

1 **Microplastics Identified in Commercial Over-the-counter Lubricant Eyedrops**

2 Running Title: Microplastics Identified in Commercial Eyedrops

3

4 **Authors**

5 Julia E Jaeger, PhD ¹

6 Matthew Burke, BSc ¹

7 Duoduo Wu, MBBS ²

8 Emily Ern-Min Curren, PhD ³

9 Sandric Chee Yew Leong, PhD ³

10 Robert Symons, PhD ⁴

11 Blanche Xiao Hong Lim, MBBS, MMed (Ophth), FAMS ^{2, 5}

12 Xinyi Su, MBBChir (Cantab), PhD, MMed (Ophth), FAMS ^{2, 5}

13 Jodhbir Singh Mehta, BSc, MBBS, PhD, FRCOphth, FRCS(Ed), FAMS ^{6, 7, 8}

14 Andri Kartasasmita Riau, PhD ^{6, 7}

15 Chris Hong Long Lim, BSc (Med) (Hons 1), BMed, MD, PhD, MMed (Ophth), FAMS ^{2, 5, 6, 9*}

16

17 **Affiliations**

18 1 Eurofins Environment Testing Australia & New Zealand, Dandenong South, VIC 3175,
19 Australia

20 2 Department of Ophthalmology, National University Health System, Singapore 119228,
21 Singapore

22 3 St. John's Island National Marine Laboratory, Tropical Marine Science Institute, National
23 University of Singapore, Singapore 119077, Singapore

24 4 Eurofins Environment Testing Australia & New Zealand, Girraween, NSW 2145, Australia

25 5 Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore, Singapore 119077,
26 Singapore

27 6 Singapore Eye Research Institute, Singapore 169856, Singapore

28 7 Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences Academic Clinical Programme, Duke-NUS Medical
29 School, Singapore 169857, Singapore

30 8 Singapore National Eye Centre, Singapore 168751, Singapore

31 9 School of Optometry and Vision Science, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW
32 2052, Australia

33

34 *Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.

35

36 **Corresponding author**

37 Chris Hong Long Lim

38 chrislimmd@gmail.com

39 Phone number: +65 69082222

40

41 Department of Ophthalmology

42 1E Kent Ridge Road, NUHS Tower Block, Level 7

43 Singapore 119228

44

45 **Financial Support: None**

46 **Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interests.

47

48 **Abstract**

49 ***Purpose***

50 There is increasing evidence that microplastics exert harmful effects on human health and
51 on the ocular surface. Recent studies have highlighted the presence of ocular surface
52 exposure to microplastics via shedding from contact lenses. This study aims to investigate if
53 microplastic particles are present in commonly used eyedrops in single-use plastic vials.

54

55 ***Design***

56 Experimental study.

57

58 ***Methods***

59 Nine commonly used commercial tear-replacement solutions available without a doctor's
60 prescription were tested (Brands A-I). All brands of eyedrops were analysed visually using
61 light microscopy and the number of microplastic particles were manually counted. Brands A-
62 F were further analysed using the 8700 Agilent Laser Direct Infrared (LDIR) chemical
63 imaging system to identify the microplastic compositions.

64

65 ***Results***

66 All eyedrops analysed contained microplastics. The number of microplastic particles
67 identified using light microscopy ranged between 15 (Brand E) to >18,000 (Brand F). In total,
68 nine types of microplastics were identified with LDIR – an average of 14 polyethylene, 8
69 polypropylene, 1 polystyrene, 2 polyvinylchloride, 21 polyethylene terephthalate, 1
70 polycarbonate, 19 polymethylmethacrylate, 23 polyamide and 22 polyurethane per millilitre
71 of eyedrop were identified.

72

73 ***Conclusions***

74 This is the first study that identified microplastics in commercial tear-replacement solutions.
75 These particles may have been derived from secondary degradation of the plastic vials
76 (polyethylene) during production, transportation, or storage, and represent a major source of
77 exposure to the ocular surface, especially among patients who require chronic instillation of
78 eyedrops.

79 **Introduction**

80 Plastics are synthetic or semi-synthetic polymeric materials found commonly in everyday life.
81 Their plasticity allows them to be moulded into objects with varied shapes and rigidity,
82 making them invaluable materials in daily life and especially in healthcare ¹. Unfortunately,
83 plastics have been shown to undergo secondary degradation into smaller pieces, termed
84 microplastics and nanoplastics, when environmental factors such as mechanical abrasion,
85 ultraviolet irradiation and high temperatures are applied.

86

87 Microplastics are defined as plastic particles smaller than 5 mm ². Primary microplastics are
88 manufactured plastic particles of small sizes, while secondary microplastics are derived from
89 the physical, chemical, and biological degradation of larger plastic materials found in the
90 environment. Their presence is ubiquitous in daily living, and studies have identified
91 microplastics in air, water, food, and humans ^{3,4}. As a sector heavily reliant on plastics for its
92 low cost, sterility, and plasticity, microplastics have been detected in the healthcare surgical
93 environment ⁵. Worryingly, microplastics were recently isolated from 49 vitreous samples of
94 patients who underwent intraocular surgery at two centres in China ⁶.

