positioning it as a potential safe therapeutic option for patients with exposure  
427 keratopathy [23]

428 Our study, drawing on precedents from prior research (28), indicates that the  
429 therapeutic efficacy of Repetitive Magnetic Stimulation (RMS) in alleviating Dry  
430 Eye Syndrome primarily operates through the proliferation of epithelial cells.  
431 Consistent Schirmer test scores observed across the study period suggest that the  
432 observed improvements in both subjective and objective measures are not  
433 attributable to alterations in tear secretion. Notably, significant modifications were  
434 detected in parameters indicative of epithelial transformation, including National  
435 Eye Institute (NEI) scores and Tear Film Break-Up Time (TBUT), lending further  
436 support to the proposition that RMS promotes epithelial cell changes and  
437 proliferation. This aligns with the hypothesized mechanism of RMS action  
438 involving direct stimulation of trigeminal nerve fibers, which leads to the release of  
439 neuromodulators from sensory nerve endings, thereby directly stimulating corneal  
440 epithelial growth.

441 Several previous studies have investigated the use of different forms of  
442 neurostimulation in humans for the treatment of dry eye disease. A study that  
443 investigated the use of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) [32]  
444 found that this treatment improved symptoms of dry eye, including ocular  
445 discomfort and tear film instability. Similarly, the use intranasal tear stimulator  
446 (ITS) [33] was reported to improved symptoms of dry eye. Moreover, in animals,  
447 treatment with electrical stimulation of the lacrimal gland (LNS) and afferent nerves  
448 for enhanced tear secretion [34] also found to improve symptoms of dry eye.

449 All these studies, that were developed to treat dry eye signs and symptoms and are  
450 based on electric stimulation, including the current one, suggest that  
451 neurostimulation may be a promising treatment option for dry eye disease.  
452 However, it is worth noting that these studies used different forms of

453 neurostimulation (TENS, LNS, ITS, RMS) and different stimulation parameters. It  
454 is therefore difficult to directly compare the results of these treatments and further  
455 research is needed to determine the optimal form and parameters of  
456 neurostimulation for the treatment of dry eye disease.

457 Contrary to the methodologies referenced in preceding studies, our investigation  
458 showcases distinct advantages that potentially augment treatment outcomes and  
459 patient compliance. For instance, while previous studies on Transcutaneous  
460 Electrical Nerve Stimulation (TENS) required a regimen of 20 sessions spread over  
461 five sessions per week (29), our protocol involved a mere four treatment sessions.  
462 Furthermore, unlike studies focusing on intranasal tear stimulation (30), our method  
463 is entirely non-invasive, thereby circumventing the adverse effects associated with  
464 invasive procedures, such as epistaxis. These distinctions underscore the benefits of  
465 utilizing repetitive magnetic stimulation over the methods employed in these prior  
466 studies, offering a non-invasive and more manageable treatment approach.  
467 Consequently, these characteristics are likely to enhance patient adherence and  
468 overall satisfaction with the treatment regimen, underscoring the potential for  
469 improved clinical outcomes and patient experiences.

470 The current study is subject to several limitations that might impact the  
471 extrapolation of its findings. Firstly, the relatively small sample size, a consequence  
472 of the high costs associated with conducting the trial, may restrict the  
473 generalizability of the results. Additionally, the cohort consisted exclusively of  
474 individuals presenting with moderate to severe dry eye syndrome, suggesting that  
475 the observed efficacy of repetitive magnetic stimulation (RMS) may not extend to  
476 those with milder forms of the condition. The potential for bias is further  
477 compounded by the study's open-label design, where some participants were  
478 allocated to a placebo group, and others received active treatment in both eyes.  
479 Variability in the subjective assessment questionnaires, despite efforts to maintain  
480 consistency in scoring and analysis, introduces another layer of complexity that

481 could potentially lead to statistical inaccuracies and fail to accurately reflect the  
482 progression of symptoms over time.

483 Despite these methodological constraints, our study identified significant  
484 improvements in signs and symptoms associated with dry eye disease among the  
485 participants. These key findings highlight the potential of RMS as an effective  
486 intervention for reducing symptoms of dry eye syndrome, underscoring its promise  
487 despite the noted limitations.

488 This study presents an innovative approach to the management of Dry Eye Disease  
489 (DED), introducing a non-invasive, cost-effective, and efficient therapeutic method.  
490 Our findings indicate that Repetitive Magnetic Stimulation (RMS) promotes  
491 epithelial healing and elicits notable improvements in both objective dry eye  
492 parameters and subjective patient experiences, with favorable tolerance levels  
493 reported. To our knowledge, the application of RMS in DED treatment represents a  
494 novel exploration not previously documented in the literature. This contrasts with its  
495 use in psychiatric conditions, such as obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD), where  
496 treatment typically necessitates multiple sessions per week. Our protocol, however,  
497 implemented RMS in a singular session format. This initial evidence supports the  
498 potential for further investigation and broader application of this technology,  
499 including modifications to stimulus frequency, timing, and an increased number of  
500 treatment sessions, which may unveil greater benefits in DED management.

