

The Benefit of Low-Level Light Therapy in Association with Intense Pulsed Light for Meibomian Gland Dysfunction

João Heitor Marques (✉ joaoheitormarques@gmail.com)

Centro Hospitalar Universitário do Porto <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6487-7950>

Ana Marta

Centro Hospitalar Universitário do Porto <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3495-4649>

Pedro Manuel Baptista

Centro Hospitalar Universitário do Porto <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8285-1084>

Daniel Almeida

Centro Hospitalar Universitário do Porto

Diana José

Centro Hospitalar Universitário do Porto

Paulo Sousa

Centro Hospitalar Universitário do Porto

Irene Barbosa

Centro Hospitalar Universitário do Porto <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6053-5339>

Research Article

Keywords: Dry Eye Syndromes, Meibomian Gland Dysfunction, Phototherapy, Intense Pulsed Light Therapy, Low-Level Light Therapy

Posted Date: July 21st, 2022

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1879448/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Purpose

To study the clinical benefit of low-level light therapy when associated with intense pulsed light for the treatment of meibomian gland dysfunction.

Methods

An observational comparative study. Sixty-two (62) subjects were assigned 1:1 to one of two treatment arms: group 1 (31 subjects, 62 eyes), intense pulsed light followed by low-level light and group 2 (31 subjects, 62 eyes) intense pulsed light alone. In both groups, treatments were performed in 3 sessions and subjects were evaluated at baseline and 3 weeks after the last treatment session. Values are shown as Δ = mean difference \pm standard deviation.

Results

We observed a significant improvement in OSDI-12 score and lipid layer thickness, in both groups ($\Delta = -22.7 \pm 17.5$, $p < 0.001$ in group 1 and $\Delta = -23.6 \pm 23.8$, $p < 0.001$ in group 2 for OSDI and $\Delta = +18.6 \pm 37.0$, $p < 0.001$ in group 1 and $\Delta = +19.9 \pm 26.4$, $p < 0.001$ in group 2 for lipid layer thickness). Despite no differences between groups at baseline ($p = 0.469$), only group 1 had a significant improvement in Schirmer test ($\Delta = +1.6 \pm 4.8$, $p = 0.009$ in group 1 and $\Delta = +1.7 \pm 6.9$, $p = 0.057$ in group 2). No significant side effects were noted. No patient in any group felt subjectively “worse” after the treatment.

Conclusion

Intense pulsed light seems effective and safe for the treatment of meibomian gland dysfunction, improving symptoms and the tear film lipid layer. This study shows no strong evidence of the benefit of low-level light, but it shows weak evidence that it may further improve aqueous tear production.

Introduction

Meibomian gland dysfunction (MGD) is currently considered a crucial factor in dry eye disease.¹ The prevalence of MGD ranges from 3.5–60%², it leads to patient-reported symptoms³ and it objectively and subjectively impairs visual function and life quality^{4,5} because of tear film instability and inflammation.

The treatment of MGD underwent a revolution in the past years: in addition to classical self-administered options such as warm compresses, lid massage and several types of ocular lubricants, new in-office targeted therapies are now available. Intense pulsed light (IPL) is broad spectrum high-power light pulsed that, in controlled trials, has been shown to improve tear film quality and symptoms.^{6–8} It may be more

effective than eyelid hygiene in improving meibomian gland structure and reducing inflammation.⁹ The proposed mechanisms for its effectiveness are ablation of superficial blood vessels in the eyelids, leading to a reduced supply of inflammatory agents; reduction of bacterial and parasitic growth; meibum liquefaction, and collagen remodeling.¹⁰

Low-level light therapy (LLL) is a different type of photomodulation, where low-power monochromatic red light is applied for a longer period, promoting tissue repair, antioxidation and reducing inflammation.¹¹ LLL has been more recently studied in combination with IPL in the treatment of MGD.¹²⁻¹⁴ Conversely, there is neither a published controlled study using LLL alone nor a study comparing IPL plus LLL with IPL alone. Therefore, the benefit of adding LLL to IPL therapy remains unknown.

Our purpose was to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of LLL when associated with IPL for the treatment of MGD.

Materials And Methods

Study design

A prospective observational study was performed. The researcher collecting the data was masked to the subject's group and subjects were unaware of the treatment allocation. The treatment was performed always by the same experienced unmasked clinician, but who was not involved in data collection.

