

Graft survival rate of deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty for keratoconus

A meta-analysis

Meng Guan, MM^a, Weijia Zhao, MM^b, Yang Zhang, MM^a, Yu Geng, MM^a, Zonghan Chen, MM^c, Liuyan Feng, MM^d, Dongli Li, MM^a, Ling Yuan, MM^{a,*}

Abstract

Background: Deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty (DALK) is an optional treatment for patients with keratoconus, and the associated graft survival rate varies. Herein, we aimed to explore the graft survival rate of DALK in patients with keratoconus.

Methods: PubMed, Web of Science, and ProQuest databases were searched to retrieve the related articles. General data, clinical characters, and graft survival rates were obtained directly from the included studies and analyzed by meta-analysis.

Results: A total of 12 articles were included. The merged 1-, 3-, and 5-year graft survival rates were 100% (99.9–100%, P < .001), 92.9% (89.8–95.9%, P < .001), and 90.4% (86.0–0.948%, P < .001), respectively. Lower heterogeneity was shown in each subgroup that was divided neither according to the sample number nor number of surgeons.

Conclusion: The survival rate slightly decreases year by year, but the overall trend seems relatively stable. Ensuring that all DALK procedures are performed by a single surgeon might be helpful to improve the graft survival rate after surgery.

Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval, DALK = deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty, DLKP = deep lamellar keratoplasty, PKP = penetrating keratoplasty.

Keywords: deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty, graft survival rate, keratoconus, meta-analysis

1. Introduction

Keratoconus is a progressive eye disease that causes thinning of the cornea and results in mixed vision problems.^[1–4] Researchers estimate that the prevalence of keratoconus varies worldwide^[5,6] and affects about 1 in 2000 people.^[7,8] Keratoconus was first described by the German oculist Burchard Mauchart^[9] in 1748 and later understood comprehensively on the basis of the exhaustive 270-page treatise by John Nottingham^[10,11] in 1854. It is characterized by noninflammatory thinning of the corneal stroma, irregular astigmatism, myopia, and protrusion, and decrease in visual acuity.^[3,12,13] Owing to the complex pathogenesis and early onset, patients with keratoconus who have severe and progressive vision problems or scarring on the cornea have little

Editor: Kaili Wu.

Medicine (2018) 97:28(e11404)

Received: 18 January 2018 / Accepted: 12 June 2018 http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MD.000000000011404 choice but accept corneal transplantation. Penetrating keratoplasty (PKP) has been used to treated progressive stage keratoplasty for several decades.^[14–16] However, in recent years, deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty (DALK)^[17,18] has been increasingly chosen by patients instead of PKP owing to minimal violation of the intraocular structures and reduced adverse effects of the former. DALK can effectively decrease the failure rates of grafts by retaining patients' corneal endothelium and reducing immunological rejection post-transplantation.^[19] It was reported that the survival rate of endothelial cells after DALK was higher than that of PKP treatment. However, the studies were limited by small sample sizes and varied 5-year survival rates compared with current research reports about DALK. In this article, we explored the graft survival rate of DALK in patients with keratoconus by single factor of meta-analysis.

2. Methods

2.1. Literature research

Different databases including PubMed, Web of Science, and ProQuest were searched to retrieve randomized controlled trials related to DALK. "Deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty" OR "DALK," "keratoconus," and "graft survival" were used as keywords. The literature retrieval was dated from inception to May 15, 2017. All collected articles were scanned and recruited according to preset inclusion and exclusion criteria. Any difference of opinion was resolved by a third researcher. As the data included in our study were extracted from published literatures, no ethical approval and patient consent were required.

The inclusion criteria were as follows: Studies related to patients with conical cornea who were treated with deep lamellar keratoplasty (DLKP) were recruited. Different research types like randomized controlled trials, nonrandomized controlled trials, case–control

This study was supported by Yunnan Health Science and Technology Project (Grant No. 2017NS064).

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

^a Department of Ophthalmology, ^b Department of Dermatology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Kunming Medical University, ^c Office of Educational Administration, Yunnan College of Traditional Chinese Medicine, ^d Library, The First Affiliated Hospital of Kunming Medical University, Kunming, Yunnan, China.

^{*} Correspondence: Ling Yuan, Department of Ophthalmology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Kunming Medical University, 295 Xichang Road, Kunming, Yunnan 650031, China (e-mail: 55528430@qq.com).

Copyright © 2018 the Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial License 4.0 (CCBY-NC), where it is permissible to download, share, remix, transform, and buildup the work provided it is properly cited. The work cannot be used commercially without permission from the journal.

Literatures searched from

PUBMED database (n=167)

2.3. Statistical analysis

The 5-year transplant success rate after DLKP was used as the final indicator for this meta-analysis. Heterogeneity of the recruited studies was analyzed by Cochran Q test and I² test. The *P* value of Cochran Q test < 0.05 or I² value > 50% was indicative of significant heterogeneity, and the random-effect model was used; otherwise, a fixed-effect model was chosen.

3. Results

3.1. Literature research and data extraction

The literature screening process is shown in Fig. 1. A total of 246 articles (167 from PubMed, 40 from Web of Science, and 39 from Embase) were included after searching by the keywords and preliminary screening by the database literature screening tool. After duplicates were automatically removed with Endnote software or manually, 181 articles remained. Then, the titles and abstracts were scanned, 30 articles with only abstract or report of meeting or reviews, 18 case reports, 83 unrelated studies, and 12 articles which were not written in English or Chinese were eliminated. The full text of the remaining 38 articles were screened and 12 studies^[20–31] that finally matched the inclusion or exclusion criteria were analyzed in this report.

As shown in Table 1, general information and clinical data were abstracted from the 12 recruited articles. All these studies were retrospective research and focused on people of Mongolian and Caucasian ethnicity. Included samples were mainly collected from

studies, cohort studies, and serial case reports were included. Studies that had data of the 5-year transplant success rate. In case of duplicate publications, studies that were of higher quality and had a more complete outcome were included. The language of the included publication was limited to English and Chinese.

Figure 1. Literature screening process.

Literatures searched from Web of

science database (n=40)

Literatures after removing duplicates (n=181)

Literatures after reading title and abstract (n=38)

Literatures included in meta-analysis (n=12)

Excluded after title and abstract (n=143)

The language is not English or Chinese, n=

Excluded after title and abstract (n=26)

The subjects were not only patients with keratoconus Unable to extract data.

were not about Graft survival after DALK, n=83

Abstract or meeting or review, n=3 case report, n=18;

The exclusion criteria were as follows: Studies like letters, notes of meetings, and reviews were excluded. Studies with no exact outcome or those wherein data extraction was not possible were excluded.

