RESEARCH PAPER | Medical Science | Volume : 5 | Issue : 5 | May 2015 | ISSN - 2249-555X

A Clinico - Microbiological Perspective of Corneal Ulcer

KEYWORDS: Corneal ulcer, Clinical evaluation, Bacterial, Fungal, Management.

Dr. D.Chandrakanth Reddy
Asso. Professor, Dept. Of Ophthalmology, SVS Medical College & Hospital, Yenugonda, Mahabubnagar.

Dr. M Vijaya Rama Raju
Professor & Head, Dept. Of Ophthalmology, SVS Medical College & Hospital, Yenugonda, Mahabubnagar.

Dr. Manisha Singh
Professor, Dept. Of Microbiology, SVS Medical College & Hospital, Yenugonda, Mahabubnagar.

Dr. N Deepika
IInd Postgraduate, Dept. Of Ophthalmology, SVS Medical College & Hospital, Yenugonda, Mahabubnagar.

ABSTRACT *Corneal ulcer is a major cause of mono-ocular blindness in developing countries. Clinical diagnosis and management of corneal ulcers is helped by microbiological diagnosis.*

PURPOSE: To evaluate microbiological support for clinical diagnosis and management of corneal ulcers.

MATERIALS AND METHODS: All the patients presenting with corneal ulceration underwent clinical evaluation and standard microbiological evaluation of their corneal scrapings (smear and culture).

RESULTS: Out of 200 corneal ulcer cases, 127 were clinically diagnosed as bacterial and 73 as fungal. On microscopy 65 were Gram's stain positive, 49 were KOH stain positive and rest 86 were negative. Further culture examination of total corneal ulcer cases identified 69 bacterial isolates and 50 fungal isolates.

CONCLUSION: A good clinical evaluation aided with microbiological support will help in better diagnosis and treatment of corneal ulcer.

Introduction
Corneal ulcer is a major cause of mono-ocular blindness in developing countries. Surveys in Africa and Asia have confirmed this finding[1-3]. Corneal ulceration is second only to cataract as a major etiology of blindness and visual disability in many developing nations.[4] Annual incidence of corneal ulceration was as high as 10 times more than age and sex adjusted population in USA [5].

Microbiological methods of confirmation in diagnosing corneal ulcer has been found to be difficult due to sample collection, sample size, prior use of antibiotics eye drops at presentation etc.

Materials and methods:
All patients with corneal ulceration presenting to Ophthalmology OPD of SVS Medical College and Hospitals, Mahabubnagar, Telangana during Feb 2013 to Aug 2014 were studied. A total number of 200 cases of corneal ulcerations were taken up for study. Cases presented with typical viral ulcerations, shield ulcers, neurotropic ulcers, neuroparalytic ulcers, phylectenular keratitis, moorens ulcers were excluded from the study.

Clinical diagnosis was based on severity of the symptoms, nature of injuring agent, duration and findings under slit lamp examination, ulcer characteristics like site, size and depth of the infiltrate, nature of the infiltrate, margins of the ulcer, satellite lesions, immune ring and hypopyon.
The corneal scraping sample was taken using a slit lamp under asceptic conditions. Scraping was done with the help of topical 0.5% propacaine and sterile badparkers blade (no.15). Scraping material was taken from the edge and base of the ulcer. The scrapped material was examined using grams staining, 10% KOH mount and cultured in blood agar, chocolate agar, nutrient agar and Sabourard's Dextrose Agar without antibiotics. Bacteria were identified by using routine biochemical tests. Filamentous fungus ware identified on the basis of growth rate, colony characteristics and microscopy.

All corneal ulcers were grouped under bacterial and fungal base on clinical and microbiological results and were compared.

