

Title: Pilocarpine 1.25% Efficacy for management of Uncorrected Presbyopia (PILE-UP Study)

Rohit Saxena¹, Vinay Gupta¹, T Velpandian¹, Tanya Nidhi¹, Himani Thakur¹, Jeewan S Titiyal¹, Namrata Sharma¹

¹Dr. R. P. Centre for Ophthalmic Sciences, AIIMS New Delhi

Corresponding Author:

Prof. (Dr.) Namrata Sharma MD

Professor of Ophthalmology

Dr. R. P. Centre for Ophthalmic Sciences

AIIMS New Delhi.

Email: namrata.sharma@gmail.com

Short Title: Pilocarpine 1.25% for uncorrected presbyopia

Financial Disclosure: No financial disclosure to make for any author.

Conflict of Interest: No conflict of interest exists for any author.

Keywords: presbyopia, pilocarpine 1.25%, near vision acuity, near correction, pilocarpine.

Abstract

Purpose: This study aimed to evaluate the efficacy and safety of pilocarpine 1.25% eye drops for improving near vision acuity in presbyopic individuals.

Design: Non-randomized prospective interventional trial

Methods: This single-arm prospective interventional trial includes fifty presbyopic individuals aged between 40 to 55, administered pilocarpine 1.25% eye-drops daily once (9 am, Hour 0) for one month. Visual parameters, including distance corrected near visual acuity (DCNVA), near add power, amplitude of accommodation (AoA), and depth of focus (DoF) along with ocular biometric parameters were assessed at baseline and after one month at hour 3 (12 noon) and hour 6 (3 p.m.). Adverse effects were monitored.

Results: After one month of pilocarpine treatment, a significant improvement was observed in DCNVA (0.64 ± 0.2 to 0.26 ± 0.11 , $P:<0.001$) along with a decrease in near add power (1.43 ± 0.43 D to 0.42 ± 0.22 D, $P:<0.001$). The AoA increased (3.23 ± 0.74 D to 3.92 ± 0.93 D, $P:0.005$), and DoF widened (0.72 ± 0.18 D to 0.81 ± 0.26 D, $P:0.038$). No change in ocular biometry parameters was observed. The change in DCNVA showed strong positive correlations with change in near add ($r: 0.84$, $P:<0.001$) and AoA ($r: 0.66$, $P:0.04$). Adverse effects were mild and did not lead to discontinuation.

Conclusion: Pilocarpine 1.25% eye drops demonstrated statistically significant improvements in DCNVA, near add, AoA, and DoF after one month of treatment. Pilocarpine 1.25% eye drops shown increase in the amplitude of accommodation and depth of focus; without any significant change in ocular biometry parameters. The use of pilocarpine 1.25% eye drops can be an alternative intervention for enhancing near vision acuity of presbyopic subjects.

1 **Introduction**

2 Presbyopia is an age-related condition resulting in loss of the eye's ability to focus on near
3 objects due to progressive loss of accommodation with increasing age. Accommodation loss
4 is likely because of loss of contraction power in ciliary body and viscoelasticity of the
5 crystalline lens resulting in hardening of lens.¹ Uncorrected presbyopia globally affect 1.8
6 billion people approximately, 826 million of whom had near vision impairment because of
7 no, or inadequate, vision correction.² It decrease the quality of life by affecting individual's
8 emotional well being and ability to do daily activities.³

9 The current options for correction of presbyopia include spectacle for near work e.g. single
10 vision reading glasses, bifocal, multifocal progressive glasses; multifocal contact lens and
11 some surgical techniques.⁴⁻⁶ But none of these methods able to restore dynamic range of
12 accommodation.⁷ Multifocal glasses are often considers to be inconvenient by many and
13 require need to direct the visual axes in a particular direction for adequate near vision.⁸

14 Pharmacological treatment for presbyopia has been under investigation recently.⁹⁻¹²
15 Pilocarpine is a cholinergic muscarinic receptor agonist, and may expand the diversity of
16 existing strategies for treating presbyopia. It acts by enhancing depth of focus as well as
17 accommodation for the treatment of presbyopia.^{7,10} Pilocarpine contracts ciliary muscles and
18 iris sphincter muscles by binding to and activating muscarinic M3 receptors.¹³ Pupillary
19 constriction caused by contraction of the iris sphincter create a pinhole effect that improves
20 the ability to focus on near objects by increasing depth of focus.¹⁴ Also, accommodation is
21 enhanced by contraction of ciliary muscles which also improve the near vision.