2.2. Quality evaluation and data extraction

General information of the included studies

Table 1

Quality evaluation tool of literatures was chosen according to different research types. General data including country and year of publication, study design, and study duration were extracted. Definition of graft failure, number of patients, and follow-up

Study	Country	Study design	Duration	Single surgeon	Study setting	Defined of graft failure	Patient number	Median or mean recipient age	Follow- up, mo	Follow- up rate, %
Cohen et al ^[27]	USA	Retrospective	2000–2006	Yes	University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics	Loss of visual acuity that was attributed to central corneal edema or opacities, irrespective of etiology	11	45.5±13.1	22.5±2.5	64
Coster et al ^[31]	Australia	Retrospective	1996–2013	No	Australian Corneal Graft Registry	Loss of corneal clarity or replacement of the graft was considered a failure	317	32 (1–92)	0–180	50
Han et al ^[20]	Singapore	Retrospective	1992-2006	No	Donald T. H. Tan, Singapore National Eye Centre	NR	25	_	16 (mean)	100
Shimazaki et al ^[26]	Japan	Retrospective	1997-2013	No	Electronic and paper records	NR	79	36±12	57 ± 39	100
Jones et al ^[28]	UK	Retrospective	1999–2005	No	NHSBT	Analysis as an indication of the surgeon's experience with the technique	455	_	0–36 mo	91
MacIntyre et al ^[24]	Australia	Retrospective	2000-2010	Yes	The single surgeon's surgical database	A clear graft with no history of a repeat graft	31	29.2±7.82	51.8 (14–111)	100
Feizi et al ^[29]	Iran	Retrospective	2004–2012	Yes	NR	The irreversible loss of central graft clarity, significant interface vascularization and haziness, or need for repeat keratoplasty for any reason	290	27.8±8.2	38.6±20.2	100
Feizi et al ^[25]	Iran	Retrospective	2004–2013	Yes	NR	second graft in the same eye	382	28.0 ± 8.4	50.8 ± 27.1	100
Kasbekar et al ^[21]	UK	Retrospective	1999.4-2010.3	No	NHSBT	NR	1224	_	1-60	89
Romano et al ^[22]	Italy	Retrospective	2003–2008	Yes	Records from Reggio Emilia Hospital by a single surgeon's surgical database	NR	150	33.6±8.8	76.9±23.2	*
Zhang et al ^[30]	China	Retrospective	2000-2010	Yes	The single surgeon's surgical database	A clear graft with no history of a repeat graft	75	20.6 ± 6.8	46.9 ± 28.0	100
Chen et al ^[23]	China	Retrospective	2012-2013	Yes	The single surgeon's surgical database	NR	28	24.1±6.5	1–12	100

* Postoperative follow-up time <4 years was excluded before study

NHSBT = UK Transplant Registry of National Health Service Blood and Transplant, NR = no reference.

Study					*
D				p (95% CI)	Weight
Douglas J. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014)				0.93 (0.90, 0.96)	0.08
Han DCY, 1992-2006 (2009)				1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	31.50
Jun Shimazaki 1997-2013 (2015)				0.99 (0.96, 1.01)	0.09
		7.03			
Mark N. A. Jones,1999-2005 (2009)				0.95 (0.93, 0.97)	0.13
Sepehr Feizi,2004-2012 (2015)			•	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	34.03
Sepehr Feizi,2004-2013 (2017)				0.99 (0.98, 1.00)	0.53
Shivania A. Kasbekar, 1999-2001 (2014)		-	_ 1	0.93 (0.89, 0.97)	0.03
Chinesia & Kashakar 2002 2004 (2014)				0.05 (0.02, 0.02)	
ANNUNI A. HUBBERG, 2002-2004 (2014)		1	6	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)	0.11
Shivania A. Kasbekar,2005-2006 (2014)			-	0.98 (0.96, 1.00)	0.17
Yong-ming ZHANG.2000-2010 (2013)			•	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	33.31
Yueqin Chen,2012-2013 (2015)				0.96 (0.89, 1.03)	0.01
Overall (I-squared = 87.7%, p = 0.000)			1	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis		1		- i	
8 1 year survival rate subgroup 1		.9			
Study ID				p (95% CI)	% Weigt
≻100					
Douglas J. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014)				0.93 (0.90, 0.96)	0.08
Mark N. A. Jones, 1999-2005 (2009)			-	0.95 (0.93, 0.97)	0.13
Sepenr Feizi, 2004-2012 (2015)				1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	34.03
Shiyania A. Kashekar (1999-2001 (2014)				0.93 (0.89, 0.97)	0.03
Shivania A. Kasbekar 2002-2004 (2014)			_	0.95 (0.93, 0.98)	0.11
Shivania A. Kasbekar 2005-2006 (2014)				0.98 (0.96, 1.00)	0.17
Subtotal (I-squared = 92.4%, p = 0.000)			\diamond	0.97 (0.95, 0.98)	35.09
<100				1 00 (1 00 1 00)	24 50
han Dist (1992-2000 (2009)			- I	0.00 (0.05, 1.00)	0.00
Vons.mins 7HANG 2000-2010 (2013)				1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	33.31
Vuenin Chen 2012-2013 (2015)				- 0.05 (0.89, 1.03)	0.01
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.515)				1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	64.91
Overall (I-squared = 87.7%, p = 0.000)				1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	100.0
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis				T	
6 1 3	.7	.8	.9 1	1.1	
Study					%
D				p (95% CI)	Weigh
No.			I I		
Douglas J. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014)				0.93 (0.90, 0.96)	0.08
Han DCY, 1992-2006 (2009)			t	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	31.50
Mark N. A. Jones 1999-2015 (2015)				0.95 (0.93, 0.07)	0.09
Shivania A. Kasbekar 1999-2001 (2014)			_	0.93 (0.89, 0.97)	0.03
Shivania A. Kasbekar, 2002-2004 (2014)				0.95 (0.93, 0.98)	0.11
Shivania A. Kasbekar,2005-2006 (2014)			-	0.98 (0.96, 1.00)	0.17
Subtotal (I-squared = 92.2%, p = 0.000)			\diamond	0.96 (0.94, 0.99)	32.11
Yes					
Sepehr Feizi,2004-2012 (2015)			+	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	34.03
Sepehr Feizi,2004-2013 (2017)			+	0.99 (0.98, 1.00)	0.53
Yong-ming ZHANG,2000-2010 (2013)			+	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	33.31
Yueqin Chen,2012-2013 (2015)				- 0.96 (0.89, 1.03)	0.01
Subtotal (I-squared = 34.6%, p = 0.204)				1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	67.89
Overall (I-squared = 87.7%, p = 0.000)				1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	100.0
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis	ţ	-			

Figure 2. Forest graph of 1-year graft survival rate. (A) The 1-year graft survival rate of keratoconus patients after treatment with deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty in 9 studies. (B) Subgroup analysis of 1-year graft survival rate when studies were divided into 2 groups according to the sample number. (C) Subgroup analysis of 1-year graft survival rate when studies were divided into 2 groups according to the sample number. (C) Subgroup analysis of 1-year graft survival rate when studies were divided into 2 groups according to the sample number.

institutions like hospitals, surgical databases, and National Health Service Blood and Transplant. The duration of these studies were all over 5 years, and the follow-up rates of each study were over 50%.

3.2. Meta-analysis

3.2.1. One-year graft survival rate. Eleven survival rates of 2241 patients from 9 studies^[20,21,23,25,26,28–31] were analyzed in

this 1-year graft survival rate analysis. The 1-year graft survival rate of the analyzed articles ranged from 93% to 100%. The merged 1-year graft survival rate of keratoconus patients after treatment with DALK was (95% confidence interval [CI]): 100% [99.9–100%], P < .001) (Fig. 2A). However, the I² value was 87.7%, which suggested a significant heterogeneity. To confirm the source of heterogeneity, subgroup meta-analysis was further

analyzed. No heterogeneity was shown in each subgroup, divided either according to the sample number or number of surgeons (Fig. 2B and C) which indicated that these might be the 2 main reasons of heterogeneity. In subgroup analysis, the merged 1-year graft survival rate of bigger sample number group (>100), 97% (95–98%) P<.001 was lower than the smaller sample number group (<100) (Fig. 2B).