Participants and protocol

Subjects with clinical diagnosis of MGD according to The International Workshop on Meibomian Gland Dysfunction¹⁵ and aged over 18 years were considered for treatment in the Ophthalmology Department of *Centro Hospitalar Universitário do Porto*. Atrophy of meibomian glands on any of the lower eyelids (loss area of the meibomian glands through infrared meibography over 40%, measured automatically with IDRA® Ocular Surface Analyzer in the inferior eyelid, SBM Sistemi, Italy) led to exclusion from the treatment. Other contra-indications were: (1) ocular trauma, intraocular surgery, or intraocular inflammatory disease in the past six months; (2) contact lens use in the past six months; (3) previous eyelid or lacrimal surgery; (4) skin cancer anywhere or pigment lesions on the periorbital skin; (5) pregnancy or nursing; and (6) inability to comply with the treatment or with the follow-up regimen.

Two groups of patients that were treated with IPL were considered:

- Group 1: Patients that underwent IPL+LLL, 31 subjects, 62 eyes. Each treatment session started with 5 IPL (Eye-Light® with Optimal Power Energy®, Espansione Marketing S.p.A., Bologna, Italy) pulses applied inferiorly (4 pulses) and laterally (1 pulse) to each eye followed by bilateral application of LLL (My Mask®, Espansione Marketing S.p.A., Bologna, Italy) for 15 minutes. The application of a

cooling gel was not necessary with the Optimal Power Energy® technology. The treatments were performed in 3 sessions 1 week apart, as recommended by the manufacturer.

- Group 2: Patients that underwent IPL alone, 31 subjects, 62 eyes. Each treatment session consisted of 5 IPL (E>Eye, E-SWIN, Paris, France) pulses applied inferiorly (4 pulses) and laterally (1 pulse) to each eye, over a layer of gel applied to the skin for optimized cooling and light conduction. The treatments were performed in 3 sessions, at day 0, day 15 and day 45, as recommended by the manufacturer.

During IPL treatment, protective shields were placed over the eyes. The level of energy delivered was automatically set for each patient according to the degree of skin pigmentation (subjectively evaluated with skin Fitzpatrick scale). There were no restrictions regarding the use of regular artificial tears, but no changes were allowed on every patient during the study and no drops could be used during the day of the study visit until after the examination. Moreover, mechanical gland expression, warm compresses, antibiotic, or anti-inflammatory treatments were not used during the study period. All subjects included for analysis completed all treatment sessions.

Outcomes

Subjects underwent the following evaluation both at baseline and 3 weeks after the last treatment session: (1) A validated dry-eye related questionnaire (OSDI 12); (2) automated ocular surface analysis as described previously¹⁶ (IDRA® Ocular Surface Analyzer SBM Sistemi, Italy) that reported non-invasive break-up time (NIBUT), eye blink quality (EB, score calculated automatically by the device using blinking frequency and completeness), lipid layer thickness (LLT), loss area of the meibomian glands (LAMG) in the inferior eyelid and tear meniscus height (TMH); (3) tear osmolarity (OSM, measured with TearLab® Osmolarity System, Tearlab, San Diego, CA, USA); (4) Schirmer test type 1 and (5) slit lamp evaluation with fluorescein and the presence of corneal staining (CFS) were noted.

Due to the presence of mucinous filaments in the corneal surface at baseline visit, the automatic measurement of LLT was not feasible in 17 eyes (3 in group 1 and 14 in group 2). Therefore, these eyes were excluded from the analysis that considered LLT. There were no other missing values.

At the post-treatment evaluation, each patient answered a subjective end report as feeling “better”, “the same” or “worse”.

Statistical analysis

Regarding the ocular surface outcomes, both eyes were included for analysis and each eye was considered the statistical unit. For demographic data, subjects were considered the statistical unit.

Analysis was performed using IBM SPSS version 26.0.0.0. Chi-square and McNemar tests were used in categorical variables. *t*-tests were used in continuous variables after confirmation of the variables' normal distribution (Shapiro–Wilk test) and equal variance (Levene's test). Statistical significance was set as a *p*-value inferior to 0.01 to minimize type I statistical errors. Values are shown as mean ± standard deviation.

Results

Comparison of baseline demographic and clinical data between groups is shown in Table 1. An analysis of the outcomes before and after treatment is shown in Table 2 (quantitative analysis) and Table 3 (qualitative analysis).

Moreover, in group 1 (IPL + LLL), 4/32 eyes (13%) with CSF at baseline exhibited its resolution with treatment. In group 2 (IPL), this frequency was 21/43 (49%, *p* = 0.002). Furthermore, 6/30 (20%) eyes in group 1 (IPL + LLL) and 4/19 (21%) eyes in group 2 (IPL) that had no CSF at baseline developed it by the time of the post-treatment visit.

