

Efficacy and Safety of Olopatadine 0.1% Ophthalmic Solution and Bepotastine 1.5% Ophthalmic Solution in Patients with Vernal Keratoconjunctivitis

Niroop R¹, Chandani Ashok Kumar²

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Pharmacology, ICARE Institute of Medical Science & Research & Dr. Bidhan Chandra Roy Hospital, Haldia, West Bengal, India

²Associate Professor, Department of Community Medicine, Narayana Medical College, Nellore, India

Received: 19-05-2023 / Revised 22-06-2023 / Accepted 18-07-2023

Corresponding author: Dr. Niroop R

Conflict of interest: Nil

Abstract:

Aim: The purpose of the present study was intended to compare the effectiveness and safety of olopatadine 0.1% ophthalmic drops and bepotastinebesilate 1.5% ophthalmic drops with BD administration to relieve the symptoms of VKC in a tertiary care hospital.

Methods: The study was done in the Department of Pharmacology, for duration of 12 months. Institutional ethics committee approved the study. By simple randomization (odd/even number) method, registered patients were grouped into A and B. Group A and Group B were given olopatadine 0.1% ophthalmic drops and bepotastinebesilate 1.5% ophthalmic drops, respectively, administered one drop in the affected eye twice daily for 6 weeks.

Results: The itching scores among the treatment groups with all follow-ups compared with baseline are not statistically significant. The mean ocular discomfort scores during each visit. At the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd follow-up, there is statistical significance in ocular discomfort scores with Group B. The mean watering scores during each visit. In Group B, during the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th follow-ups, there is statistical significance in watering scores ($P < 0.05$).

Conclusion: In this study, based on the evaluation of therapeutic performance, bepotastine eye drops proved quicker relief of symptoms and signs compared to olopatadine eye drops but was not statistically significant which would prove beneficial for the patients.

Keywords: Bepotastine, Efficacy, Olopatadine, Vernal keratoconjunctivitis

This is an Open Access article that uses a funding model which does not charge readers or their institutions for access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>) and the Budapest Open Access Initiative (<http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read>), which permit unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided original work is properly credited.

Introduction

Allergies are the fifth leading cause of the world's chronic illnesses, affecting 40% of the population. [1] Globally, in the last 10 years, there has been a drastic increase in allergic diseases. The occurrence of allergic diseases among children is rising moderately in between 0.3% and 20.5%. There are so many causative factors such as genetics, pets, air pollution, and early childhood exposure being the reasons for this increase. [2] Among the causes of ocular morbidity in India, allergic conjunctivitis is at the second position and involves about 15%–20% of people attending ophthalmology clinic. School absenteeism in children is common because of its distressing symptoms. [3]

The most common form of ocular allergy is allergic conjunctivitis which is a condition which affects the conjunctiva, eyelids and cornea and it is often associated with non-ocular symptoms and signs of rhinitis or sinusitis.¹ It is one of the most common

reasons for school absenteeism in children because of its distressful symptoms. [4,5] The various types of allergic conjunctivitis are seasonal allergic conjunctivitis (SAC), perennial allergic conjunctivitis (PAC), vernal keratoconjunctivitis (VKC), atopic keratoconjunctivitis (AKC) and giant papillary conjunctivitis (GPC). [6-8] However, clinical and pathophysiological features of AKC and VKC are quite different from SAC and PAC in spite of some common markers of allergy. [9]

The VKC is a chronic, recurrent, bilateral inflammation of the conjunctiva mainly occurring in kids and adolescents with a male predominance. It is a seasonal allergic disease, but in severe cases, it may turn into a perennial one. It includes a wide spectrum of manifestations like intense itching, tearing, red eye, foreign body sensation, mucus discharge, photophobia, lid oedema, chemosis,

papillae hypertrophy in tarsal and/or limbal areas, giant papillae, Horner-Trantas dots, and corneal epitheliopathy. [10,11]

Vernal Keratoconjunctivitis has a worldwide occurrence, usually affects young males in dry and hot climatic regions. In western Europe in a survey, the prevalence of the disease ranged from 1.16 to 10.55 per 10,000 population. The disease is common in temperate zones of Mediterranean areas, Central and West Africa, the Middle East, Japan, the Indian subcontinent and South America. In regions of Cameroon, Turkey, India, and Israel, prevalence ranges from 3% to 10% in younger population. [12] Two studies from northern and southern parts of India also reported the prevalence of VKC to be 5.1% and 18% in school going children. [13,14]

A new generation of drugs such as bepotastine, olopatadine, epinastine, ketotifen and azelastine has shown dual activity of mast-cell stability and H1 receptor antagonism makes them suitable for twice-daily dosing. [15] Besides these action they also exert anti-inflammatory effects through several different mechanisms. These classes of drugs comprise the first line of pharmacological treatment. [16]

The purpose of the present study was intended to compare the effectiveness and safety of olopatadine 0.1% ophthalmic drops and bepotastinebesilate 1.5% ophthalmic drops with BD administration to relieve the symptoms of VKC in a tertiary care hospital in Bihar region.