Results
A total of 200 patients of corneal ulcers without any history of preexisting ocular disease were included in present study and following observations were made:

Table 1: Clinical profile of corneal ulcers under study

CLINICAL PROFILE OF CORNEAL ULCERS UNDER STUDY		
History of injury with vegetative matter		82 (41%)
Nature of infiltrate	Dry	88 (44%)
	Wet	112 (56%)
Depth of infiltrate	<1/3rd corneal thickness	142 (71%)
	>1/3rd corneal thickness	58 (29%)
Satellite lesions		19 (9.5%)
Hypopyon		46 (23%)
Size of ulcers	<6mm	154 (77%)
	>6mm	46 (23%)

Taking into consideration the above clinical characteris-

Volume : 5 | Issue : 5 | May 2015 | ISSN - 2249-555X

tics mentioned Table 1 we grouped the cases under study into clinically bacterial – 127 (63.5%) and clinically fungal – 73(36.5%). Corneal ulcers with regular margins, wet exudative infiltrate, and mobile hypopyon and with more symptoms were grouped under bacterial ulcers. Those with irregular margins, dry leathery infiltrate, thick immobile hypopyon, satellite lesions, predominately having history of injury with vegetative matter and with more signs were grouped under fungal ulcers.

MICROBIOLOGICAL REPORTS

Table 2 a: Microscopy

TOTAL CASES	GRAM'S STAINING	KOH MOUNT	MICROSCOPY NEGATIVE
200	65 (32.5%)	49(24.5%)	86 (43%)

Table 2 b: Culture reports

TOTAL CASES	Culture Positive		Culture Negative
	119 (59.5%)		
	Bacterial	Fungal	
200	69 (34.5%)	50 (25%)	81(40.5%)

Finally, summarizing the clinical diagnosis and microbiological reports the following observations were made:

Table 3: Comparison of clinical and microbiological findings.

		Gram's Staining	KOH Mount	Bacterial Culture Positive	Fungal culture Positive
Clinically Bacterial	127 (63.5%)	60 (47.24%)	4 (3.14%)	60 (47.24%)	4 (3.14%)
Clinically Fungal	73 (36.5%)	5 (6.84%)	45 (61.64%)	5 (6.84%)	46 (63.01%)

Distribution of Culture Positive Cases

Table 4 a: Bacterial isolates

BACTERIAL ISOLATES	NUMBER OF CASES	PERCENTAGE
Pseudomonas aeruginosa	31	44.92
Streptococcus pneumoniae	19	27.53
Staphylococcus aureus	13	18.84
Micrococcus	6	8.69
Total	69	100

Table 4 a: Fungal isolates

FUNGAL ISOLATES	NUMBER OF CASES	PERCENTAGE
Aspergillus	26	52
Fusarium	16	32
Pencillium	3	6
Others	5	5
Total	50	100

Discussion

Corneal ulcer is the most common cause of monocular blindness in developing countries. Most of primary and secondary eye care centers rely on clinical characters of ulcer to diagnose and treat. As of now only at tertiary and institution based eye care centers only have facility of microbiological support. The purpose of our study was to evaluate microbiological support for clinical diagnosis and management of corneal ulcer.

In our study, 200 corneal ulcers based on clinical characteristics were grouped under clinically bacterial 127 (63.5%) and clinically fungal 73 (36.5%).All these cases were subjected to staining and culture. The initial line of treatment was started after microscopy reports.

Out of 127, clinically diagnosed bacterial keratitis, Gram's staining was positive in 60 cases (47.24%) and these were managed purely with antibacterial drugs. In non – severe cases (size less than 6mm, depth less than 1/3rd of corneal thickness) commercially available antibacterials were used (4th generation fluoroquinolones). In severe cases (size more than 6mm, more than 1/3rd corneal thickness) fortified antibiotics were started. In proven Gram's stain positive cases fortified Cephazoline was used. Out of 127, clinically diagnosed bacterial cases 4 cases (3.14%) were KOH positive and treated with antifungals.

Remaining 63 cases where staining was negative, but clinically bacterial were started with antimicrobial treatment depending on severity and reviewed for response. In few cases line of management was changed according to culture and sensitivity reports. Over all out of 127 clinically diagnosed as bacterial corneal ulcers culture positivity was in 64 cases (50.3%). Based on clinical response to antimicrobial therapy in these cases 113 cases (88%) were considered to be bacterial. 10 cases did not respond to any antimicrobial therapy and were added with antifungals without any response and they went for worse.