22 Pilocarpine 1.25% has been shown as a potential alternative for presbyopia treatment in
23 recent studies,^{10-12,15} and has been approved by FDA¹⁶ as treatment of presbyopia. However
24 current available studies are mainly in Caucasian population, its effect on the eyes with
25 pigmented iris has not been evaluated. Pilocarpine demonstrates greater bioavailability in
26 pigmented eyes, suggesting a biophase preference. Subjects with blue and brown eyes
27 exhibited comparable levels of miosis when administered pilocarpine, yet the onset of peak
28 effects was notably prolonged in the latter group.¹⁷ Furthermore, there exists a positive
29 correlation between the density of pigmentation and the uptake capacity of pilocarpine.¹⁸
30 Major unaddressed questions related to pilocarpine for management of presbyopia are safety,
31 optimum duration, and effect on ocular biometry parameters. There is lack of information on

32 the efficacy and safety of pilocarpine 1.25% for treatment of presbyopia among pigmented
33 eyes.

34 This study aims to evaluate the effect of pilocarpine 1.25% eye drops on near vision acuity
35 and accommodation (efficacy outcomes); and associated side effect (if any) of pilocarpine
36 1.25% eye drops as measure by pupil size, ocular biometry, and occurrence of adverse events
37 (safety outcomes).

38 **Methodology**

39 The study was a prospective interventional trial [CTRI: REF/2022/07/056632] following the
40 principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki. The study protocol received approval from
41 the Institute Ethics Committee [Ref. No.: IEC-623/15.07.2022], and all participants provided
42 written informed consent.

43 The inclusion criteria encompassed individuals aged 40 to 55 years, in good general health,
44 and exhibiting both objective and subjective evidence of presbyopia. A thorough assessment
45 of ocular and general health was conducted, including vision evaluation, slit-lamp
46 examination for anterior segment health, cycloplegic refraction using tropicamide 1%, fundus
47 examination and measurement of intraocular pressure. Emmetropes were defined as
48 individuals with a spherical equivalent refractive error between -0.50 D and +0.50 D for
49 distance in each eye, along with <0.75 D of astigmatism. Key inclusion criteria required
50 participants to have high contrast uncorrected logMAR distance visual acuity better than or
51 equal to 0.1, best corrected near visual acuity of N6 at 33cm in both eyes, intraocular pressure
52 (IOP) between 10 to 21 mm of Hg, mesopic pupil size < 8.00 mm, and photopic pupil size >
53 3.00 mm. On the other hand, key exclusion criteria involved the presence of severe dry eye
54 disease, corneal abnormalities, cataract, or any other retinal/ocular pathology, a history of
55 ocular surgery and/or phakic intraocular lens implantation, migraine headaches, angle-closure
56 glaucoma, abnormal pupil shape, anisocoria >1 mm, amblyopia, and known allergy to
57 pilocarpine eye drops.

58 Throughout the study, participants received pilocarpine 1.25% eye drops once daily at 9 am
59 in both eyes for one month, prepared by our in-house pharmacy compliant with good
60 laboratory practice. Isotonic pilocarpine 1.25% eye drops (1.25 % of pilocarpine nitrate
61 preserved with chlorbutol) were compounded from sterile dispensing facility of our
62 pharmacy. Study visits were scheduled at baseline and a one-month follow-up. The data was
63 recorded at 12 noon (Hour 3) and 3 pm (Hour 6). During the visits, objective and subjective

