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## Pupil block



Steep iris curvature


High rise PAS


Ciliary body/Iris mechanism


Shallow peripheral and deep central anterior chamber

## Lens mechanism



Shallow peripheral and shallow central ACD

## Atypical - 42 yr old male

- Sudden onset reduction in distance vision
- RVA = 6/60, PH 6/9, LVA 6/36, PH 6/9
- N5 both eyes, 6/6 with -2.0D lens
- IOP R $=40 \mathrm{mmHg}, \mathrm{L}=34 \mathrm{mmHg}$
- Goniosopy - appositional closure both eyes

Choroidal effusions


## Anatomical risk factors

## Old

- Shallow/ crowded AC
- Hyperopic eyes
- Large lens
- Lens position
- Lens curvature



## New

- Anterior chamberwidth, area and volume
- Iris - thickness, area, and curvature.
- Lens - lens vault



## "Plateau Iris" configuration

- Deep Central AC
- Iris Profile: Flat
- Angular Iris Root
- Anterior Ciliary Body




## Quantitative Iris parameters

- I-Curv,- line from peripheral to the most central points of iris pigment epithelium
- I-Area - cross-sectional area of iris (from spur to pupil).
- Iris thickness (IT)750 and IT2000 - iris thickness measured at 750 and $2000 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ from the scleral spur, respectively.
- Greater iris curvature, area and thickness


Automatic measurement of iris

## Lens vault

- $\uparrow$ lens vault increases the risk AC by 48 times compared to normal
- Bulk of lens located anterior to the plane
 of the angles plays an important role in the pathogenesis

Absolute lens position (ALP), Relative Lens Position (RLP) defined by Lowe $A L P=A C D+L T / 2(m m)$ $R L P=(A C D+L T / 2) / A L$ (no units)


## Developing a qualitative grading scale

- 11 observers
- Mixed experience - glaucoma consultants, clinical scientists, research fellow, technicians
- 2 images given as start and end anchor points
- Each observer asked to rank 8 images for each characteristic under standardised conditions
- Strength of correlation analysed for each observer against each other
- Kendall's W coefficient of concordance for multiple observers

R. Siddiqui, D. Henson, V. Sung, P. Good, R. Stanton, W. Nolan



## Anterior chamber depth



- Perfect concordance between 4 observers where $x=y$
- 2-point transpositions (7 and 8) and 3 point transposition $(4,5,6)$
- Highest variance at points 4,5 and 6




Key

* WN $\triangle \mathrm{RS} \nabla \mathrm{RSt} \Rightarrow \mathrm{MA} \forall \mathrm{JM} \square \mathrm{DH} \theta \mathrm{CF} \theta \mathrm{PG} \Rightarrow \mathrm{VS} \exists \mathrm{NB} \triangle \mathrm{YW}$


Pruned scales concordance

| Characteristic | Number of <br> points in scale | Pruned Kendall's <br> Concordance | $\mathbf{1 0}$ Kendall's <br> Concordance (W) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACD | 7 | 1.00 | 0.95 |
| Iris Thickness | 5 | 0.92 | 0.91 |
| Iris Profile | 5 | $1-0.84$ | 0.84 |
| Convexity | 5 | 0.85 | 0.79 |
| Angulation | 4 | $0.41-0.21$ | 0.41 |
| Ciliary Body Size | 5 | $0.92-0.80$ | 0.90 |
| Ciliary Body Position | 4 | $-1-1$ | 0.65 |

## Mechanisms of angle closure - Do they matter?

Subclassification of Primary Angle Closure Using Anterior Segment Optical Coherence Tomography and Ultrasound Biomicroscopic Parameters


Ophthalmology 2017;124:1039-1047


Figure 1. Quantitative parameters mesured on the (A) anterior-segment optical coherence tomography (ASOCT) and (B) ultrasound biomicrocopic images. ACA = anterior chamber area; ACD = anterior microsoopic umages. $\mathrm{ACA}=$ anterior chamber area; $\mathrm{ACD}=$ anterior chamber depth; $\mathrm{ACW}=$ anteriot chamber with; $\mathrm{ACDS00}=$ angle peni dic IC I
 TCPD = mbectiry mex trabecular-cilury process angle; TCPD $=$ trabecularciliary proces distance