3.2.2. Three-year graft survival rate. A total of 2224 patients' 11 graft survival rates from 9 studies^[20,21,23,25,26,28–31] were analyzed. Three years after treatment with DALK, the merged graft survival rate was (95% CI): 92.9% (89.8–95.9%), P < .001 (Fig. 3A). Similar to the 1-year survival rate analysis, significant heterogeneity was observed (I²: 94.2%; P < .001). Sample number and number of surgeons in the entire procedure were

D the W. Cohen. 2000-2006 (2019) but Simazak. 1997-2003 (2009) the Simazak. 1997-2003 (2015) the Sherak A. Kabebar. 1999-2005 (2014) the real: A. Kabebar. 2005-2006 (2014) the real: A. Kabebar. 2005-2006 (2014) the series A. Kabebar. 1999-2005 (2014) the series A. Kabebar. 1999-2005 (2014) the series A. Kabebar. 1999-2005 (2015) the series A. Kabebar. 1999-2005 (2010) Han DCY, 1992-2006 (2010) Han A. Kabebar. 1993-2006 (2014) Subtrail (1-squared = 84.5%, p = 0.000) -100 Douglas J. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014) Shivania A. Kabebar. 1993-2006 (2014) Shivania A. Kabebar. 2005-2006 (20	p (95% CI) 1.00 (0.99, 1.01) 0.84 (0.80, 0.89) 0.73 (0.56, 0.89) 0.91 (0.84, 0.97) 0.88 (0.86, 0.92) 0.92 (0.85, 0.92) 0.92 (0.85, 0.92) 0.93 (0.81, 0.01) 0.93 (0.81, 0.89) 0.93 (0.94, 1.01) 0.93 (0.94, 1.01) 0.93 (0.94, 1.01) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.984 (0.80, 0.89) 0.997 (0.94, 1.01) 0.97 (0.94, 0.99)	Weight 11.13 9.33 2.38 7.43 10.02 10.83 10.02 9.65 10.26 9.35 100.00 9% Weight 11.14 2.41 7.45 30.65 9.33 10.01
Nex W. Cohen.2000-2006 (2014)	1.00 (0.99, 1.01) 0.84 (0.80, 0.89) 0.73 (0.56, 0.80) 0.91 (0.84, 0.97) 0.86 (0.86, 0.87) 0.94 (0.80, 0.87) 0.93 (0.86, 0.87) 0.93 (0.86, 0.97) 0.93 (0.86, 0.93) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.73 (0.56, 0.90) 0.91 (0.84, 0.97) 0.97 (0.84, 1.01) 0.95 (0.89, 1.00) 0.84 (0.80, 0.86) 0.89 (0.86, 1.00) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	11.13 9.33 2.38 7.43 10.02 9.65 100.00 9.5 100.00 9.5 Weight 7.45 30.65 30.65
Douglas J. Coster. 1993-2006 (2014) Han DCY. 1992-2006 (2009) An Shimazaki. 1997-2013 (2015) Have K. A. Jones. 1999-2005 (2009) Bepeter Feed. 2004-2012 (2016) Binvaria A. Kaabekar. 2005-2008 (2014) Shvaria A. Kaabekar. 2005-2008 (2014) Shvaria A. Kaabekar. 2005-2008 (2014) Study ID 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 10	0.84 (0.80, 0.89) 0.73 (0.54, 0.97) 0.89 (0.80, 0.82) 0.97 (0.80, 0.82) 0.97 (0.80, 0.82) 0.97 (0.80, 0.83) 0.97 (0.80, 0.83) 0.97 (0.81, 0.91) 0.93 (0.80, 0.83) 0.97 (0.94, 1.61) 0.93 (0.80, 0.92) 1.1 1.00 (1.00, 1.00) 0.73 (0.56, 0.20) 0.91 (0.84, 0.97) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.95 (0.84, 1.02) 0.95 (0.84, 1.02) 0.95 (0.84, 1.02) 0.95 (0.84, 1.02) 0.95 (0.86, 0.20) 0.95 (0.86, 0.20) 0.95 (0.86, 0.20) 0.95 (0.96, 0.20) 0.97 (0.96, 0.96) 0.97 (0.96, 0.99)	9.33 2.36 7.43 10.02 10.83 10.72 8.90 10.28 9.85 100.00 % Weight 11.14 2.41 7.45 9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
San DCV: 1992-2005 (2009) ++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++	073 (0 56, 0 99) 091 (0 84, 0 37) 089 (0 86, 1 00) 097 (0 85, 0 99) 030 (0 80, 1 00) 030 (0 80, 0 87) 030 (0 81, 0 86) 089 (0 85, 0 83) 097 (0 94, 1 01) 033 (0 30, 0 86) 11 10 10 10 01 (0 0, 1 00) 0 37 (0 56, 0 00) 091 (0 84, 0 97) 097 (0 94, 1 01) 0 57 (0 94, 1 01) 0 57 (0 94, 1 01) 0 57 (0 94, 1 01) 0 59 (0 86, 0 92) 0 58 (0 86, 1 00) 0 597 (0 95, 0 99) 0 597 (0 95, 0 99)	2.38 7.43 10.02 10.83 10.72 8.90 10.28 9.35 9.85 100.00 7% Weight 11.14 2.41 7.45 9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
Aur Bilmazaki (1997-2013 (2015) hapehr Feist.2004-2012 (2016) hapehr Feist.2004-2013 (2017) bitwaria A. Kaabekar.2005-2006 (2014) hitwaria A. Kaabekar.2005-2006 (2014) hitwaria A. Kaabekar.2005-2006 (2015) Doverall (I-squared = 94.2%, p = 0.000) HOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis B b b c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c	0.91 (0.81, 0.97) 0.88 (0.86, 0.92) 0.98 (0.96, 1.00) 0.93 (0.86, 0.97) 0.93 (0.86, 0.97) 0.93 (0.86, 0.97) 0.93 (0.86, 0.97) 0.93 (0.86, 0.93) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.93 (0.90, 0.96) 1.1 1.0 (1.00, 1.00) 0.73 (0.56, 0.90) 0.91 (0.84, 0.97) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.95 (0.89, 1.00) 0.84 (0.80, 0.88) 0.89 (0.96, 0.92) 0.99 (0.96, 0.92) 0.99 (0.96, 0.92)	7,43 10,02 10,83 10,72 8,60 10,26 9,85 100,00 9% Weight 11,14 2,41 7,45 9,65 30,65 9,33 10,01
Hark N. A. Jones. 1999-2005 (2009) Ispeker Fee: 2005-2012 (2016) Ispeker Fee: 2005-2013 (2017) Ishvaria A. Kaabaka: 2005-2008 (2014) Anazara A. Kaabaka: 2005-2008 (2014) Anazara A. Kaabaka: 2005-2008 (2014) Anazara A. Kaabaka: 2005-2008 (2014) Anazara A. Kaabaka: 1999-2001 (2013) Detrail (I-squared = 94.2%, p = 0.000) -100 Anac W. Cohen. 2000-2006 (2010) Han DCV, 1992-2006 (2010) Han DCV, 1992-2006 (2010) Han DCV, 1992-2006 (2010) -100 Douglas J. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014) Mark N. A. Jones, 1993-2006 (2014) Subtoal (I-squared = 84.5%, p = 0.000) -100 Douglas J. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014) Shivania A. Kaabaka: 2005-2008 (2014) Shivania A. Kaabaka: 2005-2006 (2014) Shivania A. Shababa: 2005-2006	0.88 (0.86, 0.82) 0.98 (0.86, 0.82) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99) 0.93 (0.86, 0.97) 0.93 (0.86, 0.97) 0.93 (0.86, 0.97) 0.93 (0.91, 0.96) 0.88 (0.86, 0.93) 0.97 (0.94, 1.91) 0.93 (0.90, 0.96) 1.1 1.0 (1.00, 1.00) 0.73 (0.56, 0.90) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.95 (0.89, 1.00) 0.84 (0.80, 0.86, 0.92) 0.88 (0.96, 1.00) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	10.02 10.83 10.72 8.90 10.28 9.85 100.00 9% Weight 11.14 2.41 7.45 9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