95

96 There is increasing evidence that microplastics exposure may pose health risks and has
97 been implicated in the development of malignancies, endocrine and hormonal abnormalities,
98 and abnormal foetal development ^{4,7-9}. Exposure of the ocular surface to microplastics is
99 associated with upregulation of IL-1 α , IL1- β , and IL-6 in the conjunctiva and lacrimal glands,
100 as demonstrated in murine models ¹⁰. Microplastics are also present in the atmosphere as
101 particulate matter, and population-based studies have suggested that high levels of these
102 particles may be associated with the development of dry eye disease ¹¹⁻¹³. Elevated
103 concentrations of microplastics in vitreous samples were also associated with higher
104 intraocular pressures and the presence of aqueous humour opacities ⁶. Contact lenses have
105 been identified as a source of microplastics, with an estimated release of 90,000 particles on
106 the ocular surface from regular wear of ten hours daily over a year ¹⁴. Given the ubiquitous
107 nature of microplastics in plastic packaging, it is conceivable that microplastics may also be
108 present in commercially available eyedrops. This is of particular concern as patients with
109 chronic ophthalmic conditions such as glaucoma, dry eye disease or uveitides may require
110 long-term instillation of eyedrops which exposes the ocular surface to microplastics. Thus
111 far, there is no published literature supporting the identification of microplastics in topical
112 ophthalmic formulations. This study aims to identify and characterise microplastics in
113 common over-the-counter tear-replacement solutions to ascertain whether there is a
114 potential for microplastic exposure of the ocular surface when eye drops are administered.

115

116 **Methodology**

117 *Sample Collection*

118 Single-use tear-replacement solutions of various brands and formulations were selected for
119 this study. Over-the-counter commercial eyedrops with their constituent ingredients and
120 volumes are summarised in Table 1. These formulations were chosen as they are commonly
121 prescribed lubricants and can also be bought off-the-shelf from departmental stores and
122 retail pharmacies without a prescription.

123

124 All eyedrop samples were analysed prior to their expiry date. Two methods of analyses were
125 utilised in a microplastic-free environment – light microscopy with manual count and laser
126 direct infrared (LDIR) imaging system (Figure 1). Details of the analyses are outlined below.

127

128 *Light Microscopy*

129 Prior to analysis, all labware including forceps, glass bottles, petri dishes and metal sieves
130 were sterilised with ethanol and rinsed with Mili-Q ultrapure water twice. In addition, glass
131 and stainless steel labware were used to minimise external microplastic contamination. All
132 open-lid containers were covered with either a glass slide or aluminium foil to minimise
133 microplastic contamination from the air. All loading of eyedrop samples were conducted in a
134 clean air cabinet. Contamination protocols undertaken during analysis are as described by
135 Curren and Leong¹⁵.

136

137 A total of three samples of each over-the-counter tear-replacement solution were obtained.
138 Two samples were from the same production batch while a third sample was obtained from
139 another batch when possible. This allowed for comparison of microplastic counts between
140 samples of the same batch and between batches for each formulation, to determine the
141 consistency of microplastic counts between batches. Samples from tear-replacement
142 solutions were analysed by pipetting 1 mL of each eyedrop formulation using a glass pipette
143 onto a Sedgewick rafter slide and viewed under an inverted light microscope. Microplastic
144 particles were identified based on visual characteristics and sorted into categories such as
145 fibre, film, or fragment. The number of microplastics in each sample was determined from
146 triplicate counts. A blank controls were used prior to each eyedrop samples count analysis to
147 ensure that no ambient microplastic contamination was present prior to testing.

148

149 *Laser Direct Infrared Imaging System with Spectroscopy*

150 LDIR is an infrared spectrometer that utilises a fast-tuneable quantum-cascade laser (QCL)
151 coupled with a rapidly scanning imaging system to analyse particulate information such as
152 quantification, size, colour and morphology, while identification of polymer type can be
153 identified with spectroscopic analysis¹⁶.

154

155 To prevent environmental contamination, the LDIR analysis was performed in a segregated
156 room within the facility, physically distinct and equipped with an airlock system and change
157 pod. The laboratory was kept at a positive pressure and air inflow HEPA filtered. Lab
158 analysts also don specialised black cotton lab coats with efforts made to avoid clothing that
159 is prone to shedding polymer fibres. All glassware underwent either furnace cleaning for a
160 minimum of 4 hours at temperatures exceeding 400 °C or washing with microplastics-
161 analysis-grade (MAG) water. Prior to use, MAG water samples were analysed to ascertain
162 their purity. Sample filtration was performed within a fume cupboard, with samples left in the
163 cupboard for over 5 minutes covered with foil. Monthly air blank tests are conducted to
164 assess the air quality within the laboratory and the fume cupboard. Nightly vacuuming and
165 regular surface wiping are also conducted to remove potential contaminants. Quality control
166 and accuracy of analysis was assessed by running samples with a known concentration of
167 green polyethylene (PE) and analysing reagent blanks using 1 L of MAG water. A polymer
168 register is also diligently updated to track and trace potential contaminations.

