



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Elucidation of the migratory behaviour of the corneal endothelium

Miron, A.

Citation

Miron, A. (2023, March 9). *Elucidation of the migratory behaviour of the corneal endothelium*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3570514>

Version: Publisher's Version


License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3570514>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

CHAPTER 10

Summary, Discussion, and Future Perspectives



SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

An intact corneal endothelium is essential for corneal transparency as it regulates corneal nutrition and hydration by balancing a semipermeable barrier activity with active ion transport mechanisms. The human endothelium is thought to be an amitotic cell layer with a continuous and age-dependent loss of endothelial cells of about 0.5 to 0.9% annually.[1] However, the endothelial cell loss can be accelerated due to corneal diseases, damage by inflammatory processes or by mechanical trauma following intraocular surgery or penetrating injury. Although the corneal endothelial cells (CEC) in low density conditions will display increased cellular migration by decreasing contact inhibition, once the endothelial cell density (ECD) drops below a minimum required to maintain the pumping function of the endothelium (typically around 400 – 500 cells/mm²), it will result in corneal decompensation. In such cases, the damaged or diseased portion of the cornea is surgically replaced either by a full thickness corneal graft (Penetrating Keratoplasty – PK) or a lamellar endothelial cell layer graft (lamellar endothelial keratoplasty – EK). Descemet Membrane Endothelial Keratoplasty (DMEK) is the most selective EK technique and nowadays the preferred treatment option for endothelial diseases.

Similar to solid organ grafting, transplanted corneal tissue possesses a limited lifespan that is often related to the density of cells transplanted. Grafts may display an acute (related to surgical technique or graft preparation) or chronic endothelial cell loss (subclinical immunological reaction) that could lead to graft failure. Moreover, due to the global deficit of donor corneas it is estimated that only 1 in 70 visually impaired patients that require a corneal graft actually receive one.[2,3] In an effort to overcome tissue shortage, Hemi-[4–6] and Quarter-DMEK[7–10] were developed to use the available donor tissue more efficiently. These techniques, like other new treatment options to alleviate tissue shortage, are most appropriate for patients with still healthy peripheral endothelial cells. Therefore, regeneration of the corneal endothelium by tissue engineering techniques, administration of pharmacological modulators or synthetic alternatives is being researched to overcome these problems.[11]

This thesis outlines the rapid progression of the corneal regeneration field, including an in-depth analysis of wound healing pathways and biological modulators. In addition, *in vitro* studies were conducted to evaluate the migration capacity of corneal endothelium before and after EK. These findings result in a better understanding of endothelial cell migration and provided further knowledge for the ongoing research on endothelial graft substitutes.

Early postoperative decrease in ECD after DMEK and DMEK graft viability prior to transplantation

DMEK has become the gold standard to treat endothelial dysfunction owing to the rapid visual rehabilitation, near-normal anatomical restoration of the cornea and a lower risk of allograft rejection.[12] Initially, the DMEK technique was met with some reluctance as there were concerns regarding the technical aspects of graft preparation and surgery.[13] Preparation of thin (10–15 µm) grafts can be challenging and, together with intraoperative graft handling, could potentially lead to either complete tissue loss especially during preparation or to high postoperative endothelial cells loss and low graft survival rate.[14] Since ECD is fundamentally tied to the longevity of endothelial keratoplasty, ECD decrease is considered one of the main outcome measures in the investigation of the efficacy and safety of DMEK, as well as for predicting long-term graft survival.[14–16] Postoperative ECD decrease for all endothelial keratoplasty techniques is usually reported for the six-month follow-up and shows a drop of about 30–40%, comparative to preoperative values, followed by an annual decrease of 7–9% thereafter.[17,18] However, it is unclear at what time point the decrease in ECD reported at six months actually occurred, and whether it reflects a gradual decrease or a sudden drop. The results of a small

case series at our institute showed a larger than 30% decrease in ECD within the first month after DMEK.[19] This finding was substantiated in a follow-up study (**Chapter 1**) on a series of 24 DMEK eyes operated for Fuchs endothelial cell dystrophy (FECD). In this study we were able to obtain specular microscopy images already 1 day and 1 week postoperatively due to the fast corneal clearance after DMEK and we could show that the 30% ECD drop occurs within the first postoperative week; about 2/3 of the total decrease could already be observed after the first postoperative day.[20] Such a rapid decrease cannot be explained by endothelial cell migration and/or redistribution that usually requires more time.[21] Similarly, it is unlikely that such an early drop was caused by an immune response, especially because an allograft rejection is generally considered to be a delayed reaction.[22] Other possibilities for causing the sudden early onset drop in ECD after DMEK may be intraoperative handling or an overestimation of preoperative viable cells on the graft. Since for most surgeries in this study no intraoperative complications were reported, the larger portion of the ECD decrease within the early postoperative phase after DMEK may primarily be explained by the overestimation of the eye bank viable ECD. This led us to examine endothelial cell viability after graft preparation in more detail.