In our study out of 200 corneal ulcer cases seen 73 cases were clinically diagnosed as fungal. Out of 73 cases KOH staining was positive in 45 cases (61.64%) and these were managed purely with antifungal drugs. In non severe cases, topical Natamycin drops were prescribed. In severe cases, oral Fluconazole was given for two weeks duration. Out of 73, clinically diagnosed as fungal cases, 5 cases (6.84%) were gram's stain positive and hence treated with antibacterial drugs.

Remaining 23 cases where staining was negative but clinically fungal were started with antifungal treatment depending on severity and reviewed for response. In few cases line of management was changed accordingly to culture and sensitivity reports. Overall out of 73 clinically diagnosed as fungal corneal ulcers culture positivity was in 46 cases (63.01%). Based on clinical response to antifungal therapy in these cases 56 cases (76.7%) were considered to be fungal. 12 cases did not respond to any antifungal therapy and were added with antibacterial showing no response they went for worse.

We isolated Pseudomonas aeruginosa 31 (42.92%) as the predominant bacterial pathogen followed by Streptococcus 19 (27.53%) among bacterial ulcer patients. Pseudomonas keratitis tends to progress rapidly if inadequately treated [6]. Basak SK el al., isolated Pseudomonas at 74 % isolation rate [7]. In Ghana, more than 50 % of bacterial isolates were from Pseudomonas species [8]. Among fungal Aspergillus was most common isolates 26 cases (52%), followed by Fusarium 16 cases (32%). Basak SK el al. isolated Aspergillus at 59.8% isolation rate and Fusarium at 21.2 % isolation rate[7].

Volume : 5 | Issue : 5 | May 2015 | ISSN - 2249-555X

Out of 200 cases in 9 cases (4.5%) our clinical diagnosis proved to be wrong by microbiological reports. Culture positivity in most of the studies including ours was around 60 %. So entirely relying on the microbiological support for the initial line of management of corneal ulcer is not mandatory. Microbiological reports definitely have a role in avoiding false positive diagnosis, to change the line of management in refractive cases and epidemiological purposes.

Conclusion:

A good clinical evaluation aided with microbiological support will help in better diagnosis and treating the corneal ulcer.

REFERENCE

1) Rapoza PA, west SK, Katala SJ, Taylor HR. Prevalance and causes of vision loss in central Tanzania. Int ophthalmol 1991; 15:123-9. | 2) Brilliant LB, Pokherl RP, Grasset NC, Lepkowski JM, Kolstad A, Hawks W, et al . Epidemiology of blindness in Nepal. Bull WHO 1985; 63:375 -86. | 3) Khan MU, Hague MR, Khan MR. Prevalence and causes of blindness in rural Bangladesh. Ind j Med Res 1985; 82:257 – 62. | 4) ThyleforsB, Negrel AD, PararajaSegaram R, Dadzie KY. Available data on blindness (update 1994). Ophthalmic Epidemiol 1995; 2:5-39. | 5) Erie JC, Nevitt MP, Hodge DO, Ballard DJ. Incidence of ulcerative keratitis in a defined population from 1950-1988, Arch Ophthalmol 1993; 111:1665-71. | 6) Mcleod SD. Bacterial keratitis .In: Myon Yanoff, Jay S Duker, editors. Ophthalmology .3rded .Mosby; 2008. 262 -70. | 7) Basak S K, BASAK S, Mohanta A, Bhowmick A. Epidemiological and microbiological diagnosis of suppurutve keratitis in Gangetic West Bengal, Eastern India. Indian J Ophthalmol 2005; 53 (1): 17 -22. | 8) Leck AK, Thomas PA , Hagan M, et al Aetiology of suppurative corneal ulcers in Ghana and South India , and epidemiology of fungal keratitis , Br J Ophthalmol 2002 ;86 (11): 1211 – 5. |