64 refraction, along with near add, were performed. The patients' acceptance of distance and
65 near vision was recorded. Parameters noted included spherical equivalent refractive error,
66 near correction, uncorrected visual acuity for both distance and near, best corrected visual
67 acuity for both distance and near, and distance corrected near visual acuity. The near visual
68 acuity was measured using near logMAR chart [ETDRS 2000 series (logarithmic chart
69 calibrated for 33 cm), Precision Vision, Woodstock, IL, USA] at 33 cm in mesopic light
70 conditions (10 lux at target). Additionally, optical biometry using partial interferometry
71 optical biometer (IOL Master® 700, Zeiss, Germany) was conducted to measure axial length
72 (AL), keratometry (Km), anterior chamber depth (ACD), vitreous chamber depth (VCD), and
73 lens thickness (LT). The near point of accommodation was calculated using the RAF ruler,
74 and the amplitude of accommodation (AoA) was determined as the inverse of this value.
75 Pupil size was measured using automated, hand-held, infrared pupillometer (Neuroptics
76 PLR-200, Irvine, USA); and I-tracey (Tracey™ Technologies, Houston, TX) was employed
77 to document depth of focus (DoF). Three readings were taken and median was recorded for
78 purpose of analysis. The participants were asked to report any adverse effect such as
79 headache, flashes of light etc. The individual was inquired about their response to the
80 treatment, specifically regarding any challenges they experienced in performing routine near
81 tasks and during close work or delicate tasks. This included questions about whether they
82 encountered minimal or no difficulties in performing these tasks, as well as whether they
83 were unable to carry out routine or delicate tasks even with the use of pilocarpine 1.25%. An
84 anterior segment examination using slit lamp and central as well as peripheral retinal
85 examination using indirect ophthalmoscopy was done at 1 month follow up.

86 After conducting a pilot study at the study centre from September 2022 to October 2022, we
87 performed a conservative estimation of the effect size. To detect a minimum difference of 5
88 lines (0.5 logMAR visual acuity) on the logMAR near visual acuity chart, with a significance
89 level of 0.05 and a power of 90%, sample size of 43 subjects is required. Accounting for an
90 attrition rate of 15%, we determined that a total sample size of 50 subjects would be
91 necessary.

92 Statistical analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics software, Version 25.0 (IBM
93 Corp., Armonk, NY). The variables were represented in terms of mean and standard
94 deviation. For a comprehensive examination of the data, linear mixed effects models were
95 employed to address missing data at random and account for the correlation between the two
96 eyes within each participant. Clustered data from both eyes of the same patient were

97 combined using robust standard error.¹⁹ To assess the clinical significance of changes in
98 variable characteristics, the P value was calculated using paired sample t-test for intra-group
99 comparisons. P value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

100 **Results**

101 The study enrolled 50 subjects with a mean age of 45.3 ± 5.1 years, of whom 45% were
102 males. All the subjects had dark brown iris. There were no statistically significant differences
103 observed in the baseline characteristics between the measurements taken at 12 pm and 3 pm
104 at baseline ($P > 0.05$ for all parameters). (*Table 1*)

105 The mean follow-up time was 29.8 ± 1.6 days. At the one-month follow-up (12 noon), there
106 was a statistically significant improvement in the logMAR distance corrected near visual
107 acuity (DCNVA), which changed from 0.74 ± 0.2 at baseline to 0.36 ± 0.11 at one month (P
108 < 0.001). This improvement was accompanied by a decrease in the near add power, from
109 1.43 ± 0.43 D at baseline to 0.42 ± 0.22 D at one month ($P < 0.001$). Additionally, an
110 increase in the Amplitude of Accommodation was observed, changing from 3.23 ± 0.74 D to
111 3.92 ± 0.93 D ($P = 0.005$), along with an increase in the Depth of Focus from 0.72 ± 0.18 D
112 to 0.81 ± 0.26 D ($P = 0.038$). No significant change observed in any other studied
113 parameters. (*Table 2*)

114 Furthermore, there was a strong positive correlation between the change in DCNVA & the
115 change in Near Add ($r: 0.84, P < 0.001$); and change in DCNVA & change in amplitude of
116 accommodation (AoA) ($r: 0.66, P: 0.04$). No strong correlation observed between change in
117 DCNVA & change in depth of focus ($r: 0.32, P: 0.075$); and change in near add & change in
118 depth of focus ($r: 0.28, P: 0.062$). However, a strong correlation found between change in
119 AoA & change in near add ($r: 0.61, P: 0.048$); and change in AoA & change in depth of
120 focus ($r: 0.71, P: 0.036$).