Evaluation of the cell viability and quality of endothelial grafts prepared in the eye bank has become the subject of numerous studies. Endothelial cell loss was evaluated following various graft preparation methods or surgical manipulations.[23–29] Current eye banking practices determine ECD based on the structural integrity of the cells (assessed by trypan blue staining) though this does not exactly reflect the viable cell pool of corneal endothelium allocated for transplantation. Our follow-up study (**Chapter 2**) on graft viability using surgery grade DMEK grafts that could not be allocated (due to the Covid-19-related cancellation of elective surgeries), demonstrated the need to perform a more accurate post-processing corneal endothelial cell analysis.[30] Ideally, grafts should not only be evaluated based on live-dead analysis, but it should be differentiated between various forms of cell death (apoptosis, necrosis, autophagy) since otherwise e.g. apoptotic cells are considered as ‘live’ cells. For a better differentiation, multiple biochemical and functional assays should be applied. In this regard, Calcein acetoxymethyl ester (Calcein-AM) has been used for studies of enzymatic activity, cell membrane integrity, and long-term cell tracking due to its low cellular toxicity.[31,32] In our study, the cell viability of five grafts scheduled for transplantation was assessed by Calcein-AM on the originally planned surgery day and revealed that the percentage of central surface area covered by viable cells ranged from 57% to 97%. Because of this scattered viability range, we continued with the viability analysis of 11 paired donor corneas evaluated either directly post-preparation or after 3–7 days of storage. Our results showed that cell viability of most DMEK grafts seems not to be affected by preparation and storage, while for some grafts endothelial cell damage undetected by trypan blue could be observed within hours after graft preparation. Because trypan blue can only identify dead cells, it fails to detect apoptotic or necrotic cells.[33] Therefore, when ECD was evaluated after graft preparation by trypan blue staining (eye bank procedure), we observed an average ECD difference of 10 (± 21)% compared to ECD determined on the same grafts by Calcein-AM. This large variability of endothelial cell loss observed by Calcein-AM after graft preparation supported our clinical observation that the high endothelial cell loss detected in the early postoperative phase after DMEK can be primarily explained by an overestimation of the graft’s viable endothelial cell population.

As an alternative to Calcein-AM, an annexin V-FITC assay has also been reported to detect early apoptosis by targeting negatively-charged phosphatidylserine translocated from the inner membrane leaflet of viable cells to the outer membrane surface during apoptosis.[34] Therefore, combining assays routinely used to characterize cell apoptosis with membrane impermeable dyes such as trypan blue would allow for the detection and quantification, in the same sample, of the apoptotic/necrotic and viable cell populations. However, these assays are not yet approved for the use on transplantable tissue and therefore, there is a still a strong need to develop and validate cell viability and cytotoxicity detection methods that analyze the functional status of the corneal endothelial cells after graft preparation and provide an accurate cell count. Meanwhile, an additional DMEK quality check by light microscopy performed within hour after graft preparation or just before surgery

could help to detect grafts with doubtful endothelial quality and thus, reduce postoperative DMEK complications and low postoperative ECD outcomes.

Perceiving the morphological changes and regenerative capacity of the corneal endothelium *in vivo* and *in vitro*

Intracellular signaling in wound healing

Next to improving the quality of the available corneal donor tissue, current research is also focusing on non-surgical treatments for restoration of corneal endothelium by first understanding the concepts and limitations of clinical procedures. In this regard, the extensive review (**Chapter 3**) on signaling pathways involved in CEC proliferation and migration could lead to new ideas on how to treat corneal endothelial dysfunction in the future.[35]

Developing novel strategies to re-activate CEC regenerative capacity is challenging as CEC are blocked in the G0/G1 phase of the cell cycle *in vivo* and this is further hindered by endothelial-to-mesenchymal transition (EMT). Literature and gene and genome data base analysis revealed a complex interplay of pathways regulating the cell cycle and migration including among others the β -catenin and transforming growth factor (TGF- β) pathways, the PI3K/Akt pathway, and the Rho-ROCK pathway.[36-43] Especially the Rho/ROCK pathway regulates a wide spectrum of fundamental cellular events and is involved in a variety of pathological conditions; its inhibition may trigger various signaling cascades and produce multiple biological effects such as enhanced proliferation, increased motility, or cytoskeleton rearrangements.