Concerning the subjective end report, in group 1, 25/31 patients (81%) reported feeling “better” and 6/31 patients (19%) stated feeling “the same” after treatment. In group 2, these frequencies were 30/31 patients (97%) and 1/31 patients (3%), respectively. No patient in any group felt “worse” after the treatment.

Regarding the safety analysis, no adverse effects were noted in any group (no conjunctivitis, blistering, edema, skin pigmentation changes or loss of eyelashes).

Analyzing all eyes (124 eyes), there were no differences in the magnitude of changes in OSDI, LLT, EB or OSM (outcomes with significant changes) regarding the use of lubricant eye drops (*p* > 0.189), use of antihypertensive eye drops (*p* > 0.061), use of eye drops with preservatives (*p* > 0.188) or previous cataract surgery (*p* > 0.014).

Discussion

Our results, regarding both IPL alone and IPL plus LLL, corroborate previous studies that showed the objective and subjective efficacy of IPL in the treatment of patients with dry eye disease and MGD^{6–8,17–21}. Conversely, a 2020 Cochrane meta-analysis, that included 3 of these previous studies, found uncertain evidence of effectiveness and safety of IPL as a treatment for MGD.²² In the current trial, regardless of the treatment arm, we observed a reduction in OSDI and an increase in LLT. Figure 1 shows a case study.

The reduction in OSDI may be accompanied by a placebo effect from inclusion in the study but may also be associated with less eyelid inflammation and better tear film quality after treatment. The anti-inflammatory properties of IPL are thought to be one of its main benefits in tear film homeostasis.²³

We postulate that the increase in LLT is a consequence of the improved outflow of meibum from the glands and their enhanced function and morphology, as it has been already described.¹⁸ In both groups, LLT increased equally and on average 39% from baseline to the post-treatment visit and 30% of cases reached normal values. Still, the other 70% of cases did not reach the normal value of LLT at 1 month, a result that should be interpreted carefully. An improvement in patients with MGD may be clinically significant even if normal values (calculated for a healthy population) are not met. Moreover, it has been showed that LLT may further improve up to 6 months after the treatment.¹²

Regarding comparative studies using IPL, there is a single published one that showed few clinically significant differences between two distinct devices.²⁴ Regarding LLL, there is no published article exploring this treatment alone in humans. There are three previous single arm studies using IPL combined with LLL¹²⁻¹⁴, showing improvement in symptoms and objective measures, similar to the effect of IPL alone. However, proper comparisons with other studies using IPL alone were not possible given the variable methodologies used. Therefore, there has been no discrimination in the effect of LLL. The current study is the first to compare the clinical efficacy and safety of IPL combined with LLL to IPL alone.

Our study groups were relatively well-balanced regarding demographic data and most baseline ocular surface parameters. Yet, there were baseline differences between groups in EB and OSM, that limit proper longitudinal comparison of these outcomes between groups. We found no other significant differences between groups in the changes after treatment. Still, regarding the Schirmer test, significance was reached in the IPL plus LLL group and not in the IPL alone group. As previously suggested in a pre-clinical study²⁵, LLL alone may have an effect on the lacrimal gland, increasing tear volume and reducing neutrophil infiltration. As Marta A et al. highlighted,¹² LLL, but not IPL, is applied directly to the superior lid which may justify the differences regarding tear production after treatment.

On the contrary, a significant reduction in CFS after treatment was seen in the IPL group and not in the IPL + LLL group. There was however no difference between groups in the number of eyes that developed *de novo* CFS, suggesting it was not a safety issue. This finding may be a consequence of non-significant but uneven distribution of diabetic patients between groups, with higher frequency in the IPL + LLL group. Diabetic patients show increased corneal epithelial fragility, delayed healing, and persistent defects.^{26,27} Anyway, further research is needed regarding the effect of IPL and LLL in the corneal epithelium.

The results of this study support no superiority in efficacy or safety when comparing both treatment modalities. In clinical practice, it should also be taken into consideration the extra burden caused by LLL namely the increased treatment time, and some discomfort caused by the application of heat. Our methodology did not consider these two outcomes.

A possible limitation of this study is the use of different IPL devices in each group and different treatment intervals. Currently there is no approved device to perform LLL separately. We used the commercially available devices to perform each treatment and the session intervals recommended by each

manufacturer. Another limitation is the short follow-up. Other studies with longer follow-up periods observed an effect up to 3–6 months after similar treatment protocols.^{8,12,14,19} It remains unclear if LLL will affect the results in the long term.