121 At 1 month follow-up, significant difference was observed in DCNVA ($P: .046$), amount of
122 near add ($P: .031$), and amplitude of accommodation ($P: .048$), between hour 3 (12 noon) and
123 hour 6 (3 pm) post instillation of pilocarpine 1.25% drop. (*Table 3*) However all these 3
124 parameters remained significantly better at 1 month compared to the baseline values at 6 hour
125 (3 pm) ($P < 0.001$). (*Table 4*)

126 The patient satisfaction response to treatment summarized in *Table 5*.

127 The adverse effects reported by patient includes headache (8/50, 16%), eye pain (1/50, 2%),
128 visual blur (2/50, 4%) and irritation (2/50, 4%). Symptoms are during initial days of

129 treatment and was not severe. No patient discontinued using pilocarpine 1.25% due to
130 adverse effect. No relevant anterior segment as well as retinal changes was observed at 1
131 month follow up when accessed through slit-lamp examination and dilated fundus
132 examination respectively.

133

134 **Discussion**

135

136 In this prospective interventional study, we assessed the impact of 1.25% pilocarpine eye
137 drops on both near vision acuity and accommodation, while also monitoring any potential
138 adverse events associated with the drug. After one month, an improvement in Distance
139 Corrected Near Visual Acuity (DCNVA) at hour 3, along with a simultaneous reduction in
140 the Near-Add required by the patient was observed. The term "near add" refers to the
141 additional optical power needed to achieve clear near vision, typically in the form of reading
142 glasses or bifocal/multifocal lenses. By contracting the ciliary muscle, pilocarpine increases
143 the eye's ability to adjust its focus for near vision tasks,¹⁸ reducing the need for additional
144 optical correction (near add) to achieve clear near vision.

145 Our study showed a significant improvement in DCNVA, AoA, DoF along with reduction in
146 near add requirement after 1 month of treatment as compared to baseline. GEMINI-1 Phase 3
147 Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT)¹², pilocarpine 1.25% demonstrated superiority over the
148 vehicle in terms of DCNVA on day 30, hours 3, and 6. Specifically, on day 30, hour 3, 30.7%
149 of participants in the pilocarpine 1.25% group showed an improvement of 3 or more lines in
150 DCNVA, compared to only 8.1% in the vehicle group. At hour 6, these percentages were
151 18.4% and 8.8%. In our study 44% of participant at hour 3 and 30% of participant at hour 6
152 showed an improvement of 0.5 logMAR (5 lines on logMAR scale). Our study revealed a
153 significant decrease in logMAR DCNVA at hour 6 compared to hour 3 on day 30. This
154 suggests that the effect of pilocarpine on near vision acuity may start to diminish over time
155 after the initial application, and the efficacy for near addition tends to be higher during the
156 first few hours following application; though the effect of pilocarpine 1.25% was retained at
157 hour 6 when compared to baseline The VIRGO trial had demonstrated significant benefit
158 with Pilocarpine 1.25% twice daily compared to placebo.¹⁵ It is possible that twice daily dose
159 may provide more sustained effect.

160 There was no change observed after 1 month of using pilocarpine 1.25% in Best-Corrected
161 Visual Acuity (BCVA) for distance. This finding aligns with the GEMINI-1 Phase 3 RCT,

162 where no participants with a DCNVA improvement of 3 lines or more experienced a loss of
163 more than 5 letters in BCVA for distance on day 30.¹²

164 In addition to evaluating near vision acuity, our study also compared the amplitude of
165 accommodation and depth of focus at baseline and after 1 month of treatment. We observed a
166 significant increase in the amplitude of accommodation and depth of focus at day 30, hour 3.
167 The increase in the amplitude of accommodation after 1 month of using pilocarpine 1.25% is
168 likely due to the drug's pharmacological effects on the eye's anatomy and physiology. These
169 findings indicate that pilocarpine's mechanism of action involves pupillary constriction,
170 which leads to an increase in depth of focus, as well as contraction of the ciliary muscle,
171 resulting in an increased amplitude of accommodation. When the ciliary muscle contracts, it
172 causes the lens of the eye to change its shape, becoming more rounded. This increased
173 curvature of the lens enhances its refractive power, enabling the eye to focus on nearby
174 objects. Also, a greater depth of focus, such as that achieved through the use of pilocarpine
175 eye drops, can enhance near vision by expanding the range of distances at which near objects
176 can be seen clearly without straining the eyes or constantly adjusting the focus.