In the process of wound repair, corneal endothelial cells may undergo EMT and transform to fibrogenic myofibroblasts. Myofibroblast generation through EMT is largely modulated by the transforming growth factor β (TGF- β)[44,45] that activates not only Smad signals but also other cytokines/growth factors such as mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK), P38MAPK.[46–48] Because migration is a major component of wound healing in the corneal endothelium, strategies to inhibit of the unfavorable EMT of the corneal endothelium should not be accompanied with an impairment of cell migration.

The wound healing process of corneal endothelium considers that cells close the wounded gap mainly by migration and increased cell spreading,[49] while cell division remains very low[34] with cells dividing mostly amitotic with formation of binuclear cells.[50] Successful clinical options for replacing the diseased endothelium include approaches that accelerate endothelial healing and suppress EMT through topical administration of ROCK inhibitor eye drops. There is clear evidence that topical Rock inhibitor administered after removal of non-confluent guttae (Descemet stripping only (DSO))[51,52] or after transplanting a devitalized DM[53] for treating central FECD, sustained cornea clearance, improved endothelial cell density, while overall, cells displayed a better architecture. ROCK inhibitors played also a major role in the clinical trial for injecting cultured human CEC into the anterior chamber of the eye.[54,55]

Corneal endothelial cells migrate by transiently acquiring a fibroblast morphology reorganizing the actin into stress fibers, events that are consistent with EMT. Furthermore, EMT may lead to fibrotic complications of healing such as the formation of a retrocorneal fibrous membrane.[56] Inducers of EMT and fibrotic changes in the endothelial layer include interleukine-1 beta (IL-1 β) that may be released in response to many 'pathogen associated molecular patterns' (PAMPs) and TGF- β . Although TGF- β can stimulate healing, it also promotes fibrogenic changes including deposition of aberrant extracellular matrix (ECM).[57] To counteract the fibrogenic response, inhibition of TGF- β signaling, viral-mediated overexpression of SMAD7[58] – a natural TGF- β signaling inhibitor, proved to suppress the inhibitory action of TGF- β on cell proliferation, which was mediated by inhibition of SMAD2 phosphorylation and downregulation of p27Kip1.[59] SMAD7 therapy is being currently considered useful for prevention and treatment of fibrogenic disorders in the corneal endothelium.[57]

Clinical scenarios that require corneal endothelial cell migration

Clinical studies on endothelial healing are usually restricted to observations of cases with ocular chemical burn,[60,61] or after replacement of the abnormal corneal endothelium with healthy donor tissue.[62,63] These cases reported corneal recovery either through proliferation of endothelial progenitors from specific regions of the eye (progenitor-enriched niche adjacent to the peripheral endothelium and named inner transition zone (TZ))[64] or combined migration of both donor and remaining recipient endothelial cells. However, the wound healing process of corneal endothelium gives rise to many unanswered questions. For instance, endothelial cell migration insights after Quarter-DMEK surgery (that is, a modified DMEK-technique in which a full-sized DMEK graft is divided in quarters to treat 4 eyes),[8–10] did not succeed in confirming the presence of endothelium progenitors residing in the area close to the limbus. All operated eyes cleared centrally, while the peripheral bare stroma showed persistent edema.[8] The lack of cell migration from that specific region was attributed to the arrangement of collagen fibrillary bands in the graft periphery acting as a barrier for cell migration[6] but could also be caused by the removal of (progenitor) cells during Quarter-DMEK graft preparation. Typical, a DMEK graft diameter of 8–8.5 mm, that is prepared using the no-touch peeling technique, has low chances to show endothelial damage because trephination is performed outside the touched area during preparation.[66,67] However, Quarter-DMEK graft preparation requires manual removal of trabecular meshwork[9] and this technical step may be likely to deteriorate the quality of the peripheral endothelium.