Table 2. Comparison of Anterior Segment Optical Coherence Tomography and Ulrasound Biomicroscopy Parameters Used in Cluster Analysis ( $\mathrm{N}=73$ )

| Variables | Cluster A ( $\mathrm{n}=48$ ) | Cluster B ( $\mathrm{n}=25$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AS-OCT parameters |  |  |
| AOD500 (mm) | $0.15 \pm 0.10$ | $0.17 \pm 0.08$ |
| $\mathrm{LV}(\mathrm{mm})$ | $1.11 \pm 0.35$ | $1.22 \pm 0.24$ |
| ACD (mm) | $20 \pm 03$ | $2.0 \pm 0.2$ |
| ACA ( $\mathrm{mm}^{2}$ ) | $14.4 \pm 2.6$ | $14.1 \pm 2.1$ |
| ACW (mm) | $11.8 \pm 0.5$ | $11.9 \pm 0.4$ |
| IC (mm) | $0.16 \pm 0.08$ | $0.11 \pm 0.04$ |
| $1 \mathrm{~A}\left(\mathrm{~mm}^{2}\right)$ | $4.29 \pm 1.04$ | $4.04 \pm 0.90$ |
| $\mathrm{TT}_{750}(\mathrm{~mm})$ | $0.43 \pm 0.10$ | $0.43 \pm 0.08$ |
| $\mathrm{PD}(\mathrm{mm})$ | $3.4 \pm 0.8$ | $3.4 \pm 0.8$ |
| UBM parameters |  |  |
| TCA (degrees) | $91.0 \pm 13.4$ | $63.7 \pm 6.2$ |
| TCPD (mm) | $0.99 \pm 0.22$ | $0.78 \pm 0.16$ |
| CBT1 (mm) | $0.45 \pm 0.11$ | $0.44 \pm 0.09$ |
| CB orientation (neutral/anteriot), temporal | 35/13 | 0/25 |
| CB orientation (neutral/anterior), resal | 35/13 | 0/25 |
| Iris insertion (basi//middle/apical), temporal | 37/92 | 12/11/2 |
| Iris insertion (basal/middle/apical), rasal | 36/10/2 | 149/2 |
| Iris angulation (none/mildpronounced), temporal | 35/13/0 | 5/14/6 |
| Iris angulation (rone/mild/pronounced), rasal | 36/12/0 | 5/14/6 |
| Iris convexity (absent/mild/moderate/extreme), temporal | 23/24/1 | $22 \beta / 0$ |
| Iris convexity (absent/mild/moderate/extreme), rasal | 24/23/1 | 205/0 |
| Cilury sulaus (absencelpresence), temporal | $9 / 39$ | $24 / 1$ |
| Ciliary sulcus (absence/presence), rasal | 3/45 | 24/1 |
| Iribo-angle contact (closurelopen), temporal | 18/30 | $20 / 5$ |
| Irido-angle contact (closure/open), rasal | 17/31 | 20/5 |

## PAC/ PACG post iridotomy imaging

TCA = Trabecular-ciliary process angle TCPD = Trabecular-ciliary process distance

Table 3. Comparison of Other Clinical Characteristics between 2 Clusters Determined by Anterior Segment Optical Coherence Tomography and Ultrasound Biomicroscopy ( $\mathrm{N}=73$ )

| Variables | Cluster A ( $\mathrm{n}=48$ ) | Cluster B ( $\mathrm{n}=25$ ) | $P$ Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age (yrs) | $65.1 \pm 7.1$ | $66.0 \pm 8.4$ | 0.449 |
| Sex (men/women) | 9/39 | 4/21 | 1.000 |
| AXL (mm) | $22.5 \pm 0.4$ | $22.8 \pm 0.6$ | 0.360 |
| PAS ( $\mathrm{No} / \leq 2 \mathrm{Q} />2 \mathrm{Q}$ ) | 35/12/1 | 20/5/0 | 0.668 |
| Pre-LPI IOP ( mmHg ) | $18.8 \pm 5.4$ | $16.2 \pm 4.5$ | 0.037 |
| Post-LPI IOP ( mmHg ) | $13.9 \pm 2.5$ | $14.1 \pm 2.1$ | 0.647 |
| IOP difference ( mmHg ) ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | $5.0 \pm 5.0$ | $2.0 \pm 4.2$ | 0.014 |
| IOP reduction (\%) ${ }^{\text {l }}$ | $22.3 \pm 17.9$ | $83 \pm 19.5$ | 0.003 |
| No. of antighucoma medication | $1.0 \pm 1.2$ | $1.0 \pm 1.0$ | 0.360 |
| $\mathrm{AXL}=$ axial lenght; $\mathrm{IOP}=$ intraocular presure; $\mathrm{LPI}=$ hser peripheral iridotomy; $\mathrm{PAS}=$ peripheral anterior synechiae; $\mathrm{Q}=$ quadrant. *Pre-LPI IOP - post-LPI IOP ( mmHg ). <br> ${ }^{1}$ IOP difference/pre-LPI IOP $\times 100$ (\%). |  |  |  |
| $P$ values with statistical significance ( $<0.05$ ) appear in boldface. |  |  |  |
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## Clincal case:

45yr old, symptomatic angle closure and $\uparrow$ IOP, post iridotomy

Right Eye


Good response to Pilocarpine


## Summary

- Pupil block, iris/ ciliary body and lens mechanisms
- Combination of all three often present
- Quantitative analysis using imaging can help classify by mechanism
- Qualitative analysis better for linear measures
- Determining mechanism can help predicting response to treatment but most cases with raised IOP respond to lens extraction


## Thank you