Mark H. A. Jones, 1999-2001 (2014) Biveraira A. Kaabekar. 2005-2001 (2014) Biveraira A. Kaabekar. 2005-2000 (2014) Contemport Biveraira A. Kaabekar. 2005-2000 (2013) Diveraira A. Kaabekar. 2005-2000 (2010) Hort Weights are from random effecta analysis A A gear survival rate subgroup 1 Biudy Diversition C100 Accoher. 2000-2006 (2010) Han DCY, 1992-2006 (2010) Han DCY, 1992-2006 (2010) Han DCY, 1992-2006 (2010) Han DCY, 1992-2006 (2013) Bubtolari (I-equared = 84.5%, p = 0.000) -100 Douglas J. Coster, 1983-2006 (2014) Biveraira A. Kaabekar. 2002-2004 (2014) Biveraira A. Kaabekar. 2002-2004 (2014) Biveraira (I-equared = 91.5%, p = 0.000) Overail (I-equared = 91.5%, p = 0.000) Ove	1.1 0.84 (0.86, 0.82) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99) 0.93 (0.86, 0.97) 0.93 (0.86, 0.97) 0.93 (0.86, 0.97) 0.93 (0.96, 0.99) 0.97 (0.94, 1.81) 0.93 (0.90, 0.96) 1.1 p (95% Cl) 1.0 0.73 (0.56, 0.90) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.957 (0.94, 1.01) 0.957 (0.94, 1.02) 0.957 (0.94, 1.02) 0.957 (0.94, 1.02) 0.958 (0.86, 0.92) 0.968 (0.86, 0.92) 0.97 (0.96, 1.09) 0.97 (0.96, 0.99)	10.02 10.83 10.72 8.90 10.28 9.35 9.85 100.00 % Weight 11.14 2.41 7.45 9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
Sepert Feiz.2004-2012 (2016) Biversia A Kaubekar:2009-2004 (2014) Biversia A Kaubekar:2009-2004 (2014) Biversia A Kaubekar:2009-2004 (2014) Biversia A Kaubekar:2009-2006 (2014) Comparing ZFMANG.2000-2010 (2013) Syear survival rate subgroup 1 Biody D <100	0.84 (0.80, 1.60) 0.87 (0.95, 0.99) 0.93 (0.88, 0.97) 0.93 (0.95, 0.96) 0.84 (0.85, 0.93) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.93 (0.90, 0.96) 1.1 1.00 (1.00, 1.00) 0.73 (0.56, 0.90) 0.91 (0.84, 0.97) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.95 (0.89, 1.00) 0.84 (0.80, 0.86) 0.99 (0.96, 1.02) 0.98 (0.86, 1.09) 0.97 (0.96, 1.09) 0.97 (0.96, 0.99)	10.83 10.72 8.80 10.26 9.85 100.00 % Weight 11.14 2.41 7.45 9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
Signif Feil: 2004-2013 (2017) Bivaria A Kaubikar: 2009-2004 (2014) Bivaria A Kaubikar: 2005-2008 (2014) Signif Feil: 2004-2010 (2013) Derrill (Haquined = 94.2%, p = 0.000) VOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis A 5 3 years survival rate subgroup 1 Study D 100 Ave: V. Cohen. 2000-2006 (2010) Hand School (2016) A gear survival rate subgroup 1 Study D 100 Ave: V. Cohen. 2000-2006 (2010) Hand Device (2013) Jum Shimazaki, 1987-2003 (2015) Torge-ming 2HANG.2000-2010 (2013) Bubtotal (I-squared = 84.5%, p = 0.000) -100 Dogias J. Coster, 1983-2006 (2014) Bubtotal (I-squared = 91.5%, p = 0.000) -101 Douglas J. Coster, 1993-2001 (2014) Bivaria A: Kaabekar.2005-2006 (2014) Bivaria A: Kaab	0.97 (0.85, 0.89) 0.93 (0.86, 0.97) 0.83 (0.86, 0.93) 0.97 (0.94, 1.91) 0.95 (0.94, 1.91) 0.95 (0.90, 1.90) 1.00 (1.00, 1.00) 0.73 (0.56, 0.90) 0.91 (0.84, 0.97) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.95 (0.84, 1.02) 0.86 (0.86, 0.92) 0.86 (0.86, 1.02) 0.97 (0.96, 1.09) 0.97 (0.96, 1.09)	10.72 8.80 10.28 9.35 9.65 100.00 % Weight 11.14 2.41 7.45 9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
BitNamia A: Kaabekar.2005.2006 (2014) Intermined = 94.2%, p = 0.000) VOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis A 5 By array and a strate subgroup 1 Story Bitogram Story Populate A: Kaabekar.2005.2006 (2013) D ************************************	0.93 (0.88, 0.97) 0.93 (0.81, 0.86) 0.88 (0.85, 0.93) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.93 (0.80, 0.96) 1.1 p (95% Cl) 1.00 (1.00, 1.00) 0.73 (0.56, 0.90) 0.91 (0.84, 0.97) 0.95 (0.84, 1.01) 0.95 (0.84, 1.02) 0.88 (0.86, 0.92) 0.98 (0.86, 0.92) 0.997 (0.95, 0.99)	8.90 10.26 9.35 9.65 100.00 % Weight 11.14 2.41 7.45 30.65 9.33 10.01
bivaria A. Kaabeka: 2002-2004 (2014) throws A. Kaabeka: 2005-2006 (2014) throws A. Kaabeka: 2005-2006 (2013) berrall (Laquared = 94.2%, p = 0.000) KOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis A b A b Budy b T b Budy c D c Cloop c Cloop c D c Cloop c Cloop c D c Cloop c Septer Feiz: Cloop - 2006 (2014) Shothal (Laqua	0.33 (0.91, 0.96) 0.88 (0.85, 0.93) 0.97 (0.94, 1.91) 0.93 (0.90, 0.96) 1.1 p (95% Cl) 1.00 (1.00, 1.00) 0.73 (0.56, 0.90) 0.91 (0.84, 0.97) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.95 (0.89, 1.00) 0.84 (0.80, 0.88) 0.58 (0.66, 0.92) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	10.26 9.35 9.65 100.00 9% Weight 11.14 2.41 7.45 9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
Bitwana A Kaabakar 2005 2008 (2014) frog-ming 2HANG 2000 2010 (2013) Dentall (H-squared = 94 2%, p = 0.000) Work Weights are from random effects analysis A 1 B year survival rate subgroup 1 Budy D 100 Max W. Cohen, 2000-2006 (2010) Han DCV, 1992-2006 (2009) Jan Bitmizzaki, 1997-2013 (2015) Yong-ming 2HANG 2000-2010 (2013) Subtoal (H-squared = 84.5%, p = 0.000) -100 Douglas J. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014) Janshimizzaki, 1997-2013 (2015) Subtoal (H-squared = 84.5%, p = 0.000) -100 Douglas J. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014) Janshimizzaki, 1993-2006 (2014) Subtoal (H-squared = 91.5%, p = 0.000) Overail	0.88 (0.85, 0.93) 0.97 (0.94, 1.61) 0.93 (0.90, 0.96) 1 1.1 p (85% Cf) 1.00 (1.00, 1.00) 0.73 (0.56, 0.90) 0.91 (0.84, 0.97) 0.97 (0.84, 1.01) 0.95 (0.89, 1.00) 0.84 (0.80, 0.88) 0.589 (0.86, 0.92) 0.98 (0.96, 0.92)	9.35 9.65 100.00 % Weight 11.14 2.41 7.45 9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
