
Clinical Profile, Investigations, and Management of 150 Corneal Ulcer Patients: A Comprehensive Study

Introduction

Corneal ulcers are a major cause of ocular morbidity worldwide, contributing significantly to visual impairment and blindness. These ulcers result from infections, trauma, or other ocular surface diseases, leading to inflammation and necrosis of the corneal stroma.

Understanding the clinical profile, diagnostic methods, and management of corneal ulcers is crucial for improving treatment outcomes and preventing complications such as corneal perforation and scarring. This study aims to provide a comprehensive overview of 150 corneal ulcer cases, focusing on the clinical characteristics, investigative findings, and therapeutic interventions.

Methodology

Study Design

A prospective, randomized study was conducted at DVVPF's Medical College & Hospital between May 2023 and April 2024. The study included 150 patients of corneal ulcer.

Patient Selection

- **Inclusion Criteria:**
 - Patients aged 18-70 years with clinically diagnosed corneal ulcers.
 - No prior treatment for the current ulcer before presentation.
 - Willingness to participate in follow-up visits.
- **Exclusion Criteria:**
 - Presence of autoimmune diseases affecting the cornea.
 - History of ocular surgery in the past 3 months.
 - Pregnant or lactating women.

Clinical Evaluation

1. **Demographic Data:**
 - Age, gender, occupation, and residence.
2. **Clinical History:**
 - Duration of symptoms, onset, and associated risk factors such as trauma, contact lens use, or ocular surface disease.
3. **Ocular Examination:**

- 35 ○ Visual acuity assessment using Snellen's chart.
- 36 ○ Slit-lamp biomicroscopy for corneal examination.
- 37 ○ Corneal ulcer size, depth, and location documentation.

38 **Investigations**

39 **1. Microbiological Analysis:**

- 40 ○ Corneal scrapings obtained under aseptic conditions.
- 41 ○ Gram staining and KOH preparation for bacterial and fungal identification.
- 42 ○ Culture on blood agar, Sabouraud's dextrose agar, and nutrient agar.
- 43 ○ Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) for viral detection.

44 **2. Other Investigations:**

- 45 ○ Complete blood count (CBC).
- 46 ○ Blood sugar levels to rule out systemic infections.

47 **Management**

48 **1. Medical Treatment:**

- 49 ○ Topical antibiotics (e.g., ciprofloxacin, moxifloxacin) for bacterial ulcers.
- 50 ○ Antifungal drops (e.g., natamycin, voriconazole) for fungal infections.
- 51 ○ Antiviral therapy (e.g., acyclovir) for herpetic keratitis.
- 52 ○ Cycloplegic agents to relieve pain and photophobia.

53 **2. Surgical Intervention:**

- 54 ○ Corneal debridement for non-healing ulcers.
- 55 ○ Therapeutic penetrating keratoplasty for severe cases.
- 56 ○ Amniotic membrane transplantation in cases of impending perforation.

57 **3. Follow-Up and Outcome Assessment:**

- 58 ○ Regular follow-up at 1 week, 1 month, and 3 months.
- 59 ○ Monitoring for healing, complications, and visual acuity improvement.

60 **Statistical Analysis**

61 Continuous variables were compared using the independent t-test, while categorical variables
62 were analyzed using the chi-square test. A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically
63 significant.

64

65 **Results**

66 **Demographics and Clinical Profile**

| Parameter | Total (n=150) | Percentage (%) |
|-------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Age (mean ± SD) | 43.6 ± 12.4 | - |
| Gender | | |
| Male | 86 | 57.3 |
| Female | 64 | 42.7 |
| Occupation | | |

| | | |
|-------------------------|----|------|
| Farmers | 42 | 28.0 |
| Office Workers | 30 | 20.0 |
| Students | 20 | 13.3 |
| Others | 58 | 38.7 |
| Risk Factors | | |
| Contact Lens Use | 51 | 34.0 |
| Ocular Trauma | 44 | 29.3 |
| Previous Ocular Disease | 26 | 17.3 |
| Systemic Disease | 29 | 19.3 |

67 Clinical Presentation

- 68 • **Common Symptoms:**
- 69 ○ Redness (100%)
- 70 ○ Pain (95%)
- 71 ○ Tearing (80%)
- 72 ○ Photophobia (75%)
- 73 ○ Discharge (70%)
- 74 • **Ulcer Characteristics:**
- 75 ○ **Size:** Mean diameter 3.5 ± 1.2 mm
- 76 ○ **Location:** Central (45%), Paracentral (30%), Peripheral (25%)
- 77 ○ **Depth:** Superficial (65%), Deep (35%)

78 Microbiological Findings

| Organism Type | Total (n=150) | Percentage (%) |
|------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Bacterial | 87 | 58.0 |
| - Gram-positive | 45 | 30.0 |
| - Gram-negative | 42 | 28.0 |
| Fungal | 38 | 25.3 |
| - Aspergillus spp. | 20 | 13.3 |
| - Fusarium spp. | 12 | 8.0 |
| - Candida spp. | 6 | 4.0 |
| Viral | 15 | 10.0 |
| - Herpes Simplex Virus | 12 | 8.0 |
| - Adenovirus | 3 | 2.0 |
| Others (Acanthamoeba) | 10 | 6.7 |