The clinical results of Quarter-DMEK eyes showed a different corneal clearance pattern with clearing primarily occurring adjacent to the radial cut graft edges but not along the ‘limbal’ round edge of the Quarter-DMEK grafts and in the adjacent bare stromal areas.[8,10] This observation was mainly attributed to an asymmetric endothelial cell migration over different anatomical corneal areas. To better understand the heterogenous cell migration behavior, with migration almost entirely absent in the far periphery of the endothelium, we performed *in vitro* studies to determine how Quarter-DMEK grafts may be positioned best onto the posterior recipient stroma in order to create a more homogeneous corneal clearance pattern (**Chapter 4**). The main experimental challenge was to keep a tissue, inherently inclined to curl, to stay flat in a fixed position on a surface in fluid. While Quarter-DMEK grafts were sandwiched between two glass coverslips spatially separated by a suture wire, the assembly was transferred to a culture plate and cell migration documented over 6 days.[68] Although the experimental set up was rather restrictive for nutrient diffusion, endothelial cells migrated from the radial cut edges but failed from the limbal round edge of the Quarter-DMEK grafts. This finding was mainly attributed to Descemet membrane architecture that organizes the cells in small radial rows induced by the furrow-like distribution of the underlying collagen fibers.[65] Also, it was suggested that endothelial cells undergo, throughout life, a continuous slow centripetal migration from deeper niches toward the center and lose their progenitor phenotype in response to contact with aqueous humor, the presence of TGF- β , and by cell contact inhibition as soon as they form a monolayer.[65] Hence, endothelial cells in the periphery will unlikely migrate outside from the graft area but might still possess residual proliferative capacity.[69,70]

Three-dimensional *in vitro* cell culture model: concept and its applications

Concept description

Given the success to reproduce a clinical observation using an *in vitro* system and research grade donor tissue, we decided to improve the culture technique in order to gather more insight regarding the movement of corneal endothelial cells. But to achieve more reproducible results and reduce the technical burden of the experiments, further optimization of the explant culture system was required. Therefore, we developed a 3D culture technique for explant tissue by using a temperature-reversible hydrogel system which was biocompatible, non-toxic, 100% synthetic, pathogen-free and highly transparent for cell observation (**Chapter 5**). Also, the temperature-dependent dynamic viscosity is an important characteristic that allows the gel to swell, become

soft and flexible upon warming and liquefy upon cooling. This property is very useful to develop methods to harvest cultured cells for specifically planned procedures[71,72] or develop techniques to preserve viable cells within the gel,[73] with no need for an enzymatic treatment.[74] In this study, we expanded the scope of the gel, from an effective culture matrix that provides mechanical support while directing cell adhesion to a structure that adds weight when placed over the top of the biological sample without deteriorating its structure and functionality. In our first *in vitro* cell migration study with Quarter-DMEK grafts sandwiched between two glass slides cell migration could be studied for about 7 days before cells died due to the insufficient supply of nutrients (**Chapter 4**).[68] The new adapted 3D explant culture protocol improved cell viability and collective cell migration continued far longer (>3 weeks).[75] Also, the gel's thermo-reversibility allowed the removal of liquefied gel and enabled the detection of biomolecular markers in the tissue and migrated cell layer which was not possible with the previous experimental set-up.

Study the capacity to induce CEC mitosis in the peripheral corneal endothelium, via the controlled disruption of contact inhibition

Given the advantages of the new 3D culture method to enhance the viability and migration capacity of cells from explant tissue, we continued with testing the effect of different types of peripheral Quarter-DMEK graft modifications on endothelial cell migration (**Chapter 6**). The objective of the study was to further optimize the Quarter-DMEK preparation in order to accelerate corneal clearance in patients along the round edge of the graft. Quarter-DMEK grafts with intact and viable endothelial cells were embedded in a cooled biocompatible, temperature-reversible polymer matrix and cultured over two weeks in a humidified atmosphere.[76] The peripheral edge of Quarter-DMEK grafts was physically modified by either introducing radial cuts into the far peripheral area or by removing parts of the far periphery with a trephine. Immunohistochemistry analysis performed after the two-week culture on grafts retrieved from the polymer matrix, demonstrated the presence of tightly packed and viable cells that showed high migratory ability at the leading edge of the monolayers formed from the radial cut graft edges.