169

170 Reference materials for the analysis were obtained from various manufacturers: fluorescent
171 green PE microspheres of 75-90 µm and 250-300 µm (Cospheric, Santa Barbara, CA, USA),
172 polypropylene (PP) chromatographic grade of 150 µm (Polysciences Inc, Warrington, PA,
173 USA), polystyrene (PS) EZY-CALTM microsphere size standard, NIST-traceable with mean
174 diameter 30 or 70 µm, and a concentration of 2,000 particles/mL (ThermoFisher Scientific

175 Waltham, MA, USA), polyvinylchloride (PVC) analytical standard (Sigma-Aldrich, Saint
176 Louis, MO, USA), polyethylene terephthalate (PET) with a maximum particle size of 300 µm
177 (Goodfellow, Cambridge, United Kingdom), polycarbonate (PC) beads sized 150-250 µm
178 (Sigma- Aldrich, Saint Louis, MO, USA), polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA) analytical
179 standard with a size of 50 µm in solution (Sigma-Aldrich, Saint Louis, MO, USA), polyamide
180 (PA6, Nylon) with a mean size of 15-20 µm (Goodfellow, Cambridge, United Kingdom),
181 polyurethane (PU) 3-5 mm (Goodfellow, Cambridge, United Kingdom), and POLYMER KIT
182 1.0 (Hawaii Pacific University, Honolulu, HI, USA). MAG water was obtained by filtering
183 ultrapure water from Arium® Mini water purification system connected to a CellPlus Ultrafilter
184 (Sartorius, Göttingen, Germany) and three subsequent filtrations through a 5 µm
185 polycarbonate filter.

186

187 To analyse microplastic content in commercially available tear-replacement solutions, two
188 different kinds of analysis were used: MirrIR low-e microscope slides (Kevley Technologies,
189 Chesterland, OH, USA) analysis (slide) and on-filter analysis (filter). A separate production
190 batch of tear-replacement solutions was obtained for this analysis. For every brand of
191 eyedrop, two replicates of on-slide analysis and one on-filter analysis were conducted. For
192 slide analysis, the entire content (0.4 mL) of a tear-replacement vial was filtered through a 5
193 µm pore size polycarbonate filter paper (Sartorius, Göttingen, Germany) mounted in a glass
194 vacuum filtration unit with a funnel (Rocker, Kaohsiung, Taiwan) attached to a vacuum pump
195 (Wiggins, Wuppertal, Germany). The filter was then rinsed with 100 mL of MAG water. All
196 particles were transferred onto a slide for analysis. On-filter analysis of the gold filter was
197 also performed to avoid the potential loss due to the transfer. Filtration was performed with
198 25 mm diameter, 0.8 µm pore size gold-coated polycarbonate membrane filters (Sterlitech,
199 Aubrun, WA, USA). The entire content (0.4 mL) of one eyedrop vial was administered
200 through the filter directly and washed with 100 mL of MAG water. Once dry, the filter was
201 mounted on a filter holder (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA) and analysed. For
202 the analysis of the tear-replacement vial compositions, small fragments < 300 µm of the vial
203 have been cut off and placed onto a slide for analysis.

204

205 All samples were analysed to quantify polymer particles and size ranges between 20 and
206 500 µm on the Agilent 8700 LDIR chemical imaging system (Agilent Technologies, Santa
207 Clara, CA, USA). Particles larger than 500 µm were not detected. The analyses were
208 conducted by the automated Particle Analysis workflow as part of the Clarity software
209 Version 1.5 (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA). This workflow automatically
210 counts and sizes all particles. High-magnification images can also be taken during the
211 analysis. For particle identification, an IR spectrum is generated in the fingerprint region
212 (1800 – 975 cm⁻¹). The acquired spectra was then compared to an internal library. The
213 library used in this study is based on siMPle, which has been modified for the use of the
214 LDIR chemical imaging system¹⁷. Additionally, information from open-source repositories
215 such as µATR-FTIR Spectral Libraries of Plastic Particles (FLOPP and FLOPP-e) for the
216 Analysis of Microplastics have been intergraded^{17,18}. Finally, the library was also modified by
217 Eurofins Environment Testing for the nine reported polymers which were verified against two
218 independently purchased reference materials.

219

220 The match quality was determined by comparing the acquired spectra to the library
221 reference spectra. A higher quality match score indicates a better fit between the measured

222 spectrum and the material's spectrum, with a score of 1 representing an absolute match. For
223 this study, a minimum match quality above 0.7 was deemed necessary.

224

225 **Results**

226 The number of visually identified microplastic particles in each 1 mL sample via light
227 microscopy is summarised with a logarithmic scale in Figure 2. Eyedrops from a separate
228 production batch were not available for brands C, D, F and I, hence light microscopy
229 analysis was performed only for two samples from within the same production batch.
230 Notably, Brand F had a cloudy appearance during analysis, and yielded the largest number
231 of possible microplastic particles (>18,000 per millilitre of eyedrop) among all the tear-
232 replacement samples tested. Even among eyedrops from the same production batch, the
233 number of microplastic particles remained varied.