501

502 Furthermore, corroborating evidence from animal studies involving rabbits suggests  
503 RMS as an efficacious intervention for corneal protection and a safe, efficient  
504 treatment for patients with exposure keratopathy. Its non-invasive, pain-free nature,  
505 coupled with rapid and significant therapeutic outcomes, positions RMS as a viable  
506 alternative for patients unresponsive to conventional therapies. The infrequent need  
507 for treatment sessions, spaced months apart, enhances its cost-effectiveness and  
508 convenience, particularly by obviating the daily use of eye drops. The simplicity and

509 minimal maintenance requirements of this therapy make it especially appealing for  
510 patients reluctant to undergo invasive procedures or those with contraindications to  
511 existing treatments. Moreover, the technology's ease of use extends its applicability  
512 to a broad range of healthcare providers, including office staff, ophthalmologists,  
513 optometrists, and nursing staff.

514

515 While our findings are encouraging, further research is imperative to corroborate  
516 these results comprehensively and assess the long-term impacts of magnetic  
517 stimulation on dry eye disease treatment.

## 518 **Conclusions**

519 This study introduces a groundbreaking method by applying repetitive magnetic  
520 stimulation (RMS) as a non-invasive treatment for dry eye syndrome. The outcomes  
521 underscore RMS's safety and its potential efficacy in promoting tear film stability,  
522 mitigating corneal damage, and alleviating patient-reported symptoms, all without  
523 negative effects on intraocular pressure, visual acuity, or tear secretion. These  
524 findings suggest the feasibility of incorporating RMS into the treatment repertoire  
525 for dry eye disease, indicating a potential paradigm shift towards non-  
526 pharmacological therapeutic approaches. Nonetheless, additional research is  
527 required to delineate the long-term efficacy of this treatment and to refine the  
528 treatment protocols, heralding a novel avenue in ophthalmic treatment strategies.

## 529 **Acknowledgements**

530 This paper was part of the requirements for Shimon Perelman's MD title from the  
531 Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel. This research received no specific grant from  
532 any agency.

## 533 **Data Availability:**

534 The data set generated during the current study is available from the corresponding  
535 authors on reasonable request.

536

537 **Figure legends:**

538 **Fig 1: Comparative Assessment of NEI Scores Over Time**

539 This graph illustrates the changes in the National Eye Institute (NEI) Total Scores  
540 over a period of three months, comparing groups that were treated  
541 (Green) and not treated (Orange). Each bar represents the mean  $\pm$ SE  
542 NEI Total Score at five time points: Enrollment, 1 Week, 1 Month,  
543 2 Months, and 3 Months. The black asterisks represent the statistical  
544 significance in the differences observed.

545

546 **Fig 2: Comparative Assessment of Tear Break Out Time Between Treatment**

547 **Groups.** This figure illustrates the temporal progression of Tear  
548 Break-Up Time (TBUT) scores across five different time points.  
549 The graph is comparing groups that were treated (red) and not  
550 treated (Blue). Each bar represents the mean  $\pm$ SE TBUT score. The  
551 black asterisks represent the statistical significance in the  
552 differences observed.

553

554 **Fig 3. Subjective Assessment Score Change Over Time by Treatment Group.**

555 This graph illustrates the changes in the National Eye Institute (NEI) Total Scores  
556 over a period of three months, comparing groups that were treated  
557 (Orange) and not treated (Blue). Each bar represents the mean  $\pm$ SE  
558 NEI Total Score at five time points: Enrollment, 1 Week, 1 Month,  
559 2 Months, and 3 Months. The red asterisks represent the statistical  
560 significance in the differences observed.

561

562

563 **References**

- 564 [1] J. Gayton, "Etiology , prevalence , and treatment of dry eye disease," *Clin*  
565 *Ophthalmol.*, vol. 3, pp. 405–412, 2009.
- 566 [2] D. F. Courtin R, Pereira B, Naughton G, Chamoux A, Chiambaretta F, Lanhers C,  
567 "Prevalence of dry eye disease in visual display terminal workers: a systematic review  
568 and meta-analysis," *BMJ Open*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2016, doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-  
569 009675.