Next to better understanding the molecular pathways involved in endothelial migration (**Chapter 3**), current research also focuses on understanding the structure-function relationships in the adhesive structures of an endothelial monolayer that enable the cell to exert traction on its environment.[77,78] Cells spreading is a process largely determined by two interdependent and interactive systems: the integrin-based apparatus for substrate adhesion and the actin cytoskeleton characterized by distinct arrangements of actin filaments.[79–81] Integrins and actin are coupled through a physical linkage, which provides traction for migration. In collective cell migration cells carry out specialized functions according to their position within the group. Front-rear polarization is an example in which one subset of leader cells at the front guides a larger group of follower cells at the rear.[82] Leader cells typically exhibit a mesenchymal migration phenotype and function by degrading and remodeling the ECM to create channels for the whole cell group to advance cohesively.[83,84] By contrast, followers retain endothelial features such as apical-basolateral polarity and tight junctions and express relatively low levels of guidance receptors. Importantly, cells are not dragged or pushed by neighbors, but actively sense and respond to stresses imposed on them.

Endothelial cell migration from the limbal graft edge, however, was not triggered by increasing cell exposure to free space through surgical modifications of the far periphery. Lack of migration from this area was also not due to an absence of viable cells, since immunolocalization showed cells with expression of structural (zonula occludens-1 (ZO-1) and vimentin) and functional markers (sodium/potassium pump ($\text{Na}^+/\text{K}^+ \text{--ATPase}$)). At first instance, the furrowed collagen microstructure of the peripheral cornea[65] might have acted as a barrier, thereby preventing migration. At the same time, other stimulus-specific gene expression responses might be required in order to prompt these cells to move. It is possible that important factors responsible for regulating cell migration such as cell-matrix adhesion molecules (e.g., integrins, selectins, cadherins), the Rho family of

small GTPases, and proteases (matrix-metallo proteases (MMPs)), are less expressed in the peripheral cells. When functional integrins recognize ECM ligands (fibronectin, laminin) to form focal adhesion,[85] signaling proteins are recruited to focal adhesion to regulate their assembly and disassembly.[86] Rho family of small GTPases[87] have been reported as key regulators of focal adhesion dynamics by dictating contact association, maturation, and turn over. The disassembly process through which cell adhesions are resealed could be mediated by ECM degradation by MMPs[88,89] or cellular contractile machinery ,i.e., Rho and myosin II, that cause cell rear detachment.[90,91] Taken together, cell migration framework outlines a complex map of processes, with multiple cross-talks between members of different families that influence the cell movement through mutually antagonistic pathways.[92]

Study the regenerative potential of the peripheral corneal endothelium

The failure of far peripheral EC to migrate, in spite of limbal area modifications, still limits the clinical application of Quarter-DMEK. Understanding the nature of these peripheral endothelial cells, how they differ from the central cells, and how to encourage them to migrate would greatly improve the pool of donor tissue available for patients with an immediate need of a transplant.

After having explored the controlled mechanical perturbation of the peripheral endothelium as a possible promoter of collective cell migration, we performed an *in vitro* study to evaluate the potential of ROCK-inhibitor to stimulate peripheral endothelial cell migration. We first adapted the explant tissue shape from a pizza-pie (Quarter-DMEK) to an open-ring (6.5 mm punched out endothelium with TM still attached) to create a better system model for mimicking *in vitro* the *in vivo* effect of ROCK-inhibitor on cell migration outcomes after placing a pie-shaped Quarter-DMEK graft in a circular descemetorhexis area or after DSO (**Chapter 7**). The curved outer graft rims were mounted flat on a substrate, a central prerequisite for observing cell motility, and were cultured in a 3D thermo-reversible hydrogel matrix for over a month. This enabled the assessment whether continuous ROCK-inhibition creates long-term alteration in the migration characteristics of corneal endothelial cells. Our results, described in **Chapter 7**, showed that all cultured rims remained viable and displayed either single regions or collective areas of cell migration, regardless of the presence or absence of a ROCK-inhibitor. Rock-inhibitor, on the other hand, seemed to enhance the morphological stability of the migrated cells. Interestingly, late-onset cell migration from an area close to the limbus was observed. These late-onset cells grew fast into a contact inhibited monolayer displaying the typical hexagonal cell morphology, first adopted a fibroblast-like morphology before acquiring a cell phenotype with a regular morphology and appeared less differentiated compared to other areas of migration. This late-onset cell population not only showed high proliferative capacity but also emerged from outer rim grafts cultured without dysregulating the Rho-ROCK pathway. While it did not alter the cell outgrowth from the outer graft rims, the presence of ROCK-inhibitor did appear beneficial for maintaining the cell shape and cell-cell adhesion contacts during collective migration. The ability of ROCK-inhibitor to promote corneal endothelial wound healing by enhancing endothelial remodeling, adhesion and cell migration has been reported previously.[92]