234

235 LDIR analysis was performed for seven tear-replacement brands (Brands A-F). Two
236 replicates of on-slide analysis and one on-filter analysis were performed for all samples. All
237 samples showed evidence of microplastic contamination (Table 2) (Figure 3). Nine types of
238 microplastics were identified – polyamide (PA), polycarbonate (PC), polyethylene (PE),
239 polyethylene terephthalate (PET), polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA), polypropylene (PP),
240 polystyrene (PS), polyurethane (PU), and polyvinylchloride (PVC) (Figure 4). These
241 microplastics were identified in varying levels in each tear-replacement sample and ranged
242 between 20-500 µm. The amount and type of microplastic particles retrieved from each unit
243 dose vial varied. This ranged between five and 308 particles per 1 mL of eyedrop (Table 2).
244 The most identified microplastic types were PET, PA and PU, which were identified in 16, 15
245 and 14 samples respectively. Analysis of tear-replacement solution vials shows that they are
246 made of PE.

247

248 **Discussion**

249 This study is the first to identify the presence of microplastics in tear-replacement solutions
250 in single-use vials, adding to a growing body of evidence on the pervasive nature of
251 microplastics⁴. Over-the-counter topical tear-replacement solutions were analysed in this
252 pilot study as these were commonly available across international markets and readily
253 accessible without a prescription¹⁹. Patients with ocular surface disorders are frequently
254 prescribed topical tear-replacement agents and preservative-free formulations, which are
255 thought to be innocuous, with increased frequency of administration considered useful and
256 often encouraged to supplement either an unhealthy and unstable tear film or improve a
257 poor ocular surface. Frequent use of these topical formulations may therefore inadvertently
258 expose the ocular surface to significant levels of microplastics.

259

260 Microplastic particles were identified in all eyedrop samples, with PET, PA and PU being the
261 most commonly identified. This is a concerning observation as microplastics have been
262 associated with multiple adverse health impacts⁷⁻⁹, and may adversely impact patients who
263 rely on regular instillation of eyedrops for ophthalmic diseases. A compromised ocular
264 surface such as in severe dry eye disease, Steven Johnson Syndrome and ocular mucous
265 membrane pemphigoid may also be more susceptible to the negative impacts of
266 microplastics. Owing to its small size, microplastics have a high surface-area-to-volume ratio
267 and bioaccessibility and can exert harmful effects at a cellular level²⁰. These are postulated
268 to occur via three main mechanisms - inflammation and oxidative damage, microbial
269 dysbiosis and toxicological effects from additives and sequestered chemicals¹⁶.

270

271 In-vitro studies with human cornea and conjunctival epithelial cell lines have demonstrated
272 the uptake of polystyrene particles with subsequent accumulation around the cell nuclei
273 when they were administered topically¹⁰. Cytotoxicity of the PS particles resulted in
274 decreased cell viability and was associated with a reduction in proliferation markers.
275 Exposure of the ocular surface of murine models to 50 nm or 2 µm polystyrene microplastics
276 thrice daily for two to four weeks further demonstrated a clinical reduction in tear secretion,
277 compared to both mice receiving normal saline or controls which received no eyedrops¹⁰.
278 Further ex-vivo analysis of tissues revealed reduced size and density of conjunctival goblet
279 cells with an irregular arrangement of lacrimal gland acini in mice treated with microplastics.
280 Congruent to findings in human cornea and conjunctival epithelial cell lines, proliferation-
281 related markers such as Ki-67, p63, and K14 were downregulated, while inflammatory
282 cytokines including IL-1α, IL1-β, and IL-6 were upregulated in murine models exposed with
283 their ocular surface exposed to polystyrene microplastics in a time-dependent fashion¹⁰.

284

285 Microplastics and their degradation products may also harbour toxic chemicals arising from
286 additives during production, or chemicals absorbed from the environment. A contaminant of
287 concern harboured by plastics are per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) which have
288 been shown to induce immune, cardiovascular, endocrine, and hepatic dysfunction and
289 increase the risk of developing malignancies^{21,22}. Contact lenses have been shown to be a
290 source of microplastic exposure, and a recent study showed that contact lens usage was
291 associated with elevated serum PFAS levels among young adults^{14,23}. While tear
292 homeostasis and the blink mechanism help with regulating tear volume, their role in clearing
293 microplastics and contaminants of emerging concern remains unexplored²⁴. This represents
294 an urgent need to characterise and identify potential ocular exposure of microplastics among
295 ophthalmic therapeutics to prevent long-term adverse effects.