- 570 [3] A. Galor and M. Miami, "Painful Dry Eye Symptoms : A Nerve Problem or a Tear  
571 Problem ?," *Ophthalmology*, vol. 126, no. 5, pp. 648–651, 2019, doi:  
572 10.1016/j.ophtha.2019.01.028.
- 573 [4] I. Sher *et al.*, "Repetitive magnetic stimulation protects corneal epithelium in a rabbit  
574 model of short-term exposure keratopathy," *Ocular Surface*, 2019, doi:  
575 10.1016/j.jtos.2019.09.009.
- 576 [5] G. Dieckmann, F. Fregni, and P. Hamrah, "Neurostimulation in dry eye disease—past,  
577 present, and future," *Ocular Surface*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 20–2, 2019, doi:  
578 10.1016/j.jtos.2018.11.002.
- 579 [6] J. D. Sheppard *et al.*, *Characterization of tear production in subjects with dry eye  
580 disease during intranasal tear neurostimulation: Results from two pivotal clinical  
581 trials*. Elsevier Inc. doi: 10.1016/j.jtos.2018.11.009.
- 582 [7] L. Carmi, U. Alyagon, N. Barnea-ygael, J. Zohar, R. Dar, and A. Zangen, "Clinical and  
583 electrophysiological outcomes of deep TMS over the medial prefrontal and anterior  
584 cingulate cortices in OCD patients," *Brain Stimul*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 158–165, 2018,  
585 doi: 10.1016/j.brs.2017.09.004.
- 586 [8] S. Fiocchi, M. Longhi, P. Ravazzani, Y. Roth, A. Zangen, and M. Parazzini, "Modelling of  
587 the Electric Field Distribution in Deep Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation in the  
588 Adolescence , in the Adulthood , and in the Old Age," *Comput Math Methods Med.*,  
589 2016.
- 590 [9] B. J. Seewoo, K. W. Feindel, S. J. Etherington, and J. Rodger, "Frequency-specific  
591 effects of low-intensity rTMS can persist for up to 2 weeks post-stimulation: A  
592 longitudinal rs-fMRI / MRS study in rats," *Brain Stimul*, no. xxxx, 2019, doi:  
593 10.1016/j.brs.2019.06.028.
- 594 [10] "NCT03012698 @ clinicaltrials.gov."
- 595 [11] A. Behrens *et al.*, "Dysfunctional tear syndrome: a Delphi approach to treatment  
596 recommendations.," *Cornea*, vol. 25, no. 8, pp. 900–907, 2006.
- 597 [12] P. Versura, V. Profazio, and E. C. Campos, "Performance of tear osmolarity compared  
598 to previous diagnostic tests for dry eye diseases.," *Curr Eye Res*, vol. 35, no. 7, pp.  
599 553–564, 2010, doi: 10.3109/02713683.2010.484557.
- 600 [13] I. Sher *et al.*, "Multimodal Assessment of Corneal Erosions Using Optical Coherence  
601 Tomography and Automated Grading of Fluorescein Staining in a Rabbit Dry Eye  
602 Model," *Transl Vis Sci Technol*, vol. 28;8, no. 1, p. :27, 2019.
- 603 [14] D. F. Sweeney, T. J. Millar, and S. R. Raju, "Tear film stability : A review," *Exp Eye Res*,  
604 vol. 117, pp. 28–38, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.exer.2013.08.010.
- 605 [15] "The epidemiology of dry eye disease: report of the Epidemiology Subcommittee of  
606 the International Dry Eye WorkShop (2007)," *Ocul Surf.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 93–107,  
607 2007, doi: 10.1016/S1542-0124(12)70082-4.
- 608 [16] S. J. Bron AJ, Evans VE, "Grading Of Corneal and Conjunctival Staining in the Context  
609 of Other Dry Eye Tests," *Cornea*, vol. 22, no. 7, pp. 640–650, 2003.