The broad range of cell migration phenotypes, from non-invasive motility to single-cell mesenchymal style to collective motility, differed in this study compared to previous migration studies of Quarter-DMEK grafts (**Chapter 6**),[76]. The main distinctions in the experimental design were presence of TM that remained adhered to endothelium and cell motility study-period that was considerably longer than two weeks. Thus, it is possible that a particular cell type localized at the insert region of the TM required long-term culture before displaying the characteristics of undifferentiated cells. When cell viability was evaluated on outer graft rims with the late-onset cell population, the intensity of Calcein-AM signal varied over the sample wherein the lowest signal intensity corresponded to the cell population that had emerged from the far periphery of the endothelium. We suspect that this late-onset but fast growing cell population has a low intracellular esterase activity that does not signal damaged membranes but rather low-level expression of esterase-specific genes that serves as a

reliable indicator of undifferentiated cells.[93] Similar to our explant culture, Zhang et al.[94] demonstrated that cells proliferated from peripheral corneal areas with similar morphological characteristics during cell growth, timing, and end cell morphology. Furthermore, by using quantitative polymerase chain reaction (q-PCR), the cultured cells in their study were initially found to express increased levels of stem cell genes and minimal levels of pluripotency but these gene expression levels were reversed later during culture. The conclusion was that cells residing in the Schwalbe's ring region, a transition area between the peripheral corneal endothelium and the anterior non-filtering portion of the TM (collectively called the 'transition zone' [TZ]) displayed characteristics of adult stem cells.

Generally, these cells seem to form a distinct cell population in the transition area displaying distinct ultrastructural features and with a whorled-like pattern oriented circumferentially at the corneal periphery and deep to the corneal endothelium lining of the anterior chamber.[95] Although they were proposed to have neuroregulatory function in the anterior segment [96] they were also found responsible for the formation of an aberrant endothelial membrane covering the anterior uveal meshwork in some patients treated for glaucoma with argon laser trabeculoplasty (ALT).[97,98] In addition, increased cell density in the peripheral areas of the cornea compared to the central area (average range 17%–23%)[99] also suggests that stem-like cells may be present in the peripheral transition region to provide differentiated CEC. Also, it has been documented in the literature that under some circumstances mitosis occurs in the endothelium of the adult human cornea[100,101] and percentage of replication-competent cells is higher in the peripheral CEC than those in the central cornea, which was independent of donor age.[102] These findings suggest that peripheral CEC possess regenerative capacity and may be able to supply new cells for the corneal endothelium. Although molecular marker studies for the stem cell niche at the transition zone provide supportive data,[103,104] there has not been a stem cell signature established so far.[105] Also, attempts to isolate and propagate undifferentiated progenitor cells using a sphere culture protocol have proved to be more effective in isolating young precursor cells[106] from the peripheral corneal endothelium than the central region.[107–110] Therefore, it still remains to be determined if the Schwalbe's cells, TZ cells, and precursors are the same cell type, the extent to which they retain regenerative potential, and how cellular proliferation could be unlocked *in vivo* to repopulate corneal endothelium in age and disease.

Improving surgical technique by integrating *in vitro* cell culture observations

While trying to understand and promote EC migration from the peripheral cornea, the low postoperative ECD after Quarter-DMEK helped us to focus on continuous technique improvement. In an effort to address the significant ECD decrease after Quarter-DMEK,[8,10] which was thought to be caused by the shape mismatch between a round descemetorhexis and a triangular graft, a new surgical option was described, where small diameter DMEK grafts were prepared to match a small descemetorhexis and validated through a series of *in vitro* experimental conditions (**Chapter 8**). The main findings of this study were: (1) three circular mini-DMEK grafts with a diameter of 4 mm can be successfully prepared from one donor cornea, (2) the surgical procedure could be validated *in vitro*, and (3) small-diameter grafts embedded into a thermo-responsive hydrogel matrix showed uniform cell migration around the entire circular graft edge with cells displaying typical hexagonal close-packed morphology.[111] Similar to Quarter-DMEK, transplantation of a small-diameter graft offers the theoretical benefit of reduced donor antigen load and may allow using donor corneas with multiple incisional scars following cataract extraction. Initially, grafts as small as the 4 mm diameter (mini-DMEK) were reported to treat acute corneal hydrops in keratoconus (i.e., rupture and detachment of the stiff DM due to progressing ectasia of the corneal stroma).[112,113] Not only the shape and size of the DMEK grafts used to close the tear in the DM were not standardized (5 mm round DMEK graft or razor blade cut graft with a width of 3 mm and a length adjusted to the length of the tear in the recipients' DM) but also the orientation of the graft was not important for the surgery, presumably because the healthy host endothelium would easily repopulate the DM