transmiss 214446.2000 2010 (2013) Detrail (I-squared = 94.2%, p = 0.000) MOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis A 1 3 year survival rate subgroup 1 Study 100 <100	0.97 (0.94, 1.81) 0.93 (0.90, 0.96) 1.1 p (95% Cl) 1.00 (1.00, 1.00) 0.73 (0.56, 0.00) 0.91 (0.84, 0.97) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.95 (0.89, 1.00) 0.84 (0.80, 0.88) 0.89 (0.86, 0.92) 0.98 (0.86, 0.92) 0.99 (0.96, 1.00) 0.97 (0.96, 0.99)	9.65 100.00 % Weigh 11.14 2.41 7.45 9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
Overall (I sequared = 94.2%, p = 0.000) NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis A 5 6 7 6 1 Study 3 8 7 6 1 Study 3 8 7 6 1 Action 5 6 7 6 1 Study 3 8 7 6 1 Action 500 0 0 0 0 Action 1992-2006 (2010) 0	0.93 (0.90, 0.96) 1.1 p (95% Cl) 1.00 (1.00, 1.00) 0.73 (0.56, 0.20) 0.91 (0.84, 0.97) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.95 (0.89, 1.00) 0.84 (0.80, 0.86) 0.89 (0.86, 1.00) 0.97 (0.96, 0.99)	100.00 % Weight 11.14 2.41 7.45 9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
A a	1.1 p (95% Cl) 1.00 (1.00, 1.00) 0.73 (0.56, 0.20) 0.97 (0.54, 1.01) 0.97 (0.54, 1.01) 0.95 (0.89, 1.00) 0.84 (0.80, 0.28) 0.89 (0.86, 0.32) 0.89 (0.86, 0.32) 0.97 (0.96, 0.99)	% Weight 11.14 2.41 7.45 9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
A 1 1 1 1 1 3 year survival rate subgroup 1 Budy 0 100	1 p (85% Cl) 100 (100, 100) 0.73 (0.56, 0.00) 0.97 (0.84, 0.97) 0.97 (0.84, 101) 0.95 (0.89, 100) 0.84 (0.80, 0.88) 0.89 (0.86, 100) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	% Weight 11.14 2.41 7.45 9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
3 year survival rate subgroup 1 Study D 100 100 Avs: W. Cohen.2000-2006 (2010) Han DCY, 1992-2006 (2009) Avr. Shimazaki, 1997-2013 (2015) Yong-ming ZHANG, 2000-2010 (2013) Subtotal (I-squared = 84.5%, p = 0.000) >100 Douglas J. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014) Subtotal (I-squared = 94.5%, p = 0.000) Shiwania A. Kasbekar, 1999-2001 (2014) Bhivania A. Kasbekar, 1999-2005 (2006 (2014) Shiwania A. Kasbekar, 2005-2006 (2014) Shiwania A. Sabebar, 2005-2005 (2006) Shiwania A. Sabebar, 2005-2005 (2	p (95% Cl) 1.00 (1.00, 1.00) 0.73 (0.56, 0.90) 0.91 (0.84, 0.97) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.95 (0.84, 1.01) 0.84 (0.80, 0.88) 0.59 (0.86, 0.92) 0.58 (0.96, 1.00) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	% Weight 11.14 2.41 7.45 9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
<100	p (95%, CI) 1.00 (1.00, 1.00) 0.73 (0.56, 0.90) 0.91 (0.84, 0.97) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.95 (0.89, 1.00) 0.84 (0.80, 0.88) 0.59 (0.86, 0.92) 0.88 (0.96, 1.00) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	Weight 11.14 2.41 7.45 9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
100 Alex W. Cohen, 2000-2006 (2010) Han DCV, 1992-2006 (2009) Jun Shimazaki, 1997-2013 (2015) Subtotal (I-squared = 84.5%, p = 0.000) *100 Douglas J. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014) Boglas J. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014) Brivania A. Kasbekar, 2092-2004 (2014) Shivania A. Kasbekar, 1999-2005 (2014) Brivania A. Kasbekar, 2002-2004 (2014) Brivania A. Kasbekar, 2002-2004 (2014) Brivania A. Kasbekar, 1999-2005 (2014) Douglas J. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014) Brivania A. Kasbekar, 1999-2005 (2014) Brivania A. Kasbekar, 1999-2004 (2014) Bri	1.00 (1.00, 1.00) 0.73 (0.56, 0.90) 0.91 (0.84, 0.97) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.55 (0.89, 1.00) 0.84 (0.80, 0.88) 0.89 (0.86, 0.92) 0.89 (0.86, 0.92) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	11.14 2.41 7.45 9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
Alex W. Cohen.2000-2006 (2010) Han DCV, 1992-2006 (2009) Jun Shimazaki, 1997-2013 (2015) Subtotal (I-squared = 84.5%, p = 0.000) -100 Douglas J. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014) Mark N. A. Jones, 1999-2005 (2009) Septer Feiz,2004-2012 (2015) Septer Feiz,2004-2013 (2017) Bihvania A. Kasbekar, 2005-2006 (2014) Jihvania A. Kasbekar, 2005-2006 (2014) Diversil (I-squared = 91.5%, p = 0.000) VOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis B 1 B 7 B 7 B 9 1 9 1 9	1 00 (1 00, 1 00) 0.73 (0.56, 0.90) 0.91 (0.84, 0.97) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.55 (0.88, 1.00) 0.84 (0.80, 0.88) 0.89 (0.86, 0.92) 0.98 (0.96, 1.00) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	11.14 2.41 7.45 9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
Han DCV (1992-2006 (2009) Jun Shimazaki, 1997-2013 (2015) Subtotal (I-squared = 84.5%, p = 0.000) >100 Douglas J. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014) Mark N. A. Jones, 1999-2005 (2014) Sepekr Feizz, 2004-2012 (2015) Sepekr Feizz, 2004-2013 (2017) Shivania A. Kasbekar, 1999-2001 (2014) Shivania A. Sasbekar, 1999-2001 (2014) Sh	0.73 (0.56, 0.90) 0.91 (0.84, 0.97) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.85 (0.88, 1.00) 0.84 (0.80, 0.88) 0.89 (0.86, 0.92) 0.89 (0.86, 1.00) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	2.41 7.45 9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
Jun Shimazaki, 1997-2013 (2015) Yong-ming ZHANG, 2000-2010 (2013) Subtotal (I-lequared = 84.5%, p = 0.000) -100 Douglas J. Coster, 1998-2006 (2014) Mark N. A. Jones, 1999-2006 (2014) Seperk Feizi, 2004-2013 (2017) Shvania A. Kasbekar, 1999-2005 (2014) Shvania A. Kasbekar, 2005-2001 (2014) Shvania A. Kasbekar, 2005-2002 (2014) Shvania A. Kasbekar, 2005-2002 (2014) Subtotal (I-squared = 95, 1%, p = 0.000) Overail (I-squared = 95, 1%, p = 0.000) NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis B 1 3 year survival rate subgroup 2 Study	0.91 (0.84, 0.97) 0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.95 (0.89, 1.00) 0.84 (0.80, 0.88) 0.89 (0.86, 0.92) 0.96 (0.96, 1.00) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	7.45 9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