177 The strong correlation observed between the change in near add and the amplitude of
178 accommodation suggests that the improvement in near vision acuity is directly related to the
179 increased ability of the eye to accommodate for near objects. As pilocarpine induces pupillary
180 constriction and ciliary muscle contraction, it enhances the eye's accommodative response,
181 resulting in improved near vision and a decreased reliance on additional optical correction
182 (near add) for near tasks.

183 Despite independent improvements in both near visual acuity and depth of focus, the study
184 did not find a statistical correlation between the two. In other words, the improvement in near
185 visual acuity did not necessarily correlate with the increase in depth of focus. While
186 pilocarpine eye drops can lead to improvements in near visual acuity and depth of focus
187 independently, other factors or mechanisms may be responsible for these effects,^{7,20} and they
188 might not be directly related to each other. The study's findings provide valuable insights into
189 the effects of pilocarpine on various visual parameters, but further research may be needed to
190 fully understand the underlying mechanisms and potential interactions between near visual
191 acuity and depth of focus in response to pilocarpine treatment.

192 Notably, the daily use of 1.25% pilocarpine was generally well-tolerated, with minimal side
193 effects. Ninety percent of participants in our study indicated experiencing either no
194 difficulties or only minimal challenges when engaging in both routine near work and at close-
195 distances/more-intricate tasks with using pilocarpine 1.25%. In this study, despite the

196 pupillary constriction induced by pilocarpine, there was no significant change in the size of
197 the pupil measured in both dim and well-lit conditions at the end of the 1-month treatment
198 period. This finding suggests that the effect of pilocarpine on pupil size was likely not
199 sustained over the long term or was not significant enough to produce a measurable change in
200 pupil size in the studied population. The lack of significant change in pupil size after 1 month
201 of pilocarpine use may be considered beneficial, as excessive or prolonged pupillary
202 constriction could potentially lead to visual disturbances and discomfort, especially in low-
203 light conditions. While earlier research had documented instances of retinal detachment
204 associated with the use of pilocarpine 1.25% for presbyopia,²¹⁻²² our study did not identify
205 any occurrences of retinal detachment or other retinal pathologies. However, individual
206 responses to medications should always be monitored by healthcare professionals to ensure
207 safety and optimal treatment outcomes.

208 This study has certain limitations. Firstly, being a non-randomized trial, there is a potential
209 for biases when compared to blinded randomized controlled trials. Secondly, the sample size
210 is modest; a larger cohort studied over an extended period would offer deeper insights into
211 the drug's efficacy and safety. However, this study stands out as the pioneering research
212 documenting the efficacy of pilocarpine in eyes with pigmented iris, setting a foundation for
213 future studies. A key strength of our study is the quantification of ocular biometry
214 parameters, amplitude of accommodation and depth of focus among participants administered
215 with pilocarpine 1.25% for presbyopia. To our current understanding, this is the first study
216 quantifying accommodation and depth of focus and correlating them with the adjustments in
217 near add required and enhancements in near visual acuity; among individuals given
218 pilocarpine 1.25% for presbyopia.

219

220 In conclusion, the study's findings suggest that the use of pilocarpine 1.25% eye drops can be
221 an alternative intervention for enhancing near vision acuity in the presbyopic subjects.
222 Pilocarpine 1.25% eye drops shows statistically significant improvement in uncorrected near
223 visual acuity; increase in the amplitude of accommodation and depth of focus among studied
224 presbyopic individuals, without any significant change in ocular biometry parameters. No
225 occurrence of retinal detachment or any other severe adverse effect was observed in our
226 study. However further research and individual assessments would be necessary to fully
227 understand and optimize the benefits of pilocarpine for near vision improvement in different
228 clinical contexts.

229

230 *All authors have completed and submitted the ICMJE form for disclosure of potential*
231 *conflicts of interest. Funding/Support: None. Financial disclosure: No financial disclosure to*
232 *make for any author(s).*

233

234 **Reference**

235

236 1. Radhakrishnan H, Charman WN. Age-related changes in static accommodation and
237 accommodative miosis. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt.* 2007;27(4):342-52.