even if the graft was accidentally inverted.[113] In a more recent study, Handel et al.[114] utilized mini-DMEK grafts to treat chronic focal corneal endothelial decompensation caused by tears in Descemet membrane after intraocular surgeries or corneal edema in the area of Haab striae in buphthalmus. Therefore, corneas were healthy and no disease except for the focal DM defect was present. The mini-DMEK grafts were trimmed from remaining DM to a width and a length equal to the length of the tear in the recipient's DM, while the central DM was used for patients with FECD. Although cornea deswelling was observed in all cases, the role of endothelial cells in small DM defects remained unclear.

It should also be noted that the small-diameter DMEK grafts have the potential to increase the use of one donor cornea to benefit three recipients only for treating mild FECD with guttae confined to the 4 mm central area. To avoid the 'no-touch' handling-related challenges of such small DMEK grafts, two alternative methods have been clinically tested so far, namely DSO and transplantation of acellular DM (i.e., Descemet membrane transplantation, DMT).[115–120] DSO represents a donor-independent strategy for central FECD, an approach that has already extensively been discussed in **Chapter 4**, while DMT represents a strategy for using non-clinical grade DMEK tissue. Although both techniques have the potential to treat FECD without the need for allogenic cell transplantation and fear of graft rejection, DMT provides an appropriate substrate that supports host endothelial cell migration with reduced risk for cells to enter endothelial-to-mesenchymal transition.[53] In addition, it seals the stroma to avoid keratocyte activation close to the wound space by the aqueous TGF- β ,[121] that may lead to fibrosis and increased risk for retrocorneal membrane formation.[122,123] However, both DSO and DMT report a long recovery time with complete anatomical cornea restoration and visual rehabilitation not earlier than 3 months postoperatively.

Small diameter DMEK grafts showed great surgical feasibility with improved graft characteristics (i.e., ECD, graft viability, uniform cell migration capacity) and by having a matching shape to the circular descemetorhexis, clinical recovery could be similar to conventional DMEK. However, results of clinical tests would provide greater clarity about the efficiency of small diameter-DMEK grafts for treatment of mild FECD.

FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

DMEK is nowadays the gold standard for the treatment of corneal endothelial dysfunction. Since its introduction, DMEK has proved superior to PK and other keratoplasty techniques in terms of faster visual recovery, lower rejection rates, better refractive outcomes, and increased structural integrity.[124–128] Therefore, the number of DMEK procedures performed worldwide has increased, particularly, in patients with Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy (FECD).[129,130]

By only replacing the diseased tissue, DMEK embodies conceptual simplicity and surgical sophistication. Nonetheless, the main problem with endothelial keratoplasty is the chronic loss of endothelial cell density (ECD) over time which is similar to PK.[124,131,132] The effect of several donor- and patient-related parameters on endothelial cell loss has been evaluated in several studies in the literature, but with no consistent outcome.[15,133–140] However, the intraocular handling of the 15–20 μ m thick membrane and the preoperative manual graft preparation represent technical challenges that may affect the final outcome.

We performed studies to better understand the postoperative ECD decline, as described in this thesis. One aspect regards the overestimation of graft viability in the eye bank,[30] which in turn results in an unrealistic high drop in ECD in the early postoperative phase after DMEK.[20] Grafts seem to develop pronounced endothelial cell damage even after an unremarkable preparation process. However, performing DMEK surgery using tissue with suboptimal endothelium quality could increase the risk of graft detachment and early graft failure.[14] While candidate fluorescent vital dyes can visualize life and apoptotic cells, regulatory and safety concerns as well as economic considerations may prevent eye banks from implementing such a step in their current protocol. One short-term solution could be to check the tissue quality just before releasing the graft for

transplantation. Although implementing this step might lead to an increase in the discard rate of already scarce tissue, it may result in a lower re-transplantation rate. An alternative strategy could be to improve the quality of donated corneas, by boosting the storage media with pharmacological modulators able to promote corneal endothelial regeneration and by maintaining a low level of oxidative stress. Furthermore, storing the cornea in a bioreactor, and not just free floating in a sealed bottle, could recreate the pressure gradient equivalent to intraocular pressure associated with a continuous renewal of storage medium, reduce stromal swelling, and therefore improve EC viability.[141,142] However, further research is needed to evaluate the safety of such storage methods and the therapeutical relevance of pharmaceutical agents.

