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Recent reports of CO₂ accumulation under hydrogel lenses, paired with the detection of a decrease in stromal pH following contact lens wear, have highlighted the potential for tear pH assessment as a clinical tool. The in situ anterior hydrogel lens surface pH was measured with a flat-surfaced, self-referenced pH electrode in order to indirectly evaluate fluid exchange between the precorneal tear film and hydrogel lenses. Volunteer human subjects were fitted with moderate water content (58%), disposable extended wear hydrogel lenses. Measurements were recorded from the lens in its packaged state (pH 6.99), from the lens in situ 5 minutes after initial lens application (pH 7.17), 24 hours later (pH 7.34), and at the end of 7 days continuous contact lens wear (pH 7.43). Possible cornea-tear film-hydrogel lens interactions could explain certain hydrogel lens-associated contrast sensitivity deficits and transient endothelial changes.
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Introduction

The anterior corneal surface is associated closely with an overlying canopy of moisture known as the precorneal tear film. Traditionally, clinicians have been concerned with how certain characteristics of the tears can influence corneal integrity; tear film formation problems and tear osmolarity issues represent two examples of purported tear film influence on the cornea. However, the tear film can be susceptible to influence by the cornea, as evidenced by the presence of both glycolytic and tricarboxylic acid cycle enzymes within the tear layer. The source of these enzymes has been shown not to be the lacrimal gland, but, rather, the underlying corneal tissue. Therefore, tear chemistry is affected directly by the cornea. Consequently, clinicians should be reminded that although anatomically distinct the cornea and its tear film are functionally interactive.

Attempts at quantifying the normal tear pH value have yielded varying results. Although one cause of variation appears to be due to instrumentation differences, the primary cause of the variation appears to be the location or source of the tear sample. In the past, the tear film has been approached as a unitary entity independent of whether or not a sample or pH reading was obtained from the fornix, cul-de-sac, inferior meniscus, or limbus. Based on this variety of pH results, shown in Table 1, it can be concluded that tear pH is location-specific. Discussions stemming from this investigation are limited to the precorneal tear film.

Efforts at documenting the pH of the precorneal tear film (i.e., that canopy of mucin, aqueous, and oil directly anterior to the cornea) have resulted in a mean value range of 7.45 (Ref. 9) to 7.83 (Ref. 10). Since measurements of precorneal tear film pH under the extended open-eye condition (i.e., nonblinking state) have been shown to match...
that predicted by CO₂ cornea-tear film equilibration calculations,² it is likely the above values are very close to the true precomeal tear film pH.

Initial research indicated hydrogel contact lenses may provide a barrier to carbon dioxide (CO₂) efflux from the cornea, although at the time this was considered to be insignificant in terms of corneal physiology.¹¹ However, recent measurements of tear CO₂ accumulation under hydrogel lenses,¹² paired with the detection of a decrease in both subcontact lens¹⁰ and stromal pH following contact lens wear,¹³ indicates yet another functional link between the precomeal tear film and corneal physiology. Indeed, Holden et al.¹²,¹⁴ have tied the issues of subhydrogel lens CO₂ expiration has been associated with one aspect of the precomeal tear film (i.e., the subcontact lens tear film), it is possible other aspects of the precomeal tear film may be influenced as well. The purpose of this study was to evaluate fluid exchange interactions between hydrogel lenses and the precomeal tear film in an attempt to indirectly monitor corneal and subcontact lens pH changes resulting from hydrogel contact lens wear.

