

Introduction

UNIVERSITÀ

DEL SALENTO

Manufactures of soft multifocal CLs only provide a few parameters basic description of the design (near or distance such the refractive power for distance vision, the addition, the center) and the overall diameter. These parameters are base curve conventionally labelled and measured considering a temperature of 20°C as intended by DIN EN ISO 18369-3¹. However, during wear the temperature of CLs increase to eye temperature (~35°C) and this increase can be associated to changes in typical parameters²⁻⁵. A knowledge of real power profiles, overall diameters and base curves/sagittal depths measured at 35° C would give practitioners a better understanding of the behavior of lenses and it could improve the fitting for each individual patient. The aim of the study was to investigate the effects of temperature on daily disposable soft multifocal contact lens parameters and if temperature changes can modify dimensions as well as the power of this kind of lenses.

Methods

A pre-study was performed to define samples and measurement procedure. Following this, four different daily disposable center near soft multifocal CLs, three of them made of hydrogel material and one of silicone hydrogel, were selected each with two different powers and high addition (trial lenses which were not for sale). At least one night before the measurements the CLs were taken from their blisters into glass vials, filled with standard 0.9% saline solution for acclimatization whereas each vial was covered with a cap. The glass vials were stored during the study in the measurement room at 24±1°C. In parallel one glass meniscus lens (DIA: 14.2mm; BC: 10mm; CT: 0.55mm; Power: -3.00D) was measured as a crosscheck. To obtain the measurement of mean total diameter, external sagittal depth and multifocal power a fully integrated workstation for the complete quality control of soft contact lenses (SHSOphthalmic omniSpect SCL, Optocraft) was used. The procedure for each lens was always the same: The sample was placed lens rim down into an open-top cuvette which was filled with standard saline solution. The cuvette was connected to a pump (model: omniPump III) which controlled the saline temperature to 20±0.2°C. Afterwards the test lens rested for roughly 1 hour in the cuvette for acclimatization. After stabilization 30 repeated measurements over a short period of time were performed and stored automatically. Thereafter, the lenses in the glass vials were preheated over night to 35°C on a heating plate. In the morning the cuvette was cleaned and filled with fresh standard saline solution and the pump was set to a target temperature of 35°C (controlled within ±0.3°C) and the measurement procedure was repeated. Each lens was measured two times at each temperature.

Contact: Giancarlo Montani

Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica "Ennio de Giorgi", Università del Salento Email: giancarlo.montani@le.infn.it Website: https://www.scienzemfn.unisalento.it/cdl_ottica_optometria Phone: +39 0832 29 7495

The effect of temperature on refractive and geometrical parameters of daily disposable soft multifocal contact lenses

Giancarlo Montani¹, Christina Graf², Susanne Speringer², Jürgen Lamprecht² ¹Università del Salento, Lecce (ITALY), ²Optocraft, Erlangen GmbH (Germany)

ID	Manufacturer	Lens name	Material	Parameters labelled			
				PWR (D)	BC (mm)	ADD (D)	DIA (mm)
1	Johnson&Johnson	1-DAY ACUVUE MOIST multifocal	Etafilcon A	-1.25	8.4	+2.50	14.3
2	Johnson&Johnson	1-DAY ACUVUE MOIST multifocal	Etafilcon A	-0.25	8.4	+2.50	14.3
3	Alcon	DAILIES AquaComfortPLUS multi.	Nelfilcon A	0.00	8.7	+2.50	14.0
4	Alcon	DAILIES AquaComfortPLUS multi.	Nelfilcon A	-1.5	8.7	+2.50	14.0
5	Bausch + Lomb	Biotrue ONEday For Presbyopia	Nesofilcon A	-1.25	8.6	н	14.2
6	Bausch + Lomb	Biotrue ONEday For Presbyopia	Nesofilcon A	-2.00	8.6	н	14.2
7	Cooper Vision	Clariti 1 day multifocal	Somofilcon A	-0.50	8.6	н	14.1
8	Cooper Vision	Clariti 1 day multifocal	Somofilcon A	-1.75	8.6	н	14.1