238 2. Fricke TR, Tanhan N, Resnikoff S *et al.* Global prevalence of presbyopia and vision
239 impairment from uncorrected presbyopia: systematic review, meta-analysis and
240 modelling. *Ophthalmology.* 2018;125:1492-9.

241 3. McDonnell PJ, Lee P, Spritzer K, Lindblad AS, Hays RD. Associations of presbyopia
242 with vision-targeted health-related quality of life. *Arch Ophthalmol.*
243 2003;121(11):1577-81.

244 4. Charman WN. Developments in the correction of presbyopia I: spectacle and contact
245 lenses. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt.* 2014;34:8-29.

246 5. Balgos MJTD, Vargas V, Alió JL. Correction of presbyopia: an integrated update for
247 the practical surgeon. *Taiwan J Ophthalmol.* 2018;8:121-40.

248 6. Seyaddain O, Hohensinn M, Riha W *et al.* Small aperture corneal inlay for the
249 correction of presbyopia: 3 year follow up. *J Cataract Refract Surg.* 2012;38:35-45.

250 7. Wolffsohn JS, Davies LN. Presbyopia: effectiveness of correction strategies. *Prog*
251 *Retin Eye Res.* 2019;68:124-43.

252 8. Lord SR, Dayhew J, Sc BA, Howland A. Multifocal glasses impair edge-contrast
253 sensitivity and depth perception and increase the risk of falls in older people. *J Am*
254 *Geriatr Soc.* 2002;50:1760-6.

255 9. Grzybowski A, Markeviciute A, Zemaitiene R. A Review of Pharmacological
256 Presbyopia Treatment. *Asia Pac J Ophthalmol (Phila).* 2020;9(3):226-33.

257 10. Price Jr FW, Hom M, Moshirfar M *et al.* Combinations of Pilocarpine and
258 Oxymetazoline for the Pharmacological Treatment of Presbyopia: Two Randomized
259 Phase 2 Studies. *Ophthalmol Sci.* 2021;1(4):100065.

260 11. Betinaa O, Giovanna B. Pharmacological strategies for treating presbyopia. *Current*
261 *Opinion Ophthalmol.* 2021;32(4):319-23.

262 12. Waring GO, Price FW, Wirta D *et al.* Safety and Efficacy of AGN-190584 in
263 Individuals With Presbyopia: The GEMINI 1 Phase 3 Randomized Clinical Trial.
264 *JAMA Ophthalmol.* 2022;140(4):363-71.

265 13. Drummond PD. The effect of light intensity and dose of dilute pilocarpine eyedrops
266 on pupillary constriction in healthy subjects. *Am J Ophthalmol.* 1991;112:195-9.

267 14. Kim WS, Park IK, Chun YS. Quantitative analysis of functional changes caused by
268 pinhole glasses. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2014;55:6679-85.

269 15. Kannarr S, El-Harazi SM, Moshirfar M *et al.* Safety and Efficacy of Twice-Daily
270 Pilocarpine HCl in Presbyopia: The Virgo Phase 3, Randomized, Double-Masked,
271 Controlled Study. *Am J Ophthalmol.* 2023;253:189-200.

272 16. Meghpara BB, Lee JK, Rapuano CJ, Mian SI, Ho AC. Pilocarpine 1.25% and the
273 changing landscape of presbyopia treatment. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol.* 2022;33(4):269-
274 74.