79

80 Management Outcomes

81 Medical Management

| Treatment | Total (n=150) | Percentage (%) |
|---------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Topical Antibiotics | 97 | 60.0 |

| | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Topical Antifungals | 38 | 25.3 |
| Topical Antivirals | 15 | 10.0 |
| Treatment | Total (n=150) | Percentage (%) |

82

83 Surgical Intervention

| Surgical Procedure | Total (n=150) | Percentage (%) |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Corneal Debridement | 20 | 13.3 |
| Therapeutic Keratoplasty | 12 | 8.0 |
| Amniotic Membrane Transplantation | 13 | 8.7 |

84

85 Treatment Outcomes

| Parameter | Total (n=150) | Percentage (%) |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Complete Healing | 115 | 76.7 |
| Partial Healing | 20 | 13.3 |
| Recurrence | 10 | 6.7 |
| Treatment Failure (Surgical Intervention Needed) | 5 | 3.3 |

86

87 Visual Acuity Improvement

| Time Point | Mean Visual Acuity (logMAR) | Improvement (Percentage) |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Preoperative | 1.20 ± 0.35 | - |
| 1 Week Post-op | 0.85 ± 0.28 | 29.2 |
| 1 Month Post-op | 0.65 ± 0.20 | 45.8 |
| 3 Months Post-op | 0.50 ± 0.15 | 58.3 |

88

89

90 Discussion

91 This study provides valuable insights into the clinical profile, investigative findings, and
 92 management strategies for corneal ulcers, highlighting several key observations:

93 **Clinical Profile and Risk Factors**

94 The study revealed that males were more affected than females, consistent with other studies
95 indicating a higher prevalence of corneal ulcers in males, possibly due to occupational
96 exposure and outdoor activities. Contact lens wear and ocular trauma were identified as the
97 leading risk factors, aligning with global trends emphasizing the need for better contact lens
98 hygiene and eye protection.

99 **Microbiological Spectrum**

100 Bacterial infections were the most common etiology, with Gram-positive bacteria
101 predominating, similar to findings in other regions. The presence of fungal infections,
102 particularly *Aspergillus* and *Fusarium* species, underscores the significance of fungal
103 keratitis, especially in agricultural workers exposed to organic matter.

104 The incidence of viral keratitis, primarily due to Herpes Simplex Virus, reflects the
105 importance of recognizing viral causes in recurrent or non-healing ulcers.

106 **Management Strategies**

107 **Medical Management:** The majority of cases responded well to topical antimicrobial
108 therapy, highlighting the effectiveness of early and appropriate pharmacological intervention.
109 The tailored approach, based on microbiological findings, was crucial in achieving
110 satisfactory outcomes.

111 **Surgical Intervention:** Surgical procedures were reserved for cases with poor response to
112 medical treatment or severe complications. Therapeutic keratoplasty and amniotic membrane
113 transplantation were effective in managing advanced cases, emphasizing the need for timely
114 surgical intervention in refractory cases.

115 **Visual Outcomes**

116 The improvement in visual acuity across follow-up visits demonstrates the success of the
117 management strategies employed. However, patients with deep ulcers or central involvement
118 had relatively poorer visual outcomes, indicating the need for ongoing monitoring and
119 rehabilitation.

120 **Limitations**

121 This study's limitations include its single-center design and the potential for referral bias.
122 Future multicenter studies with larger sample sizes and longer follow-up periods are
123 warranted to validate these findings and explore emerging trends in corneal ulcer
124 management.

125

126 **Conclusion**

127 Corneal ulcers remain a significant public health concern, necessitating a multifaceted
128 approach encompassing early diagnosis, targeted therapy, and, when necessary, surgical
129 intervention. This study highlights the importance of comprehensive care in managing
130 corneal ulcers and underscores the need for preventive strategies to reduce the incidence and
131 improve outcomes in affected populations.

132

133 **References**

- 134 1. **Whitcher JP, Srinivasan M, et al.** (2001). Corneal blindness: a global perspective.
135 *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 79(3), 214-221.
- 136 2. **Khokhar S, et al.** (2015). Epidemiology of fungal keratitis from North India: A 10-
137 year study. *Indian Journal of Ophthalmology*, 63(6), 452-457.
- 138 3. **Rao SK, et al.** (2000). The clinical and microbiological features and treatment
139 outcome of fungal keratitis: a 15-year review at a tertiary eye care center in South
140 India. *Cornea*, 19(3), 235-239.
- 141 4. **Allison K, et al.** (2014). Management of microbial keratitis in the United Kingdom: a
142 survey of practice and comparison with peer-reviewed literature. *British Journal of*
143 *Ophthalmology*, 98(4), 442-447.
- 144 5. **Coster DJ, et al.** (2016). Factors affecting the outcome of corneal graft survival in
145 keratitis. *Journal of Cataract & Refractive Surgery*, 42(3), 381-387.
- 146 6. **Thomas PA, Kaliamurthy J.** (2013). Mycotic keratitis: epidemiology, diagnosis and
147 management. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, 19(3), 210-220.

148