Materials and Methods

A self-referenced pH electrode (Orion Research, Model SA 230), designed for pH recording from semisolid materials, was used to assess the in situ anterior contact lens surface pH response to continuous wear of a 58% water, disposable soft contact lens. The recorded pH reading was the peak value of a transient response. Upon initial probe application, the measured pH value was within 0.2 of the final or peak value. However, a gradual drift in the alkaline direction led to stabilization of the reading, presumably due to temperature changes at the probe surface. If the probe was kept in contact with the lens beyond the stabilization period, a gradual shift in the acidic direction was noted. This has been attributed to CO₂ accumulation under the probe (Fatt, personal communication).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>N (subjects)</th>
<th>Mean ± error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Inferior fornix</td>
<td>Microglass electrode</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.93 ± 0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Lateral fornix</td>
<td>Direct contact microelectrode</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>7.11 ± 1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Limbus (1 o'clock)</td>
<td>Micro-pH electrode</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.60 ± 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Inferior cul-de-sac</td>
<td>Micro-pH electrode</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.50 ± 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Precomical</td>
<td>Micro-pH electrode</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7.51 ± 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Meniscus</td>
<td>Microelectrode</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.45 ± 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Precomical</td>
<td>Fluorescent probe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.83 ± 0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjects were on a 1-week wearing cycle, after which time the lenses were removed, disposed of, and replaced after at least one night of lens-free sleep. The pH electrode was calibrated with a 7.00 and a 10.00 pH standard solution at 35°C and disinfected by alcohol swab and surface drying between each assessment. Probe calibration was then maintained at 35°C. Measurements were recorded from the contact lens in its storage packet immediately after opening, then 5 minutes after initial lens application onto the volunteer subject’s eye, 24 hours after initial lens application, and 7 days after initial lens application. Additional anterior lens surface pH recordings were made during the course of follow-up examinations after 1, 3, and 6 months of contact lens-wearing experience using the weekly wearing paradigm detailed above. Each measurement for any one individual was taken at the same time of day in order to minimize error from individual diurnal variations.³ However, pH assessments across individuals occurred at varying times of day, thereby eliminating any group diurnal effect.

Results

Figure 1 provides a graphical data representation. The contact lens in solution is very near a neutral pH of 7.00. Within the first 5 minutes of contact lens wear, the pH reading started to rise into the alkaline region (7.17); a further increase in pH is noted after 24 hours of wear (7.34). Stabilization of pH (7.43) is apparent at day 7 near established norms for the nonlens-wearing precomeal tear film. Subsequent pH measurements after 1, 3, and 6 months of weekly disposable contact lens wear fall between the pH values found on day 1 and day 7 (7.38). Baseline, 5-minute, and 24-hour data are statistically significant by the t-test (p < 0.05). Subsequent measurements (7 day and 1-, 3-, and 6-month follow-ups) are not statistically different from the 24-hour pH value (p > 0.20). However, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) over the 1-week initial period elicits a statistically significant trend for pH shift over the entire initial 7-day time period.

Table 1. Recent Tear pH Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>N (subjects)</th>
<th>Mean ± error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norn</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Inferior fornix</td>
<td>Microglass electrode</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.93 ± 0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coles and Jarus</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Lateral fornix</td>
<td>Direct contact microelectrode</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>7.11 ± 1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer and Wiederholt</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Limbus (1 o'clock)</td>
<td>Micro-pH electrode</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.60 ± 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abelson et al.</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Inferior cul-de-sac</td>
<td>Micro-pH electrode</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.50 ± 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andres et al.</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Precomical</td>
<td>Micro-pH electrode</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7.51 ± 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carney and Hil1</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Meniscus</td>
<td>Microelectrode</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.45 ± 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen and Maurice</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Precomical</td>
<td>Fluorescent probe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.83 ± 0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anterior Lens Surface pH
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Figure 1. Anterior lens surface pH vs. continuous wearing time.

Discussion

The initial in situ pH reading of 7.17, taken just 5 minutes after lens application, suggests that a fluid exchange between the anterior tear film and the contact lens occurs very quickly. However, pH values obtained on subsequent follow-up evaluations (1, 3, and 6 months postfitting) documented the pH status of lenses that had been worn 2-7 days prior to these pH measurements. Since the average long-term follow-up pH value (7.38) falls between the initial week's pH values for day 1 (7.34) and day 7 (7.43), it would be reasonable to accept the concept of a long-term pattern of fluid exchange reaching equilibrium somewhere within a 7-day range of hydrogel lens wear. It should be noted here that the use of this pH electrode methodology assumes the anterior contact lens surface pH measurement accurately represents both the prelens tear film pH and the pH of the anterior water component of the hydrogel contact lens. However, it is possible these two entities could have slightly different pH values.