- 275 17. Salminen L, Urtti A. Effect of Ocular Pigmentation on Ocular Disposition,
 276 Metabolism and Biophasic Availability of Pilocarpine. In: Greve, E.L., Leydhecker,
 277 W., Raitta, C. (eds) Second European Glaucoma Symposium, Helsinki, May 1984.
 278 Springer, Dordrecht. *Documenta Ophthalmologica Proceedings Series*. 1985;43:91-2.
 279 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-5516-5_17.
- 280 18. Lyons JS, Krohn DL. Pilocarpine uptake by pigmented uveal tissue. *Am J*
 281 *Ophthalmol*. 1973;75(5):885-8.
- 282 19. Fan Q, Teo YY, Saw SM. Application of Advanced Statistics in Ophthalmology.
 283 *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2011;52:6059-65.
- 284 20. Wendt M, Glasser A. Topical and intravenous pilocarpine stimulated accommodation
 285 in anesthetized rhesus monkeys. *Exp Eye Res*. 2010;90(5):605-16.
- 286 21. Amarikwa L, Michalak SM, Caul S, Mruthyunjaya P, Rahimy E. Vitreofoveal
 287 Traction Associated With Pilocarpine for Presbyopia. *Ophthalmic Surg Lasers*
 288 *Imaging Retina*. 2022;53(7):410-1.
- 289 22. Al-Khersan H, Flynn HW Jr, Townsend JH. Retinal Detachments Associated With
 290 Topical Pilocarpine Use for Presbyopia. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2022;242:52-5.

291
 292
 293
 294

Table 1: Mean value of baseline parameters of study subjects

Baseline Study Parameters	12 noon	3 pm
UCVA (logMAR)	0.04 ± 0.02	0.04 ± 0.02
BCVA (logMAR)	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
DCNVA (logMAR)	0.74 ± 0.2	0.76 ± 0.22
BCNVA spectacles (logMAR)	0.12 ± 0.01	0.12 ± 0.01
SE Ref. error (distance) (D)	0.08 ± 0.41	0.1 ± 0.32
Near Addition (D)	1.43 ± 0.43	1.46 ± 0.42
IOP (mm of Hg)	16.2 ± 2.5	15.9 ± 2.7
Pupil size Mesopic (mm)	5.3 ± 1.1	5.5 ± 1.3
Pupil size photopic (mm)	3.7 ± 0.6	3.8 ± 0.6
Amplitude of accommodation (D)	3.23 ± 0.74	3.14 ± 0.62
Depth of focus (D)	0.72 ± 0.18	0.68 ± 0.2
Axial length (mm)	23.59 ± 2.22	23.6 ± 2.1
Mean Km (D)	43.78 ± 3.7	43.85 ± 3.4
ACD (mm)	3.25 ± 0.33	3.26 ± 0.31
LT (mm)	3.41 ± 0.64	3.42 ± 0.7

295 UCVA: Uncorrected distance visual acuity; BCVA: best corrected distance visual acuity; DCNVA: distance
 296 corrected near visual acuity; SE: Spherical equivalent; IOP: Intraocular pressure; ACD: Anterior chamber depth;
 297 LT: lens thickness.

298
 299

Table 2: Mean characteristics of study subject at baseline and 1 month follow-up

Study parameters	Baseline (12 noon)	1 month (12 noon)	P value
UCVA (logMAR)	0.04 ± 0.02	0.06 ± 0.02	0.15
BCVA (logMAR)	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	1
DCNVA (logMAR)	0.74 ± 0.2	0.36 ± 0.11	<0.001
BCNVA spectacles (logMAR)	0.12 ± 0.01	0.11 ± 0.02	0.25
SE Ref. error (distance) (D)	0.08 ± 0.41	0.13 ± 0.39	0.12

Near Addition (D)	1.43 ± 0.43	0.42 ± 0.22	<0.001
IOP (mm of Hg)	16.2 ± 2.5	16.8 ± 3.5	0.2
Pupil size Mesopic (mm)	5.3 ± 1.1	5.13 ± 1.4	0.066
Pupil size photopic (mm)	3.7 ± 0.6	3.51 ± 0.5	0.052
Amplitude of accommodation (D)	3.23 ± 0.74	3.92 ± 0.93	0.005
Depth of focus (D)	0.72 ± 0.18	0.81 ± 0.26	0.038
Axial length (mm)	23.59 ± 2.22	23.62 ± 2.24	0.11
Mean Km (D)	43.78 ± 3.7	43.89 ± 4.1	0.14
ACD (mm)	3.25 ± 0.33	3.27 ± 0.39	0.08
LT (mm)	3.41 ± 0.64	3.43 ± 0.81	0.071

300 UCVA: Uncorrected distance visual acuity; BCVA: best corrected distance visual acuity; DCNVA: distance
 301 corrected near visual acuity; SE: Spherical equivalent; IOP: Intraocular pressure; ACD: Anterior chamber depth;
 302 LT: lens thickness.