Results

At first from all measurements outliers were eliminated according to Grubbs' test for outliers. The measured differences between both 20°C and both 35°C runs were quite small. Hence, the mean of both measurement runs was calculated and used for further evaluation. The results of the 35°C power measurements were corrected regarding the temperature dependence of the refractive index of the saline. The "labelled" internal sag. depth of all CLs was calculated considering the BC and diameter labelled using the SAG equation⁶ assuming the CLs monocurve and with BC spherical. The internal sag. depth was also calculated removing the nominal central thickness for a -3,00D power, from anterior sagittal depth measured at 20° C and 35° C. The central sphere value was measured in the central lens area typically at around 2mm in diameter. The zone power value was measured in an peripheral ring zone with a typically width of around 2mm. Initially, the glass lens runs were compared: The differences between both temperatures were very small: -1µm for DIA, <0.001D for PWR and <1µm for anterior sag. The results for the CLs showed obvious changes in diameter, sag and power when temperature is raised. The rim diameter decreased for example with a Clariti lens by 0.25mm or decreased by 0.45mm with an Biotrue lens (Fig.1). The Acuvue presented the highest difference in respect to labelled diameter. Calculated internal sagittal depth decreased (e.g. 70µm for Clariti and by a maximum of 180µm for Biotrue) (Fig.2). The increase of temperature introduce also changes on central power values of the CLs although lower than 0,25D (Fig.3); Indicatively, all CLs presented an increased addition with lower change for DAILIES plano. Zonal power presented an increase in negative direction in all lenses except 1-DAY -0,25D. Power profile presented indicatively an increase of negative power towards the periphery and a reduction toward the center (Fig. 4/5). Indentations in difference plot (Fig. 5) are mainly caused by lens shrinkage.











Figure 3. Left: Effect of temperature on lens power. Right: Powermap example (ID 7)

References

- 2. Young G. Potts M. Sulley A. The Effect of Temperature on Soft Contact Lens different materials. Contact Lens & Anterior Eye 2004;27:133-48 Diameter. Eve Contact Lens. 2016; 42:298-302. 3. Montani G, Van der Worp E. BCE vs SAG vs DIAM. Global Contact. 02/2016: 34-39. 9. Maldonado-Codina C, Efron N. Hydrogel lenses—Materials and manufacture: A 4. Ozkan J, Ehrmann K, Meadows D, et al. Lens parameter changes under in vitro and review. Optom Pract 2003;4:101–115. ex vivo conditions and their effect on the conjunctiva. Cont Lens Anterior Eye 10. Jones L, May C, Nazar L, et al. In vitro evaluation of the dehydration characteristics of 2013:36:171-175 silicone hydrogel and conventional hydrogel contact lens materials. Cont Lens 5. Young G, Garafalo R, Peters S, et al. The effect of temperature on soft contact lens Anterior Eye 2002; 25:147–156.

- modulus and diameter. Eye Cont Lens 2011;37:337-341 6. Douthwaite WA, Contact lens optics and lens design 3th Ed. Elsevier. 2006; 57-58





Figure 4. Effect of temperature on power profile, dotted line represent the nominal power.



Figure 5. Change of power profile from 20°C to 35°C

Conclusions

Temperature increase from 20°C to 35°C induced parameter modifications in the tested daily disposable multifocal CLs with obvious changes and effects on their power. In general, CLs made from hydrogel materials with higher water content have more water to lose, and thus shrink more as temperature is increased^{7,8}. Even if some of the changes are due to the shrinkage of the material itself^{9,10}. The changes found suggest that labelled parameters of soft CLs are unhelpful to do comparison between products or for predicting their behavior on the eye. In particular way considering multifocal contact lenses where correct centration and precise determination of power values are essential for a successful fitting¹¹. Considering our results, small changes of power as sometimes requested by over-refraction of some CLs could be related to changes of their optical profile which are induced by the increase of temperature.

- 1. ISO 18369-3: 2017 Ophthalmic optics—Contact lenses—Part 3: Measurement
- 7. McCarey BE, Wilson LA. pH, osmolarity and temperature effects on the water content of hydrogel contact lenses. Contact & Intraocular Lens 1982;8:158-67. 8. Tranoudis I, Efron N. In-eye performance of soft contact lenses made from
- 11. Pérez-Prados R, Piñero DP, Pérez-Cambrodí RJ, Madrid-Costa D. Soft multifocal simultaneous image contact lenses: a review. Clin Exp Optom. 2017; 100:107-127