Yong-ming ZHANG,2000-2010 (2013) Subtotal (I-squared = 84.5%, p = 0.000) >100 Douglas J. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014) Mark N. A. Jones, 1999-2005 (2014) Seperk Feix; 2004-2012 (2015) Seperk Feix; 2004-2013 (2017) Shvania A. Kasbekar, 1099-2005 (2014) Shvania A. Kasbekar, 2005-2006 (2014) Shvania A. Kasbekar, 2005-2006 (2014) Overail (I-squared = 95.1%, p = 0.000) Overail (I-squared = 95.1%, p = 0.000) NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis B 1 3 year survival rate subgroup 2 Study	0.97 (0.94, 1.01) 0.95 (0.89, 1.00) 0.84 (0.80, 0.88) 0.89 (0.86, 0.92) 0.98 (0.96, 1.00) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	9.65 30.65 9.33 10.01
Subtolal (I-squared = 84.5%, p = 0.000) -100 Douglas J. Coster, 1983-2006 (2014) Mark N. A. Jones, 1989-2006 (2014) Septer Feiz2,2004-2013 (2015) Septer Feiz2,2004-2013 (2015) Septer Feiz2,2004-2013 (2017) Shivania A. Kasbekar, 1999-2001 (2014) Shivania A. Kasbekar, 2005-2006 (2014) Shivania A. Kasbekar, 2005-2006 (2014) Shivania A. Kasbekar, 2005-2006 (2014) Overall (I-squared = 91.5%, p = 0.000) NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis B	0.95 (0.89, 1.00) 0.84 (0.80, 0.88) 0.89 (0.86, 0.92) 0.98 (0.96, 1.00) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	30.65 9.33 10.01
>100 Douglas J. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014) Mark N. A. Jones, 1999-2005 (2009) Septer Feiz;2004-2013 (2015) Septer Feiz;2004-2013 (2017) Shivania A. Kasbekar, 1999-2001 (2014) Shivania A. Kasbekar, 2005-2006 (201	0.84 (0.80, 0.88) 0.89 (0.86, 0.92) 0.98 (0.96, 1.00) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	9.33 10.01
Dougliss J. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014) Mark N. A. Jones, 1999-2005 (2009) Seperk Feix: 2004-2013 (2017) Shvania A. Kasbekar, 1999-2005 (2014) Shvania A. Kasbekar, 2002-2004 (2014) Shvania A. Kasbekar, 2002-2004 (2014) Overall (I-squared = 95, 1%, p = 0.000) Overall (I-squared = 95, 1%, p = 0.000) NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis B 1 3 year survival rate subgroup 2 Study	0.84 (0.80, 0.88) 0.89 (0.86, 0.92) 0.98 (0.96, 1.00) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	9.33 10.01
Mark N. A. Jones, 1999-2005 (2009) Sepektr Feizi22004-2012 (2015) Sepektr Feizi22004-2013 (2017) Shivania A. Kaabekar, 1999-2001 (2014) Shivania A. Kaabekar, 2002-2004 (2014) Shivania A. Kaabekar, 2005-2006 (2014) Shivania A. Kaabekar, 2005-2006 (2014) Shivania A. Kaabekar, 2005-2006 (2014) Overall (I-squared = 91.5%, p = 0.000) Overall (I-squared = 95.1%, p = 0.000) NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis B 4 3 year survival rate subgroup 2 Budy	0.89 (0.86, 0.92) 0.98 (0.96, 1.00) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	10.01
Sepekt Feiz,2004-2012 (2015) Sepekt Feiz,2004-2013 (2017) Shivania A. Kaabakar,1999-2001 (2014) Shivania A. Kaabakar,2002-2004 (2014) Shivania A. Kaabakar,2002-2004 (2014) Shivania A. Kaabakar,2002-2004 (2014) Shivania A. Kaabakar,2002-2004 (2014) Overall (I-squared = 91.5%, p = 0.000) Overall (I-squared = 95.1%, p = 0.000) Overall (I-squared = 95.1%, p = 0.000) Styles B 6 7 8 9 1 3 year survival rate subgroup 2 Study	0.98 (0.96, 1.00) 0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	
Sepekt Field, 2004-2013 (2017)	0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	10.81
Sinvania A. Kasbekar, 1999-2001 (2014)	0.00 (0.00 0.07)	10.70
Shiveania A. Kaabakar, 2005-2005 (2014) Subtotal (I-squared = 91.5%, p = 0.000) Overail (I-squared = 95.1%, p = 0.000) NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis B 1 3 year survival rate subgroup 2 Study	0.93 (0.88, 0.97)	10.25
Subtoral (I-squared = 91.5%, p = 0.000) Overal (I-squared = 95.1%, p = 0.000) NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis B 1 1 1 3 year survival rate subgroup 2 Study	0.89 (0.85, 0.93)	9.35
Overall (I-squared = 95.1%, p = 0.000) Image: provide the squared = 95.1%, p = 0.000) NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis Image: provide the squared s	0.92 (0.88, 0.96)	69.35
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis B 6 7 8 9 1 3 year survival rate subgroup 2 Study	0.02 (0.00, 0.06)	100.00
B 8 7 8 9 1 3 year survival rate subgroup 2 Study	0.85 (0.80, 0.80)	100.00
- 3 year survival rate subgroup 2 ^{Study}	1.1	
Study		
		%
	p (95% CI)	Weight
Yes	100/100 100	11.12
Sepehr Feizi 2004-2012 (2015)	0.98 (0.96 1.00)	10.81
Sepetrr Feizi 2004-2013 (2017)	0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	10.70
Yong-ming ZHANG,2000-2010 (2013)	0.97 (0.94, 1.01)	9.65
Subtotal (I-squared = 83.9%, p = 0.000)	0.98 (0.96, 1.00)	42.29
No		
Douglas J. Coster 1993-2006 (2014)	0.84 (0.80. 0.88)	9,33
Han DCY,1992-2006 (2009)	0.73 (0.56, 0.90)	2.41
Jun Shimazaki, 1997-2013 (2015)	0.91 (0.84, 0.97)	7.45
Mark N. A. Jones, 1999-2005 (2009)	0.89 (0.86, 0.92)	10.01
Shivania A. Kasbekar, 1999-2001 (2014)	0.93 (0.88, 0.97)	8.91
Shivania A. Kasbekar,2002-2004 (2014)	0.93 (0.91, 0.96)	10.25
Shivania A. Kasbekar,2005-2006 (2014)	0.89 (0.85, 0.93)	9.35
Subtotal (I-squared = 69.6%, p = 0.003)	0.89 (0.86, 0.92)	57.71
Overall (I-squared = 95.1%, p = 0.000)		100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis	0.93 (0.90, 0.96)	