Materials and Methods

The study was done in the Department of Pharmacology, ICARE Institute of medical science & Research & Dr. Bidhan Chandra Roy Hospital, Haldia, West Bengal, India, for duration of 12 months. For participants above 18 years of age, written informed consent was taken in an authorized format in local language after describing all study procedures and course of action. For participants less than 18 years of age, their parents or guardians were explained the procedures, and written informed consent was attained. For illiterate people, left thumb mark was taken. After acquiring informed consent from all participants, the analytical details of 85 patients including past and present history and clinical and slit-lamp

examination of eyes performed were entered. Diagnosis for VKC was made by an ophthalmologist. Following the screening of 85 patients, 60 patients were enlisted in the study who fit into inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Inclusion Criteria

- Clinically diagnosed with VKC by an ophthalmologist
- Patients with the age group of 5–25 years.
- Patients who can adhere to follow-up schedule.
- **Exclusion Criteria**
- Age less than 5 years
- Contact lens wearer during the period of study
- Patients with active ocular infections and pathological conditions
- Patients with ocular disorders such as pterygium, dry eyes, and ophthalmic conditions such as uveitis or glaucoma
- History of ocular surgery in 3 months.

By simple randomization (odd/even number) method, registered patients were grouped into A and B. Group A and Group B were given olopatadine 0.1% ophthalmic drops and bepotastinebesilate 1.5% ophthalmic drops, respectively, administered one drop in the affected eye twice daily for 7 weeks.

The ocular signs such as conjunctival hyperemia and papillary hypertrophy were evaluated. The gradings were given according to the severity of signs (absence of signs as grade 0, mild signs as grade 1, moderate signs as grade 2, and severe signs as grade 3). Ocular symptoms such as itching, discomfort, and watering were estimated by discussing with the patients, and grading was given depending on severity (absence of signs as grade 0, mild signs as grade 1, moderate signs as grade 2, and severe signs as grade 3). During the study, none of the patients were lost to follow-up.

Statistical Analysis

The observations and results were tabulated accordingly and data were analyzed using the SPSS Version 16. The unpaired t-test is used as the test of significance in between two groups. P value is statistically significant when it is less than 0.05.

Results

Table 1: Mean itching scores during each visit

Itching scores	Group A Olopatadine		Group B Bepotastine		Unpaired t-test significance level
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Preintervention	2.55	0.320	2.50	0.325	1.000
1st week (1st visit)	2.60	0.330	2.56	0.328	1.000
3rd week (2nd visit)	2.10	0.4	2.05	0.296	0.430
5th week (3rd visit)	1.56	0.374	1.50	0.270	0.380
7th week (4th visit)	0.50	0.650	0.40	0.320	0.225

Table 1 shows mean itching scores during each visit. The itching scores among the treatment groups with all follow-ups compared with baseline are not statistically significant ($P > 0.05$).

Table 2: Mean ocular discomfort scores during each visit

Ocular discomfort scores	Group A Olopatadine		Group B Bepotastine		Unpaired t-test significance level
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Preintervention	2.77	0.330	2.85	0.310	0.646
1st week (1st visit)	2.65	0.435	2.10	0.255	0.000
3rd week (2nd visit)	2.00	0.408	1.25	0.410	0.000
5th week (3rd visit)	1.25	0.415	0.80	0.480	0.000
7th week (4th visit)	0.40	0.476	0.16	0.332	0.095

Table 2 shows the mean ocular discomfort scores during each visit. At the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd follow-up, there is statistical significance in ocular discomfort scores with Group B ($P < 0.05$).

Table 3: Mean watering scores during each visit

Ocular discomfort scores	Group A Olopatadine		Group B Bepotastine		Unpaired t-test significance level
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Preintervention	2.92	0.275	2.90	0.270	1.000
1st week (1st visit)	2.85	0.410	2.10	0.000	0.000
3rd week (2nd visit)	2.00	0.000	1.06	0.210	0.000
5th week (3rd visit)	1.10	0.277	0.30	0.460	0.000
7th week (4th visit)	0.38	0.488	0.10	0.277	0.018

Table 3 shows the mean watering scores during each visit. In Group B, during the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th follow-ups, there is statistical significance in watering scores ($P < 0.05$).