- 610 [17] P. IK. Chun YS, Yoon WB, Kim KG, “Objective assessment of corneal staining using  
611 digital image analysis,” *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*, vol. 55, no. 12, pp. 7896–903,  
612 2014, doi: 10.1167/iovs.14-15618.
- 613 [18] W. Ngo, P. Situ, N. Keir, D. Korb, C. Blackie, and T. Simpson, “Psychometric Properties  
614 and Validation of the Standard Patient Evaluation of Eye Dryness Questionnaire,”  
615 *Cornea*, vol. 32, no. 9, pp. 1204–1210, Sep. 2013, doi:  
616 10.1097/ICO.0b013e318294b0c0.
- 617 [19] R. D. Hays *et al.*, “Assessment of the Psychometric Properties of a Questionnaire  
618 Assessing Patient-Reported Outcomes With Laser In Situ Keratomileusis (PROWL),”  
619 *JAMA Ophthalmol*, vol. 135, no. 1, p. 3, Jan. 2017, doi:  
620 10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2016.4597.
- 621 [20] A. BOND and M. LADER, “The use of analogue scales in rating subjective feelings,”  
622 *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 211–218, Sep. 1974, doi:  
623 10.1111/j.2044-8341.1974.tb02285.x.
- 624 [21] R. W. Beuerman and B. Schimmelpfennig, “Sensory denervation of the rabbit cornea  
625 affects epithelial properties,” *Exp Neurol*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 196–201, Jul. 1980, doi:  
626 10.1016/0014-4886(80)90154-5.
- 627 [22] D. J. Oswald *et al.*, “Communication between Corneal Epithelial Cells and Trigeminal  
628 Neurons Is Facilitated by Purinergic (P2) and Glutamatergic Receptors,” *PLoS One*,  
629 vol. 7, no. 9, p. e44574, Sep. 2012, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0044574.
- 630 [23] I. Sher *et al.*, “Repetitive magnetic stimulation protects corneal epithelium in a rabbit  
631 model of short-term exposure keratopathy,” *Ocular Surface*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 64–73,  
632 Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jtos.2019.09.009.
- 633 [24] H. Toshida, D. H. Nguyen, R. W. Beuerman, and A. Murakami, “Evaluation of Novel  
634 Dry Eye Model: Preganglionic Parasympathetic Denervation in Rabbit,” *Investigative  
635 Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, vol. 48, no. 10, p. 4468, Oct. 2007, doi:  
636 10.1167/iovs.06-1486.
- 637 [25] S. fang Feng, T. yao Shi, Fan-Yang, W. ning Wang, Y. chun Chen, and Q. rong Tan,  
638 “Long-lasting effects of chronic rTMS to treat chronic rodent model of depression,”  
639 *Behavioural Brain Research*, vol. 232, no. 1, pp. 245–251, Jun. 2012, doi:  
640 10.1016/J.BBR.2012.04.019.
- 641 [26] H.-Y. Wang *et al.*, “Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation Enhances BDNF-TrkB  
642 Signaling in Both Brain and Lymphocyte,” *Journal of Neuroscience*, vol. 31, no. 30, pp.  
643 11044–11054, Jul. 2011, doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2125-11.2011.
- 644 [27] K. Kudo *et al.*, “Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation induces kf-1 expression  
645 in the rat brain,” *Life Sci*, vol. 76, no. 21, pp. 2421–2429, Apr. 2005, doi:  
646 10.1016/J.LFS.2004.10.046.
- 647 [28] J. Hellmann *et al.*, “Repetitive magnetic stimulation of human-derived neuron-like  
648 cells activates cAMP-CREB pathway,” *Eur Arch Psychiatry Clin Neurosci*, vol. 262, pp.  
649 87–91, 2012.

- 650 [29] T. W. Reid, C. J. Murphy, C. K. Iwahashi, B. A. Foster, and M. J. Mannis, "Stimulation of  
651 epithelial cell growth by the neuropeptide substance P," *J Cell Biochem*, vol. 52, no. 4,  
652 pp. 476–485, Aug. 1993, doi: 10.1002/jcb.240520411.
- 653 [30] K. Araki-Sasaki *et al.*, "Substance P-induced cadherin expression and its signal  
654 transduction in a cloned human corneal epithelial cell line," *J Cell Physiol*, vol. 182,  
655 no. 2, pp. 189–195, Feb. 2000, doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-4652(200002)182:2<189::AID-  
656 JCP7>3.0.CO;2-9.
- 657 [31] J. Garcia-Hirschfeld, L. G. Lopez-Briones, and C. Belmonte, "Neurotrophic Influences  
658 on Corneal Epithelial Cells," *Exp Eye Res*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 597–605, Nov. 1994, doi:  
659 10.1006/EXER.1994.1145.
- 660 [32] M.-M. Cai and J. Zhang, "Effectiveness of transcutaneous electrical stimulation  
661 combined with artificial tears for the treatment of dry eye: A randomized controlled  
662 trial," *Exp Ther Med*, vol. 20, no. 6, 2020, doi: 10.3892/etm.2020.9305.
- 663 [33] J. K. Park, S. Cremers, and A. L. Kossler, "Neurostimulation for tear production," *Curr*  
664 *Opin Ophthalmol*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 386–394, Sep. 2019, doi:  
665 10.1097/ICU.0000000000000590.
- 666 [34] M. Brinton *et al.*, "Electronic enhancement of tear secretion," *J Neural Eng*, vol. 13,  
667 no. 1, p. 016006, Feb. 2016, doi: 10.1088/1741-2560/13/1/016006.

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

Figure 1: Comparative Assessment of NEI Scores Over Time




Figure 1

Figure 2: Comparative Assessment of TBUT Over Time




Figure 2

Figure 3: Subjective Assessment Score Change Over Time by Treatment Group




Figure 3