296

297 This study employed two different methods to determine the presence of microplastics in
298 commercially available tear-replacement solutions. A range of techniques have been
299 described in the literature to analyse microplastics¹⁶. These include non-destructive
300 methods such as transmission electron microscopy, scanning electron microscopy, atomic
301 force microscopy, Raman spectroscopy, atomic force microscopy, and destructive methods
302 such as thermal analysis using pyrolysis or thermal desorption gas chromatography-mass
303 spectrometry (Pyr/TD-GC-MS), and other thermogravimetric analysis (TGA)-based method
304¹⁶. There is no consensus on a standardised approach to processing and analysing samples
305 for microplastics. Variations in counts obtained reflect the differences in technique and
306 limitations of each of the approaches taken. For instance, with sample F, although more than
307 8000 possible microplastic particles were identified in 1 mL of the sample using light
308 microscopy visualisation, only 48 to 141 particles were definitively identified as microplastics
309 using triplicate analysis with LDIR. This may be related to the constituents of the sample,
310 which contains castor oil and carbomer copolymer type A particles.

311

312 This highlights the limitations of visual identification with light microscopy in microplastics
313 analysis. The variation of microplastic counts during visual identification with light
314 microscopy ranges between 20-70 % and increases with smaller particle sizes^{25,26}. Factors
315 that affect identification rates include the operator's experience, the complexity of the sample
316 matrix, microplastic particle size and the quality and magnification of the microscope^{16,25,27}.

317 Therefore, it is recommended that additional analytical methods be performed in conjunction
318 with light microscopy to reduce error rates and overcome its limitations¹⁶.

319

320 The LDIR can reliably measure particle sizes from 20 µm in size, and further identify the
321 composition of each individual particle through spectroscopic comparison against
322 established spectral libraries. In the current study, the number of microplastics varied even
323 among the same brands of tear-replacement solutions (Figure 3). This may be related to
324 analytical methodology and environmental confounders which could not be controlled. The
325 Agilent LDIR imaging system possesses the ability to automate the analysis of samples for
326 microplastics. Underestimation may ensue when particles in the sample agglomerate or
327 stack on top of each other, that requires an operator to manually analyse inaccurate
328 components²⁸. The identification capability of LDIR is dependent on the robustness and
329 extensiveness of the spectral library used. Environmental factors such as physical stress,
330 heat, chemical additives, and contamination may alter the morphology and chemical
331 composition of microplastics. These factors are influenced by manufacturing, transport, and
332 storage conditions of the tear-replacement solutions before procurement in this study.
333 Although samples from two production batches were acquired when possible, it is difficult to
334 control and assess the extent of degradation of plastic vials prior to analysis. Moreover,
335 analysis was performed in this study by referencing both a proprietary and in-house spectral
336 database. These databases are not exhaustive and further work remains useful to
337 characterise the spectral characteristics of microplastics to improve the accuracy of current
338 spectroscopic methods²⁹⁻³¹. In this study, a spectral match quality of 70% between the
339 sample particle and database was considered to be strong evidence that the particle is of the
340 same polymer type as the reference. Currently, no universally accepted guidelines exist, but
341 previous studies have suggested 70-80% match quality as the cut-off for polymer-type
342 identification^{32,33}. The California State Water Resources Control Board defines 70% or
343 above as the threshold for an accurate spectral match³⁴. Further studies investigating the
344 impact of temperature, physical stress, ultraviolet light, and other environmental factors
345 experienced during the production, transport and storage of tear-replacement solution vials
346 are required to ascertain whether the majority of microplastics arise from manufacturing
347 processes, or from post-production conditions.

348

349 Smaller microplastics particles have the propensity to exert more deleterious effects on cells.
350 This is postulated to be related to increased bioaccessibility and altered surface chemistry³⁵.
351 Smaller nanoplastic particles have been reported to cause greater intestinal mucosal
352 damage, while larger nanoplastic particles induce greater microbial dysbiosis in tilapias
353 (*Oreochromis niloticus*)³⁶. In a human intestinal in-vitro model (Caco-2 cell line), smaller 100
354 nm polystyrene microplastic particles were associated with increased intestinal toxicity
355 compared to 5 µm particles³⁷. As LDIR can reliably identify particles from 20 µm, smaller
356 particles including nanoplastics (<1 µm) were not analysed in the current study. Further
357 characterisation of these particulate properties with techniques such as pyrolysis or thermal
358 desorption gas chromatography-mass spectrometry conferring higher resolution compared
359 to LDIR will be beneficial in future studies.

360

361 The impact of microplastics on human health represents an evolving and developing field.
362 Although microplastics were identified from all tested samples, safe levels of exposure and
363 the potential physiological and toxicological effects of microplastics have yet to be
364 determined. This is compounded by the extensive range of chemicals and additives used in

365 the manufacture of different types of plastics. Cradle-to-consumer conditions, including
366 environmental conditions during storage and transport, may influence the stability of plastics
367 housing these drops and contribute to the leeching of chemicals or additives into the topical
368 tear replacement formulations. Future work to quantify microplastics in a range of topical
369 ophthalmic formulations and develop an understanding of inherent risk factors contributing to
370 the instability of the microplastics should be considered. Effects of microplastics retention
371 from chronic instillation over the ocular surface can also be investigated via animal and
372 human studies.