The final pH data for day 7 of the initial week of lens wear are not much different from the accepted published norms for the precorneal tear film. The initial data (days 0 and 1) are less alkaline compared to precorneal tear film norms, possibly due to the starting lens pH of 7.00; if the lenses were packaged in a storage solution of a more alkaline nature near 7.45, this pattern of pH adjustment might not be exhibited. In any event, the data do not support the use of this system as a useful indirect monitor of corneal and subcontact lens pH changes related to hydrogel lens wear. However, it may be possible to estimate CO₂ expiration rates by monitoring the anterior lens surface pH over a lengthy continuous probe application period. In future studies, the combined knowledge of CO₂ expiration rates and O₂ uptake rates might provide clinically useful information.

Accepting previous reports of pH decrease/CO₂ trapping or buildup under hydrogel lens, it is possible that a pH gradient exists within the matrix of a hydrogel lens (Figure 2). Moreover, this gradient, bordered by different pH environments at each hydrogel lens surface, would preclude a lens from being considered as simply a unitary piece of plastic. It previously has been shown that soft lens hydration is directly influenced by the pH of its solution. Therefore, a lens in close approximation with a cornea, with differing pH solutions at each surface, could have a transitional water content from one surface to the other. Consequently, there would be a varying index of refraction as well. This pH gradient then would create layers of "lenses" between the physical confines of the anterior and posterior lens surfaces. This laminar arrangement of varying water content and refractive indices could be responsible for the optical issues linked to certain contrast sensitivity deficits of hydrogel lens wear.

Lastly, is the initial, packaged lens pH significant to the physiological integrity of the cornea? It is accepted that the maintenance of corneal thickness and transparency, by way of active ion transport, is pH dependent. In addition, induced relative acidic pH changes at the level of the endothelium have been linked to the transient endothelial bleb response. Finally, a number of possible effects of an acidic shift in the cornea have previously been suggested. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the application of a moderate- to high-water-content hydrogel lens of a 7.0 pH or lower, weighing approximately 0.013 g, holding roughly 7.5 μl of water (if a 58% water material), would immediately create a stressful environment for the cornea. Within the context of this study (58% water content lens), application of a hydrogel lens to the anterior surface of the cornea effectively doubles the volume of fluid anterior to the cornea, since the typical precorneal tear film is 7-8 μl in volume. If the lens matrix possesses a pH that is relatively acidic compared with the precorneal tear film norm, then a significant metabolic challenge could be presented to the cornea proper. The pH-mediated transient endothelial bleb response could therefore be a reflection of this initial challenge. Upon initial lens application, the pH-induced stress would be at a peak and then begin to decline as the water component slowly equilibrates with the tear film. However, concurrent CO₂ expiration and trapping would elicit a supplementary pH-induced stress. With
the endothelial bleb response being related to pH challenge, it is reasonable to conclude that the application of a hydrogel lens, exhibiting pH characteristics relatively acidic compared with the normal precomeal tear film, is the trigger for hydrogel lens-related transient endothelial changes. If this untested hypothesis is valid, then immediate, transient endothelial changes (i.e., the bleb response) could be bypassed by packaging hydrogel lenses at a slightly alkaline pH.

In summary, simple pH measurement of the anterior lens surface does not appear to provide clinically useful information, although a pH profile monitored over an extended time period may provide information concerning CO₂ expiration. A number of questions can be raised concerning both the susceptibility of visual performance and corneal physiology to external influence by the physical state of the hydrogel material when placed on the cornea.
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