Table 4: Mean conjunctival hyperaemia scores during each visit

Conjunctival hyperaemia scores	Group A Olopatadine		Group B Bepotastine		Unpaired t-test significance level
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Preintervention	2.90	0.215	2.90	0.205	1.000
1st week (1st visit)	2.78	0.440	1.98	0.200	0.000
3rd week (2nd visit)	2.20	0.510	1.08	0.277	0.000
5th week (3rd visit)	1.08	0.542	0.32	0.545	0.000
7th week (4th visit)	0.28	0.432	0.20	0.374	0.460

Table 4 shows the mean conjunctival hyperemia scores during each visit. During 1st, 2nd, and 3rd follow-ups, there is statistical significance in conjunctival hyperemia scores with Group B ($P < 0.05$).

Discussion

The VKC is a relatively uncommon, chronic, allergic disease of the conjunctiva, characterised by severe itching, sticky ropy mucous discharge, conjunctival hyperaemia, and large papillae in the upper tarsal and/or limbus with corneal involvement in some. [17,18] Basic eye care, avoidance of allergens or provocative stimuli, and dual-acting topical drugs with antihistamine and mast cell stabilising properties are corner stones of management of mild to moderate cases of VKC. [12,16,18]

Olopatadine is one such topical agent and is shown to be efficacious in reducing symptoms of AC; scores better than antihistamines. [19] It is a low-cost, effective, widely available therapy in India and without significant adverse effects. [20-22]

Bepotastine, is also a similar drug, however it is less freely available and relatively costlier. It has been compared with olopatadine and other dual-action topical agents like alcaftadine in AC and was found to be more effective in controlling allergic symptoms, reducing ocular discomfort, and was preferred by patients in a few studies. [20,21,23]

In a study done by McCabe and McCabe, bepotastine when compared to olopatadine showed a significant reduction in ocular itching and no significance between the comfort ratings. [24] A study between 0.1% olopatadine, 1.5% bepotastine, and 0.25% alcaftadine worked similarly in relief of mild-to-moderate allergic conjunctivitis symptoms, after 1 week of treatment.

For allergic conjunctivitis, 0.2% olopatadine and 1.5% bepotastine eye drops are safe and well-tolerated topical medications. [25,26] In a study done by Hida et al., a comparison between 0.1% olopatadine hydrochloride and 0.025% ketotifen fumarate in VKC between the baseline and the 2nd visit, olopatadine treatment resulted in decreased burning, but ketotifen was slightly better after 4th

visit. Papillae and Horner-trans dots in both classes were not significantly different.

In our study, during initial follow-ups on days 7, 21, and 35, bepotastine showed significant reduction in symptoms such as ocular discomfort, watering, and capillary hyperemia, suggesting the faster onset of action. Olopatadine showed marked reduction in papillary hypertrophy. After 7 weeks of treatment, both drugs were uniformly efficacious in reducing signs and symptoms of VKC. Studies with different attributes such as larger sample size, double masking, and patient preference and studies at different geographical locations and during different seasons of the year are needed for better definition of therapy in VKC.

Conclusion

In this study, although bepotastine altered the natural course with quicker onset of action at the end of the 8th week, both drugs are equally effective in reducing the signs and symptoms. Bepotastine proved quicker to relieve watering, ocular discomfort, and conjunctival hyperemia. Olopatadine provided faster improvement in papillary hypertrophy. Laboratory findings had no statistical significance between 0.1% olopatadine and 1.5% bepotastine in improving the AEC of the VKC patients. Being more commonly prescribed of the two drugs, olopatadine is readily available at the pharmacy store. Bepotastine, on the other hand, was available at a few selected retail outlets and was costlier. Researches with above-mentioned attributes can be done in the future.