373

374 **Conclusion**

375 This study demonstrated the presence of microplastics in commonly used tear-replacement
376 solutions. The discovery of microplastics in therapeutics used on the ocular surface,
377 including contact lenses and eyedrops, raises significant concerns regarding their impact on
378 the ocular surface. Therefore, it is crucial to direct our attention towards identifying,
379 characterising, and addressing potential microplastics throughout the lifecycle of these
380 products. Only by doing so can we take proactive steps to minimise ocular surface exposure
381 to microplastics and reduce potential damage to the ocular surface, especially among
382 patients who rely chronically on these therapeutic agents.

383

384 **Acknowledgements**

385 The study was partly funded by the SERI-Lee Foundation Grant (R1845/87/2021). We thank
386 Eurofins Scientific for supporting this study with experimentation and microplastics analysis
387 with laser direct infrared imaging system with spectroscopy. Illustration was created with
388 BioRender.com.

389

390 **Figures and Tables**

391

392 **Table 1: Composition of selected tear-replacement solutions.**

Brand	Ingredients	Volume
A	Carmellose sodium* Sodium chloride Sodium lactate Potassium chloride Calcium chloride dihydrate Magnesium chloride hexahydrate Purified water Sodium hydroxide Hydrochloric acid	0.4 ml
B	Carboxymethylcellulose sodium* Sodium chloride Sodium lactate Potassium chloride Calcium chloride dihydrate Magnesium chloride hexahydrate Purified water Sodium hydroxide Hydrochloric acid	0.4 ml
C	Carboxymethylcellulose sodium* Glycerin* Boric acid Calcium chloride dihydrate Erythritol Levocarnitine Magnesium chloride hexahydrate Potassium chloride Purified water Stabilized oxychloro complex Sodium borate decahydrate Sodium citrate dihydrate	0.4 ml
D	Polyvinyl Alcohol* Povidone* Sodium chloride Purified water Sodium hydroxide Hydrochloric acid	0.4 ml
E	Dextran* Hypromellose* Potassium chloride Purified water Sodium borate Sodium chloride Sodium hydroxide Hydrochloric acid	0.8 ml
F	Carboxymethylcellulose sodium* Glycerin* Polysorbate* Boric acid Carbomer copolymer type A Castor oil Erythritol Levocarnitine Purified water Sodium hydroxide Hydrochloric acid	0.4 ml
G	Polyethylene glycol* Propylene glycol* Hydroxypropyl guar Sorbitol Aminomethyl Propanol Boric acid Potassium chloride Sodium chloride	0.7 ml
H	Polyethylene glycol 400* Sodium chlorite Sodium hyaluronate Boric Acid Sodium borate Calcium chloride (dihydrate) Magnesium Chloride Sodium chloride Potassium chloride	0.4 ml

I	Sodium carboxymethylcellulose* Sodium hyaluronate* Glycerin Erythrol Levocarnitine Sodium lactate Calcium chloride dihydrate Magnesium chloride hexahydrate Potassium chloride	0.4 ml
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------

*Active ingredient(s)


393
394
395
396
397

Table 2: Number and type of microplastics per millilitre identified via laser direct infrared imaging system with spectroscopy.

Sample	Polyethylene (PE)	Polypropylene (PP)	Polystyrene (PS)	Polyvinyl chloride (PVC)	Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET)	Polycarbonate (PC)	Polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA)	Polyamide (PA)	Polyurethane (PU)	Total
A-Slide 1	43	15	3	0	8	0	75	78	88	308
A-Slide 2	1	1	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	8
A-Filter	15	0	0	6	75	0	0	5	8	108
B-Slide 1	3	8	0	3	3	0	38	179	45	276
B-Slide 2	3	28	0	0	3	0	13	30	13	88
B-Filter	28	3	0	0	106	0	0	15	53	203
C-Slide 1	41	41	3	8	28	6	93	0	26	241
C-Slide 2	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	5
C-Filter	5	0	0	5	31	0	5	8	18	71
D-Slide 1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	8
D-Slide 2	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	45	3	55
D-Filter	5	0	3	0	21	0	0	3	10	41
E-Slide 1	0	6	0	0	4	0	53	10	43	115
E-Slide 2	1	0	0	0	10	0	0	14	1	26
E-Filter	59	1	0	3	7	0	3	10	23	106
F-Slide 1	0	5	3	0	0	0	48	3	36	93
F-Slide 2	0	18	0	0	3	0	15	0	13	48
F-Filter	46	8	0	0	60	3	0	3	23	141

398

399 **Figure 1: Summary experimental workflow of analysis with light microscopy and laser**
 400 **direct infrared imaging system with spectroscopy.**



401

402

403

*Samples were obtained from a second production batch whenever possible.


404

405

Figure 2: Number of visually identified microplastic particles using light microscopy. Samples were obtained from across two production batches from each tear-replacement brand when possible.