Figure 3. Forest graph of 3-year graft survival rate. (A) The 3-year graft survival rate of keratoconus patients after treatment with deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty in 9 studies. (B) Subgroup analysis of 3-year graft survival rate when studies were divided into 2 groups according to the sample number. (C) Subgroup analysis of 3-year graft survival rate when studies were divided into 2 groups according to the sample number. (C) Subgroup analysis of 3-year graft survival rate when studies were divided into 2 groups according to the sample number.

the main reasons of heterogeneity. After subgroup analysis, the I² values of heterogeneity decreased no matter whether the division was by sample number or number of surgeons involved in the whole procedure (Fig. 3B and C). Moreover, the 3-year graft survival rate of patients who received DALK by a single surgeon was 93.8% (96.4%, 100%; P < .001), higher than those who received surgery by multiple surgeons (89.3% [86.3%, 92.3%], P < .001).

3.2.3. Five-year graft survival rate. Ten survival rates of 1970 patients from 8 studies^[21,22,24–26,29–31] were analyzed in this 5-year graft survival rate analysis. The merged graft survival rate was (95% CI): 90.4% (86.0–94.8%), P < .001 with a significant heterogeneity (I² value: 93.5%) (Fig. 4A). According to the former analysis, subgroup analyses were performed to seek the source of heterogeneity (Fig. 4B). Low heterogeneity of the 5-year

5 year survival rate						96
D					p (95% Cl)	Weight
Douglas J. Coster 1993-2006 (2014)	_	-			0.67 (0.62, 0.72)	9.79
lun Shimazaki 1997.2013 (2015)					0.86 (0.78, 0.94)	8.45
Chivania & Kachekar 1999-2001 (2014)					0.00 (0.85, 0.95)	9.74
Chivania A. Kasbekar 2002-2004 (2014)					0.91 (0.88, 0.94)	10.74
Shivania A. Kasbekar 2005-2006 (2014)				1.1	0.81 (0.86, 0.84)	10.74
Poss Macinture 2000-2010 (2013)					0.85 (0.84, 0.92)	7.56
Coss Macintyle,2000-2010 (2013)					0.95 (0.84, 1.02)	10.05
Sepenr Peizi,2004-2012 (2015)					0.95 (0.93, 0.98)	10.95
Sepehr Feizi,2004-2013 (2017)				-	0.95 (0.92, 0.97)	10.96
rong-ming ZHANG,2000-2010 (2013)					0.97 (0.94, 1.01)	10.52
/ito Romano,2003-2008 (2014)					0.98 (0.96, 1.00)	11.00
Overall (I-squared = 93.5%, p = 0.000)				$\langle \rangle$	0.90 (0.86, 0.95)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects	analysis		_			
4	.6	.7	.8	.9 1	1.1	
5 year survival rate subgr	roup 1					%
D					p (95% CI)	Weight
Touclas I Coster 1993-2006 (2014)					0.67 /0.62 0.70	9.70
Congress 0. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014)				3	0.07 (0.02, 0.72)	0.79
epenr Feizi,2004-2012 (2015)					0.95 (0.93, 0.98)	10.95
Sepehr Feizi,2004-2013 (2017)					0.95 (0.92, 0.97)	10.96
Shivania A. Kasbekar, 1999-2001 (2014)					0.90 (0.85, 0.95)	9.74
Shivania A. Kasbekar,2002-2004 (2014)					0.91 (0.88, 0.94)	10.74
hivania A. Kasbekar,2005-2006 (2014)					0.88 (0.84, 0.92)	10.28
/ito Romano,2003-2008 (2014)					0.98 (0.96, 1.00)	11.00
ubtotal (I-squared = 95.4%, p = 0.000)					0.90 (0.84, 0.95)	73.47
=100						
lun Shimazaki 1997-2013 (2015)					0.86 (0.78, 0.94)	8.45
Pose Macloburg 2000.2010 (2013)					0.03 (0.84 1.02)	7.56
(one mine 7HANG 2000-2010 (2013)					0.07 (0.04, 1.01)	10.52
Cubicity () covered = 71.9% = = 0.020)					0.02 (0.86 1.00)	20 52
Subiotal (Insidualed - 71.0%, p = 0.023)					0.35 (0.00, 1.00)	20.00
Overall (I-squared = 93.5%, p = 0.000)				\diamond	0.90 (0.86, 0.95)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects	analysis					
B	.6	.7	.8	.9 1	1.1	
5 year survival rate subgr	oup z					
study						70
D.					p (95% Cl)	Weight
lo						
Douglas J. Coster, 1993-2006 (2014)		•			0.67 (0.62, 0.72)	9.79
un Shimazaki, 1997-2013 (2015)			-		0.86 (0.78, 0.94)	8.45
Shivania A. Kasbekar, 1999-2001 (2014)					0.90 (0.85, 0.95)	9.74
Shivania A. Kasbekar,2002-2004 (2014)					0.91 (0.88, 0.94)	10.74
Shivania A. Kasbekar,2005-2006 (2014)					0.88 (0.84, 0.92)	10.28
Subtotal (I-squared = 94.0%, p = 0.000)			<		0.85 (0.76, 0.93)	49.01
coss MacIntyre 2000-2010 (2013)					0.93 (0.84, 1.02)	7.56
epehr Feizi 2004-2012 (2015)					0.95 (0.93, 0.92)	10.95
epehr Feizi 2004,2013 (2017)					0.95 (0.92, 0.97)	10.96
(and mine 7444/2 0000 0010 (2017)					0.03 (0.02, 0.97)	10.90
rong-ming ZMANG,2000-2010 (2013)					0.97 (0.94, 1.01)	10.52
/ito Komano,2003-2008 (2014)				-	0.98 (0.96, 1.00)	11.00
iubtotal (I-squared = 21.7%, p = 0.277)				~	0.96 (0.95, 0.98)	50.99
Overall (I-squared = 93.5%, p = 0.000)				$\langle \rangle$	0.90 (0.86, 0.95)	100.00
OTE: Weights are from random effects	analysis					
C	.6	7	.8	9 1	1.1	

Figure 4. Forest graph of 5-year graft survival rate. (A) The 5-year graft survival rate of keratoconus patients after treatment with deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty in 9 studies. (B) Subgroup analysis of 5-year graft survival rate when studies were divided into 2 groups according to the sample number. (C) Subgroup analysis of 5-year graft survival rate when studies were divided into 2 groups according to the sample number. (C) Subgroup analysis of 5-year graft survival rate when studies were divided into 2 groups according to the sample number. (C) Subgroup analysis of 5-year graft survival rate when studies were divided into 2 groups according to the sample number.



graft survival rate was shown in those who received DALK by single surgeon (I² value: 21.7%, P = .277) (Fig. 4C).

However, the 5-year graft survival rate (67%) extracted from Coster et al's study^[31] was lower than others, which might have been influenced by the large sample size (317), number of surgeons (single or multiple), and long follow-up period (leading to a high rate of follow-up loss). To explore the sensitivity of the results, 5-year graft survival rate was remerged by excluding studies one by one (Fig. 5). When Coster et al's study was excluded, the merged 5-year graft survival rate of the remaining studies was 93.4% (90.9%, 95.7%), which indicates a significant improvement.

4. Discussion

Although the symptoms can be improved by wearing contact lenses or receiving IntraCorneal Ring Segments (INTACS) implants, 15% to 20% of patients^[32] with keratoconus ultimately require corneal transplant surgery.^[33] Despite several comparative studies between PKP and DALK,^[34–37] no general agreement has yet been reached on the optimal method.

Graft survival rate is the most important indicator to evaluate the treatment effect of transplantation. Compared with PKP, various rates can be found on the graft survival rate of DALK for keratoconus patients owing to a short application period. In this meta-analysis, we collected and system integrated the graft survival rates to evaluate DALK treatment effects. As shown in our results, the graft survival rate gradually decreased from over time (1 year > 3 years > 5 years). The lowest graft survival rate seen at 5 years could likely be attributed to the long-time accumulation of immunization and the side effects of transplantation. Interestingly, the result of subgroup analysis indicated that the number of surgeons in 1 complete procedure might influence the graft survival rate. We assumed that this might be related to the skill level of the surgeon,^[28] or different operational methods. More comprehensive studies should be done to verify this hypothesis.

There are some limitations in this meta-analysis. First, though we focused on the effect of surgical method on graft survival rate, the recruited studies focused on 2 different populations (Mongolian and Caucasian); hence, difference of sample source might have partly contributed to the heterogeneity. Second, it is difficult to carry out a long-term follow-up with a big sample size; some patients were lost to follow-up which resulted in some studies not being analyzed in the subgroup analysis. Third, the included studies were limited by language, as non-English or non-Chinese publications might have been missed. However, the stable results showed by the sensitivity analysis and lower heterogeneity in the subgroup analysis indicate a high quality of this meta-analysis.

This meta-analysis discusses the graft survival rate of DALK on keratoconus patients. Although the survival rate slightly decreases year by year, the entire trend appears relatively stable. Further, all DALK procedures performed by a single surgeon might be helpful to improve the graft survival rate after surgery.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: Ling Yuan.

Data curation: Meng Guan, Weijia Zhao, Liuyan Feng.