IPL seems to have advantages in patients which are refractory or uncompliant to classic therapies, but formal indications are not yet established. Future studies should also determine the stage of MGD and other patient's characteristics that predict the best cost-effectiveness for this treatment.

Conclusion

In summary, our results suggest that IPL is effective and safe in the short term for the treatment of MGD. Combining LLL to IPL may additionally improve lacrimal gland function and tear production, but further studies must confirm this finding.

Abbreviations

Corneal staining (CFS)

Eye blink quality (EB)

Intense pulsed light (IPL)

Lipid layer thickness (LLT)

Loss area of the meibomian glands (LAMG)

Low-level light therapy (LLL)

Meibomian gland dysfunction (MGD)

Non-invasive break-up time (NIBUT)

Tear meniscus height (TMH)

Tear osmolarity (OSM)

Declarations

Ethics and patient consent

The study was approved by our institutional review board and ethics committee - *Departamento de Ensino Formação e Investigação, Centro Hospitalar Universitário do Porto*, ID 2021-037(029-DEFI-030-CE) and it was conducted accordingly to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki for the protection of human subjects in medical research. Written informed consent was obtained from all subjects.

Conflict of interests: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.

Data availability: Raw data that supports the results of this study is available by request at the first author

Funding: No funding was obtained for this study.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank the Head of the Ophthalmology Department of *Centro Hospitalar Universitário do Porto*, Prof. Dr. Pedro Menéres, for the support granted for this study.

Author Contributions: The first three authors were responsible for designing the study, analyzing the data, and writing the initial manuscript. The fourth to sixth authors were responsible for performing the study visits and the exams. The last author is an ocular surface expert that performed the treatments and managed the research project. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

References

1. Craig JP, Nichols KK, Akpek EK, et al. TFOS DEWS II Definition and Classification Report. *Ocul Surf.* 2017;15(3):276–283. doi:10.1016/j.jtos.2017.05.008
2. Schaumberg DA, Nichols JJ, Papas EB, Tong L, Uchino M, Nichols KK. The international workshop on meibomian gland dysfunction: Report of the subcommittee on the epidemiology of, and associated risk factors for, MGD. *Investig Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2011;52(4):1994–2005. doi:10.1167/iovs.10-6997e
3. Bron AJ, Tiffany JM. The contribution of meibomian disease to dry eye. *Ocul Surf.* 2004;2(2):149–164. doi:10.1016/S1542-0124(12)70150-7
4. Miljanović B, Dana R, Sullivan DA, Schaumberg DA. Impact of Dry Eye Syndrome on Vision-Related Quality of Life. *Am J Ophthalmol.* 2007;143(3). doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2006.11.060
5. Denoyer A, Rabut G, Baudouin C. Tear film aberration dynamics and vision-related quality of life in patients with dry eye disease. *Ophthalmology.* 2012;119(9):1811–1818. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2012.03.004
6. Craig JP, Chen YH, Turnbull PRK. Prospective trial of intense pulsed light for the treatment of meibomian gland dysfunction. *Investig Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2015;56(3):1965–1970. doi:10.1167/iovs.14-15764
7. Piyacomn Y, Kasetuwan N, Reinprayoon U, Satitpitakul V, Tesapirat L. Efficacy and Safety of Intense Pulsed Light in Patients With Meibomian Gland Dysfunction-A Randomized, Double-Masked, Sham-Controlled Clinical Trial. *Cornea.* 2020;39(3):325–332. doi:10.1097/ICO.0000000000002204
8. Xue AL, Wang MTM, Ormonde SE, Craig JP. Randomised double-masked placebo-controlled trial of the cumulative treatment efficacy profile of intense pulsed light therapy for meibomian gland dysfunction: Intense pulsed light therapy for meibomian gland dysfunction. *Ocul Surf.* 2020;18(2):286–297. doi:10.1016/j.jtos.2020.01.003