303

304 Table 3: Mean characteristics of study subjects at hour 3 and hour 6

1 month follow-up	12 noon (Hour 3)	3 pm (Hour 6)	P value
UCVA (logMAR)	0.06 ± 0.02	0.04 ± 0.04	0.25
BCVA (logMAR)	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	1
DCNVA (logMAR)	0.36 ± 0.11	0.44 ± 0.14	0.046
BCNVA spectacles (logMAR)	0.11 ± 0.02	0.12 ± 0.02	0.17
SE Ref. error (distance) (D)	0.13 ± 0.39	0.08 ± 0.4	0.08
Near Addition (D)	0.42 ± 0.22	0.52 ± 0.26	0.031
IOP (mm of Hg)	16.8 ± 3.5	16.6 ± 4.1	0.22
Pupil size Mesopic (mm)	5.13 ± 1.4	5.39 ± 1.1	0.073
Pupil size photopic (mm)	3.51 ± 0.5	3.72 ± 0.8	0.01
Amplitude of accommodation (D)	3.92 ± 0.93	3.64 ± 0.62	0.048
Depth of focus (D)	0.81 ± 0.26	0.76 ± 0.21	0.1
Axial length (mm)	23.62 ± 2.24	23.61 ± 2.7	0.36
Mean Km (D)	43.89 ± 4.1	43.75 ± 3.9	0.14
ACD (mm)	3.27 ± 0.39	3.25 ± 0.44	0.13
LT (mm)	3.43 ± 0.81	3.43 ± 0.74	0.16

305 UCVA: Uncorrected distance visual acuity; BCVA: best corrected distance visual acuity; DCNVA: distance
 306 corrected near visual acuity; SE: Spherical equivalent; IOP: Intraocular pressure; ACD: Anterior chamber depth;
 307 LT: lens thickness.

308

309 Table 4: Mean characteristics of study subjects at baseline (3pm) versus 1 month follow-up

310 (3pm)

1 month follow-up	Baseline (3 pm)	1 month follow-up 3 pm (Hour 6)	P value
UCVA (logMAR)	0.04 ± 0.02	0.04 ± 0.04	0.72
BCVA (logMAR)	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	1
DCNVA (logMAR)	0.76 ± 0.22	0.44 ± 0.14	>0.001
BCNVA spectacles (logMAR)	0.12 ± 0.01	0.12 ± 0.02	0.54
SE Ref. error (distance) (D)	0.1 ± 0.32	0.08 ± 0.4	0.17
Near Addition (D)	1.46 ± 0.42	0.52 ± 0.26	>0.001
IOP (mm of Hg)	15.9 ± 2.7	16.6 ± 4.1	0.15
Pupil size Mesopic (mm)	5.5 ± 1.3	5.39 ± 1.1	0.055
Pupil size photopic (mm)	3.8 ± 0.6	3.72 ± 0.8	0.062
Amplitude of accommodation (D)	3.14 ± 0.62	3.64 ± 0.62	>0.001

Depth of focus (D)	0.68 ± 0.2	0.76 ± 0.21	<i>0.048</i>
Axial length (mm)	23.6 ± 2.1	23.61 ± 2.7	<i>0.48</i>
Mean Km (D)	43.85 ± 3.4	43.75 ± 3.9	<i>0.2</i>
ACD (mm)	3.26 ± 0.31	3.25 ± 0.44	<i>0.31</i>
LT (mm)	3.42 ± 0.7	3.43 ± 0.74	<i>0.12</i>

311 UCVA: Uncorrected distance visual acuity; BCVA: best corrected distance visual acuity; DCNVA: distance
312 corrected near visual acuity; SE: Spherical equivalent; IOP: Intraocular pressure; ACD: Anterior chamber depth;
313 LT: lens thickness.

314

315

316 Table 5: Patient satisfaction response to treatment

Response	Number
No difficulty in doing routine near work as well as fine work	30/50 (60%)
Easily doing routine near work, but slight difficulty in doing fine work	15/50 (30%)
Slight difficulty in doing routine near work, can't do fine work	4/50 (8%)
Can't do routine near work properly	1/50 (2%)

317

318