Formal analysis: Meng Guan, Weijia Zhao, Yang Zhang, Yu Geng, Dongli Li.

Funding acquisition: Ling Yuan.

Investigation: Zonghan Chen, Ling Yuan.

Methodology: Meng Guan, Weijia Zhao, Yu Geng.

Project administration: Ling Yuan.

Resources: Meng Guan, Weijia Zhao, Yang Zhang, Yu Geng, Zonghan Chen, Liuyan Feng.

Software: Meng Guan, Weijia Zhao, Yu Geng, Zonghan Chen, Liuyan Feng.

Supervision: Ling Yuan.

Validation: Yang Zhang, Zonghan Chen, Dongli Li.

Visualization: Yang Zhang, Yu Geng, Liuyan Feng, Dongli Li.

Writing - original draft: Meng Guan, Weijia Zhao.

Writing - review and editing: Ling Yuan.

References

- Bawazeer AM, Hodge WG, Lorimer B. Atopy and keratoconus: a multivariate analysis. Br J Ophthalmol 2000;84:834–6.
- [2] Georgiou T, Funnell CL, Cassels-Brown A, et al. Influence of ethnic origin on the incidence of keratoconus and associated atopic disease in Asians and White patients. Eye (Lond) 2004;18:379–83.
- [3] Rabinowitz YS. Keratoconus. Surv Ophthalmol 1998;42:297-319.
- [4] Facts About the Cornea and Corneal Disease. NEI Office of Science Communications, Public Liaison, and Education. Available from: https:// www.nei.nih.gov/health/cornealdisease. Retrieved January 1, 2018.
- [5] Jonas JB, Nangia V, Matin A, et al. Prevalence and associations of keratoconus in rural Maharashtra in central India: the central India eye and medical study. Am J Ophthalmol 2009;148:760–5.
- [6] Kennedy RH, Bourne WM, Dyer JA. A 48-year clinical and epidemiologic study of keratoconus. Am J Ophthalmol 1986;101:267–73.
- [7] Romero-Jiménez M, Santodomingo-Rubido J, Wolffsohn JS. Keratoconus: a review. Cont Lens Anterior Eye 2010;33:157–66.
- [8] Naroo SA. Contact lens & anterior eye. The journal of the British Contact Lens Association. Editorial. Cont Lens Anterior Eye 2008;31:173–5.
- [9] Maguire LJ, Bourne WM. Corneal topography of early keratoconus. Am J Ophthalmol 1989;108:107–12.
- [10] Gokul A, Patel DV, McGhee CN. Dr John Nottingham's 1854 landmark treatise on conical cornea considered in the context of the current knowledge of keratoconus. Cornea 2016;35:673–8.
- [11] Nottingham J. Practical Observations on Conical Cornea: and on the Short Sight, and Other Defects of Vision Connected with it. London: John Churchill, 1854.
- [12] Jhanji V, Sharma N, Vajpayee RB. Management of keratoconus: current scenario. Br J Ophthalmol 2011;95:1044–50.
- [13] Krachmer JH, Feder RS, Belin MW. Keratoconus and related noninflammatory corneal thinning disorders. Surv Ophthalmol 1984; 28:293–322.
- [14] Troutman RC, Lawless MA. Penetrating keratoplasty for keratoconus. Cornea 1987;6:298–305.

- [15] The Australian Corneal Graft Registry1990 to 1992 report. Aust N Z J Ophthalmol 1993;21:1–48.
- [16] Lim L, Pesudovs K, Coster DJ. Penetrating keratoplasty for keratoconus: visual outcome and success. Ophthalmology 2000;107:1125–31.
- [17] Al-Kharashi SA, Al-Obailan MM, Almohaimeed M, et al. Deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty. Saudi J Ophthalmol 2009;23:203–9.
- [18] Watson SL, Ramsay A, Dart JK, et al. Comparison of deep lamellar keratoplasty and penetrating keratoplasty in patients with keratoconus. Ophthalmology 2004;111:1676–82.
- [19] Gonzalez A, Price MO, Feng MT, et al. Immunologic rejection episodes after deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty: incidence and risk factors. Cornea 2017;36:1076–82.
- [20] Han DCY, Mehta JS, Por YM, et al. Comparison of outcomes of lamellar keratoplasty and penetrating keratoplasty in keratoconus. Am J Ophthalmol 2009;148:744–51.
- [21] Kasbekar SA, Jones MNA, Ahmad S, et al. Corneal transplant surgery for keratoconus and the effect of surgeon experience on deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty outcomes. Am J Ophthalmol 2014;158:1239–46.
- [22] Romano V, Iovieno A, Parente G, et al. Long-term clinical outcomes of deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty in patients with keratoconus. Am J Ophthalmol 2015;159:505–11.
- [23] Chen Y, Hu D-N, Xia Y, et al. Comparison of femtosecond laser-assisted deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty and penetrating keratoplasty for keratoconus. BMC Ophthalmol 2015;15:144–50.
- [24] MacIntyre R, Chow S-P, Chan E, et al. Long-term outcomes of deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty versus penetrating keratoplasty in Australian keratoconus patients. Cornea 2014;33:6–9.
- [25] Feizi S, Javadi MA, Khajuee-Kermani P, et al. Repeat keratoplasty for failed deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty in keratoconus: incidence, indications, and outcomes. Cornea 2017;36:535–40.
- [26] Shimazaki J, Ishii N, Shinzawa M, et al. How much progress has been made in corneal transplantation? Cornea 2015;34:S105–11.

- [27] Cohen AW, Goins KM, Sutphin JE, et al. Penetrating keratoplasty versus deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty for the treatment of keratoconus. Int Ophthalmol 2010;30:675–81.
- [28] Jones MNA, Armitage WJ, Ayliffe W, et al. Penetrating and deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty for keratoconus: a comparison of graft outcomes in the United Kingdom. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2009;50:5625–9.
- [29] Feizi S, Jafarinasab MA, Javadi F, et al. Deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty in keratoconic patients with versus without vernal keratoconjunctivitis. J Ophthal Vis Res 2015;10:112–7.
- [30] Zhang Y-M, Wu S-Q, Yao Y-F. Long-term comparison of full-bed deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty and penetrating keratoplasty in treating keratoconus. J Zhejiang Univ Sci B 2013;14:438–50.
- [31] Coster DJ, Lowe MT, Keane MC, et al. A comparison of lamellar and penetrating keratoplasty outcomes: a registry study. Ophthalmology 2014;121:979–87.
- [32] National Keratoconus Foundation. National Keratoconus Foundation: Research Overview. Available from: http://www.nkcf.org.http://www. nkcf.org. Retrieved August 20, 2017.
- [33] Javadi MA, Motlagh BF, Jafarinasab MR, et al. Outcomes of penetrating keratoplasty in keratoconus. Cornea 2005;24:941–6.
- [34] Borderie VM, Sandali O, Bullet J, et al. Long-term results of deep anterior lamellar versus penetrating keratoplasty. Ophthalmology 2012;119:249–55.
- [35] Donoso R, Díaz C, Villavicencio P. Comparative study of keratoconus between Anwar's deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty versus converted penetrating keratoplasty. Arch Soc Esp Oftalmol 2015;90:257–63.
- [36] Khattak A, Nakhli FR, Al-Arfaj KM, et al. Comparison of outcomes and complications of deep anterior lamellar keratoplasty and penetrating keratoplasty performed in a large group of patients with keratoconus. Int Ophthalmol 2018;38:985–92.
- [37] Yüksel B, Kandemir B, Uzunel UD, et al. Comparison of visual and topographic outcomes of deep-anterior lamellar keratoplasty and penetrating keratoplasty in keratoconus. Int J Ophthalmol 2017;10:385–90.