9. Yin Y, Liu N, Gong L, Song N. Changes in the Meibomian Gland After Exposure to Intense Pulsed Light in Meibomian Gland Dysfunction (MGD) Patients. *Curr Eye Res.* 2018;43(3):308–313. doi:10.1080/02713683.2017.1406525
10. Vora GK, Gupta PK. Intense pulsed light therapy for the treatment of evaporative dry eye disease. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol.* 2015;26(4):314–318. doi:10.1097/ICU.000000000000166
11. Gonzalez-Lima F, Rojas. Low-level light therapy of the eye and brain. *Eye Brain.* 2011;3:49. doi:10.2147/eb.s21391
12. Marta A, Baptista PM, Marques JH, et al. Intense pulsed plus low-level light therapy in meibomian gland dysfunction. *Clin Ophthalmol.* 2021;15:2803–2811. doi:10.2147/OPHTH.S318885
13. K S, TG A, B C, E C, R P. Combined low level light therapy and intense pulsed light therapy for the treatment of meibomian gland dysfunction. *Clin Ophthalmol.* 2019;13:993–999. doi:10.2147/OPHTH.S213664
14. Pérez-Silguero MA, Pérez-Silguero D, Rivero-Santana A, Bernal-Blasco MI, Encinas-Pisa P. Combined intense pulsed light and low-level light therapy for the treatment of dry eye: A retrospective before–after study with one-year follow-up. *Clin Ophthalmol.* 2021;15:2133–2140. doi:10.2147/OPHTH.S307020
15. Tomlinson A, Bron AJ, Korb DR, et al. The international workshop on meibomian gland dysfunction: Report of the diagnosis subcommittee. *Investig Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2011;52(4):2006–2049. doi:10.1167/iovs.10-6997f
16. Vigo L, Pellegrini M, Bernabei F, Carones F, Scorcio V, Giannaccare G. Diagnostic Performance of a Novel Noninvasive Workup in the Setting of Dry Eye Disease. *J Ophthalmol.* 2020;2020. doi:10.1155/2020/5804123
17. Arita R, Mizoguchi T, Fukuoka S, Morishige N. Multicenter Study of Intense Pulsed Light Therapy for Patients with Refractory Meibomian Gland Dysfunction. *Cornea.* 2018;37(12):1566–1571. doi:10.1097/ICO.0000000000001687
18. Yin Y, Liu N, Gong L, Song N. Changes in the Meibomian Gland After Exposure to Intense Pulsed Light in Meibomian Gland Dysfunction (MGD) Patients. *Curr Eye Res.* 2018;43(3):308–313. doi:10.1080/02713683.2017.1406525
19. Rong B, Tang Y, Liu R, et al. Long-Term Effects of Intense Pulsed Light Combined with Meibomian Gland Expression in the Treatment of Meibomian Gland Dysfunction. *Photomed Laser Surg.* 2018;36(10):562–567. doi:10.1089/pho.2018.4499
20. Liu R, Rong B, Tu P, et al. Analysis of Cytokine Levels in Tears and Clinical Correlations After Intense Pulsed Light Treating Meibomian Gland Dysfunction. *Am J Ophthalmol.* 2017;183:81–90. doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2017.08.021
21. Choi M, Han SJ, Ji YW, et al. Meibum Expressibility Improvement as a Therapeutic Target of Intense Pulsed Light Treatment in Meibomian Gland Dysfunction and Its Association with Tear Inflammatory Cytokines. *Sci Rep.* 2019;9(1):1–8. doi:10.1038/s41598-019-44000-0

22. Cote S, Zhang AC, Ahmadzai V, et al. Intense pulsed light (IPL) therapy for the treatment of meibomian gland dysfunction. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2020;2020(3). doi:10.1002/14651858.CD013559
23. Vergés C, Salgado-Borges J, March de Ribot F, Ribas V. Current developments of intensive pulsed light treatment for dry eye disease and meibomian gland dysfunction. *Expert Rev Ophthalmol.* 2021;00(00):1–9. doi:10.1080/17469899.2021.1954504
24. Wu Y, Li J, Hu M, et al. Comparison of two intense pulsed light patterns for treating patients with meibomian gland dysfunction. *Int Ophthalmol.* 2020;40(7):1695–1705. doi:10.1007/s10792-020-01337-0
25. Goo H, Kim H, Ahn J-C, Cho KJ. Effects of Low-level Light Therapy at 740 nm on Dry Eye Disease In Vivo. *Med Lasers; Eng Basic Res Clin Appl.* 2019;8(2):50–58. doi:10.25289/ML.2019.8.2.50
26. Chen WL, Lin CT, Ko PS, et al. In Vivo Confocal Microscopic Findings of Corneal Wound Healing after Corneal Epithelial Debridement in Diabetic Vitrectomy. *Ophthalmology.* 2009;116(6):1038–1047. doi:10.1016/j.opthta.2009.01.002
27. Ljubimov A V. Diabetic complications in the cornea. *Vision Res.* 2017;139:138–152. doi:10.1016/j.visres.2017.03.002

Tables

Tables 1-3 not available with this version.

Figures




Figure 1

Light photography of the anterior segment of the eye together with tear interferometry to access lipid layer thickness before (A) and after (B) intense pulsed light treatment. In addition to the change in the

inferometric pattern, it is also noticeable a reduction in the caliber of the eyelid margin telangiectasia.