406


407



408


409

410 **Figure 3: Number and type of microplastic particles identified using laser direct**
411 **infrared imaging system with spectroscopy. Two different kinds of analyses were**
412 **used: Kevley slide analysis (slide) and on-filter analysis (filter).**
413



414
415
416

417 **Figure 4: Representative images of (A) polyamide, (B) polyethylene terephthalate, (C)**
418 **polyethylene, (D) polystyrene, (E) polycarbonate, and (F) polypropylene identified in**
419 **tear-replacement solutions using laser direct infrared imaging system with**
420 **spectroscopy. Blue dotted lines represent reference spectra and red solid lines**
421 **represent measured spectra.**





422

423 References

- 424 1. Jain N, LaBeaud D. How Should US Health Care Lead Global Change in Plastic
425 Waste Disposal? *AMA J Ethics*. Oct 1 2022;24(10):E986-993.
426 doi:10.1001/amajethics.2022.986
- 427 2. Dris R, Agarwal S, Laforsch C. Plastics: From a Success Story to an Environmental
428 Problem and a Global Challenge. *Glob Chall*. Jun 2020;4(6):2000026.
429 doi:10.1002/gch2.202000026
- 430 3. Leslie HA, van Velzen MJM, Brandsma SH, Vethaak AD, Garcia-Vallejo JJ, Lamoree
431 MH. Discovery and quantification of plastic particle pollution in human blood. *Environ Int*.
432 May 2022;163:107199. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2022.107199
- 433 4. Microplastics are everywhere - we need to understand how they affect human health.
434 *Nat Med*. Apr 2024;30(4):913. doi:10.1038/s41591-024-02968-x
- 435 5. Field DT, Green JL, Bennett R, et al. Microplastics in the surgical environment.
436 *Environ Int*. Dec 2022;170:107630. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2022.107630
- 437 6. Zhong Y, Yang Y, Zhang L, et al. Revealing new insights: Two-center evidence of
438 microplastics in human vitreous humor and their implications for ocular health. *Sci Total*
439 *Environ*. Apr 15 2024;921:171109. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2024.171109
- 440 7. Pauly JL, Stegmeier SJ, Allaart HA, et al. Inhaled cellulosic and plastic fibers found in
441 human lung tissue. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. May 1998;7(5):419-28.
- 442 8. Ragusa A, Svelato A, Santacroce C, et al. Plasticenta: First evidence of microplastics
443 in human placenta. *Environ Int*. Jan 2021;146:106274. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2020.106274
- 444 9. Jin H, Yan M, Pan C, et al. Chronic exposure to polystyrene microplastics induced
445 male reproductive toxicity and decreased testosterone levels via the LH-mediated
446 LHR/cAMP/PKA/StAR pathway. *Part Fibre Toxicol*. Feb 17 2022;19(1):13.
447 doi:10.1186/s12989-022-00453-2
- 448 10. Zhou X, Wang G, An X, et al. Polystyrene microplastic particles: In vivo and in vitro
449 ocular surface toxicity assessment. *Environ Pollut*. Jun 15 2022;303:119126.
450 doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2022.119126
- 451 11. Hao R, Zhang M, Zhao L, et al. Impact of Air Pollution on the Ocular Surface and
452 Tear Cytokine Levels: A Multicenter Prospective Cohort Study. *Front Med (Lausanne)*.
453 2022;9:909330. doi:10.3389/fmed.2022.909330
- 454 12. Mu J, Zeng D, Fan J, et al. Associations Between Air Pollution Exposure and Daily
455 Pediatric Outpatient Visits for Dry Eye Disease: A Time-Series Study in Shenzhen, China. *Int*
456 *J Public Health*. 2021;66:1604235. doi:10.3389/ijph.2021.1604235
- 457 13. Kim Y, Choi YH, Kim MK, Paik HJ, Kim DH. Different adverse effects of air pollutants
458 on dry eye disease: Ozone, PM(2.5), and PM(10). *Environ Pollut*. Oct 2020;265(Pt
459 B):115039. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2020.115039
- 460 14. Liu Y, Ling X, Jiang R, et al. High-Content Screening Discovers Microplastics
461 Released by Contact Lenses under Sunlight. *Environ Sci Technol*. Jun 13 2023;57(23):8506-
462 8513. doi:10.1021/acs.est.3c01601
- 463 15. Curren E, Leong SCY. Profiles of bacterial assemblages from microplastics of
464 tropical coastal environments. *Sci Total Environ*. Mar 10 2019;655:313-320.
465 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.11.250
- 466 16. Wu D, Lim BXH, Seah I, et al. Impact of Microplastics on the Ocular Surface. *Int J*
467 *Mol Sci*. Feb 15 2023;24(4)doi:10.3390/ijms24043928
- 468 17. Primpke S, Cross RK, Mintenig SM, et al. Toward the Systematic Identification of
469 Microplastics in the Environment: Evaluation of a New Independent Software Tool (siMPle)
470 for Spectroscopic Analysis. *Appl Spectrosc*. Sep 2020;74(9):1127-1138.
471 doi:10.1177/0003702820917760
- 472 18. De Frond H, Rubinovitz R, Rochman CM. μ ATR-FTIR Spectral Libraries of Plastic
473 Particles (FLOPP and FLOPP-e) for the Analysis of Microplastics. *Anal Chem*. Dec 7
474 2021;93(48):15878-15885. doi:10.1021/acs.analchem.1c02549
- 475 19. Pucker AD, Ng SM, Nichols JJ. Over the counter (OTC) artificial tear drops for dry
476 eye syndrome. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Feb 23 2016;2(2):Cd009729.
477 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD009729.pub2