References

1. Abelson MB, Shetty S, Korchak M, Butrus SI, Smith LM. Advances in pharmacotherapy for allergic conjunctivitis. *Expert OpinPharmacother.* 2015;16(8):1219-31
2. Akil H, Celik F, Ulas F, Kara IS. Dry eye syndrome and allergic conjunctivitis in the pediatric population. *Middle East African journal of ophthalmology.* 2015 Oct;22(4):467.
3. Scandashree K. Comparative study of the efficacy and safety of olopatadine eyedrops and sodium cromoglycate in clinical practice: A prospective study. *Int J Basic ClinPharmacol.* 2016 Sep; 5:1764.
4. Chakraborti C, Mallik S, Choudhury KP, Das J. Childhood ocular morbidity in Eastern India: a tertiary hospital study. *Sudanese J Public Health.* 2012;7(4):126-30.
5. Kamath PBT, Prasad BS, Deepthi R, Muninrayana C. Prevalence of ocular morbidity among school going children (6-15years) in rural area of Karnataka, South India. *Int J Pharm Biomed Res.* 2012;3(4):209-12.
6. Mishra GP, Tamboli V, Jwala J and Mitra AK. Recent patents and emerging therapeutics in the treatment of allergic conjunctivitis. *Recent Pat Inflamm Allergy Drug Discov.* 2011; 5(1):26-36.
7. Kanski J. *Clinical ophthalmology.* 4th ed. Windsor: Butterworth-Heinemann; 1999: 66-78.
8. Swamy BN, Chilov M, McClellan K, Petsoglou C. Topical non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs in allergic conjunctivitis: meta-analysis of randomized trial data. *Ophthalmic Epidemiol.* 2007;14(5):311-9.
9. Bielory L, Frohman L. Allergic and immunologic disorders of the eye. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 1992; 86:1-20.
10. Bonini S, Coassin M, Aronni S, Lambiase A. Vernal keratoconjunctivitis. *Eye.*2004;18(4): 345-51.
11. La Rosa M, Lionetti E, Reibaldi M, Russo A, Longo A, Leonardi S, et al. Allergic conjunctivitis: A comprehensive review of the literature. *Ital J Pediatr.*2013;39(1):01-08.
12. Singhal D, Sahay P, Maharana PK, Raj N, Sharma N, Titiyal JS. Vernal keratoconjunctivitis. *Surv Ophthalmol.* 2019 1;64(3):289-311.
13. Seema S, Vashisht B, Meenakshi K, Manish G. Magnitude of refractive errors among school children in a rural block of Haryana. *The internet journal of epidemiology.* 2009;6(2):10-5580.
14. Ashwini KV, Dhatri K, Rajeev K. Vernal keratoconjunctivitis in school children in North Bangalore: An Epidemiological and Clinical Evaluation. *J Evol Med DentSci.* 2015;4(86): 15070-76.
15. Kubaisi B, Samra K, Syeda S, Schmidt A, Foster SC. Ocular Allergy: an Updated Review. *J Allergy Immunol.* 2017; 1:002.
16. Kumar S. Vernal keratoconjunctivitis: a major review. *Acta Ophthalmol.* 2009;87(2):133-47.
17. Bonini S, Bonini S, Lambiase A, Marchi S, Pasqualetti P, Zuccaro O, et al. Vernalkeratoconjunctivitis revisited: A case series of 195 patients with long-term followup. *Ophthalmology.* 2000;107(6):1157-63.
18. Bonini S, Sacchetti M, Mantelli F, Lambiase A. Clinical grading of vernal keratoconjunctivitis. *CurrOpin Allergy ClinImmunol.* 2007; 7(5): 436-41.
19. Víquez SR, Víquez CR, González PR, Sánchez GA, Sánchez-Hernández MC, Santiago AL. Diagnosis and Management of Allergic Conjunctivitis. *Curr Treat Options Allergy.* 2018; 5(2):256-65.
20. Ayyappanavar S, Sridhar S, Kumar K, Jayanthi CR, Gangasagara SB, Rathod BS, et al. Comparative analysis of safety and efficacy of Alcaftadine 0.25%, Olopatadine hydrochloride 0.2% and Bepotastinebesilate 1.5% in allergicconjunctivitis. *Indian J of Ophthalmol.* 2021;69(2):257.

21. Dudeja L, Janakiraman A, Dudeja I, Sane K, Babu M. Observer-masked trial comparing efficacy of topical olopatadine (0.1%), bepotastine (1.5%), and alcaftadine (0.25%) in mild to moderate allergic conjunctivitis. *Indian J Ophthalmol.* 2019;67(9):1400.
22. Ajmani U, Aggarwal A, Singh K, Kaur P, SP M, Shivani. Comparative Efficacy of Olopatadine 0.2%, Bepotastine 1.5% and Alcaftadine 0.25% in Treatment of Allergic Conjunctivitis. *Acta Scientific Ophthalmology.* 2021;4(2):15-21.
23. McCabe CF, McCabe SE. Comparative efficacy of bepotastine besilate 1.5% ophthalmic solution versus olopatadine hydrochloride 0.2% ophthalmic solution evaluated by patient preference. *Clinical Ophthalmology (Auckland, NZ).* 2012;6:1731.
24. McCabe CF, McCabe SE. Comparative efficacy of bepotastine besilate 1.5% ophthalmic solution versus olopatadine hydrochloride 0.2% ophthalmic solution evaluated by patient preference. *Clinical Ophthalmology (Auckland, NZ).* 2012; 6:1731.
25. Ackerman S, D'Ambrosio Jr F, greiner JV, Villanueva L, Ciolino JB, Hollander DA. A multicenter evaluation of the efficacy and duration of action of alcaftadine 0.25% and olopatadine 0.2% in the conjunctival allergen challenge model. *J Asthma Allergy.* 2013;6: 43-52.
26. McLaurin EB, Marsico NP, Ackerman SL, Ciolino JB, Williams JM, Villanueva L, Hollander DA. Ocular itch relief with alcaftadine 0.25% versus olopatadine 0.2% in allergic conjunctivitis: pooled analysis of two multicenter randomized clinical trials. *Advances in therapy.* 2014 Oct;31(10):1059-71.