- 478 20. Chen G, Feng Q, Wang J. Mini-review of microplastics in the atmosphere and their
479 risks to humans. *Sci Total Environ*. Feb 10 2020;703:135504.
480 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.135504
- 481 21. Jane LEL, Yamada M, Ford J, Owens G, Prow T, Juhasz A. Health-related toxicity of
482 emerging per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances: Comparison to legacy PFOS and PFOA.
483 *Environ Res*. Sep 2022;212(Pt C):113431. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2022.113431
- 484 22. Wen ZJ, Wei YJ, Zhang YF, Zhang YF. A review of cardiovascular effects and
485 underlying mechanisms of legacy and emerging per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS).
486 *Arch Toxicol*. May 2023;97(5):1195-1245. doi:10.1007/s00204-023-03477-5
- 487 23. Kang H, Kim DH, Choi YH. Elevated levels of serum per- and poly-fluoroalkyl
488 substances (PFAS) in contact lens users of U.S. young adults. *Chemosphere*. Feb
489 2024;350:141134. doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2024.141134
- 490 24. Palakuru JR, Wang J, Aquavella JV. Effect of blinking on tear volume after instillation
491 of midviscosity artificial tears. *Am J Ophthalmol*. Dec 2008;146(6):920-4.
492 doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2008.06.020
- 493 25. Hidalgo-Ruz V, Gutow L, Thompson RC, Thiel M. Microplastics in the marine
494 environment: a review of the methods used for identification and quantification. *Environ Sci
495 Technol*. Mar 20 2012;46(6):3060-75. doi:10.1021/es2031505
- 496 26. Eriksen M, Mason S, Wilson S, et al. Microplastic pollution in the surface waters of
497 the Laurentian Great Lakes. *Mar Pollut Bull*. Dec 15 2013;77(1-2):177-82.
498 doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.10.007
- 499 27. Mariano S, Tacconi S, Fidaleo M, Rossi M, Dini L. Micro and Nanoplastics
500 Identification: Classic Methods and Innovative Detection Techniques. *Front Toxicol*.
501 2021;3:636640. doi:10.3389/ftox.2021.636640
- 502 28. Tian X, Beén F, Bäuerlein PS. Quantum cascade laser imaging (LDIR) and machine
503 learning for the identification of environmentally exposed microplastics and polymers.
504 *Environ Res*. Sep 2022;212(Pt D):113569. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2022.113569
- 505 29. Araujo CF, Nolasco MM, Ribeiro AMP, Ribeiro-Claro PJA. Identification of
506 microplastics using Raman spectroscopy: Latest developments and future prospects. *Water
507 Res*. Oct 1 2018;142:426-440. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2018.05.060
- 508 30. Palmer A, Phapale P, Fay D, Alexandrov T. Curatr: a web application for creating,
509 curating and sharing a mass spectral library. *Bioinformatics*. Apr 15 2018;34(8):1436-1438.
510 doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btx786
- 511 31. Cowger W, Steinmetz Z, Gray A, et al. Microplastic Spectral Classification Needs an
512 Open Source Community: Open Specy to the Rescue! *Anal Chem*. Jun 1 2021;93(21):7543-
513 7548. doi:10.1021/acs.analchem.1c00123
- 514 32. Ghanadi M, Joshi I, Dharmasiri N, et al. Quantification and characterization of
515 microplastics in coastal environments: Insights from laser direct infrared imaging. *Sci Total
516 Environ*. Feb 20 2024;912:168835. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.168835
- 517 33. Morgado V, Palma C, Bettencourt da Silva RJN. Microplastics identification by
518 infrared spectroscopy - Evaluation of identification criteria and uncertainty by the Bootstrap
519 method. *Talanta*. Mar 1 2021;224:121814. doi:10.1016/j.talanta.2020.121814
- 520 34. Standard Operating Procedures for Extraction and Measurement by Infrared
521 Spectroscopy of Microplastic Particles in Drinking Water (2021).
- 522 35. Mahmoudi M, Lynch I, Ejtehadi MR, Monopoli MP, Bombelli FB, Laurent S. Protein-
523 nanoparticle interactions: opportunities and challenges. *Chem Rev*. Sep 14
524 2011;111(9):5610-37. doi:10.1021/cr100440g
- 525 36. Hao T, Gao Y, Li ZC, Zhou XX, Yan B. Size-Dependent Uptake and Depuration of
526 Nanoplastics in Tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) and Distinct Intestinal Impacts. *Environ Sci
527 Technol*. Feb 21 2023;57(7):2804-2812. doi:10.1021/acs.est.2c08059
- 528 37. Liu S, Wu X, Gu W, Yu J, Wu B. Influence of the digestive process on intestinal
529 toxicity of polystyrene microplastics as determined by in vitro Caco-2 models. *Chemosphere*.
530 Oct 2020;256:127204. doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2020.127204
- 531



100000

Number of Microplastic Particles per 1ml. of Eyedrop