In an effort to overcome tissue shortage, the use of Quarter-DMEK could potentially quadruple the pool of donor tissue. However, the technique may benefit from some further modification to improve ECD outcomes. *In vitro* studies on the endothelial cell migration included in this thesis showed that the round peripheral edge of the Quarter-DMEK graft will constitute a physical barrier for cell migration[68,76] unless progenitor-like cells, recently discovered in an area close to the limbus,[64] could be unlocked to induce sufficient corneal deturgescence. Also, by adapting the graft preparation protocol to eliminate the round peripheral edge of the Quarter-DMEK, small diameter-DMEK may provide a fast and uniform corneal clearance and become a viable clinical option to treat central endothelial disease.[111]

The limited numbers of high-quality corneal donors, and the surgical complexity of DMEK has promoted significant research interest in developing alternative techniques that either encourage a more efficient use of donor tissue or completely eliminate the need for implanting donor tissue.

To date, no better therapeutic alternatives are available for the treatment of diseased endothelium than corneal transplantation. However, current tissue engineering approaches for corneal replacement represent a promising avenue for clinical applications. To overcome cornea donor shortage, researchers have adopted two basic tissue-engineering approaches: a “cell-based” strategy to allow the cells to create their own extracellular matrix, and “scaffold-based” strategies to provide strong and biocompatible matrices upon which to grow cells.[143–146] Regardless of strategy, *in vitro* expansion or the *de novo* generation of corneal endothelial cells (CEC) from pluripotent stem cells or other cell sources is required.[147,148] The main challenge for the *in vitro* proliferation of terminally differentiated cells is to preserve their phenotype by avoiding endothelial-to-mesenchymal transition (EMT), which can cause CEC to lose their normal cell morphology and induce cell fibrosis. The alternative of differentiating CEC from pluripotent stem cells or other cell sources such as bone marrow-derived endothelial precursors, neural crest cells, corneal stromal stem cells, skin-derived precursors, or mesenchymal stem cells requires suitable culture protocols which have to comply with regulatory directives to guarantee that the final cell source resembles CEC.[148–154] While good manufacturing practice directives may differ depending on the country or region in which they are defined, there is an urgent need for standardization of endpoint parameters that generated CEC should fulfil. Therefore, the list of quality criteria should be reviewed for: (i) morphology assessment by checking cellular hexagonality upon reaching confluence in culture, (ii) genotype and phenotype by examining structural and functional markers, (iii) karyotype conservation by checking the integrity of the DNA to demonstrate the lack of gross chromosomal aberration, and (iv) functionality checked *in vitro* by tools that measure ion permeability across a monolayer of cells, *ex vivo* using corneas in a setting that mimics physiological conditions and allows the measurement of corneal thickness and further correlate to cell functionality, or *in vivo* using animal models of corneal edema.[155]

After facing all challenges with CEC culture in terms of cellular profile, proliferative capacity, and downstream analysis, cells must be delivered alive and with sufficient potential to adhere to the posterior part of the cornea. The “cell-based” strategy proposes the delivery of CEC in a simple and minimal invasive manner via injection into the anterior chamber of the eye.[155] After the procedure, placing the subject in a prone position for 3 hours allows gravity to increase the attachment of CEC to the posterior part of the cornea. The proof-of-concept clinical study by Kinoshita and associates demonstrated that corneal edema could be reversed by injecting about

1×10^6 cultured human CEC supplemented with ROCK inhibitor Y-27632 into the anterior chamber after mechanical scrapping of the diseased endothelium; corneal clarity was maintained at least 5 years postoperatively.[54,55] Additionally, the latest technique refinement suggests that injection therapy using highly purified mature cultured human CEC for corneal endothelial failure is safer, provides rapid recovery of corneal thickness, better ECD, and a low cell attrition rate over 3 years postsurgery.[156] However, larger, prospective, randomised controlled trials are required to ensure the long term efficacy and safety.

The main challenge for the “scaffold-based” strategy is to obtain a monolayer of CEC on a biocompatible carrier to produce bioengineered corneal endothelial grafts.[145] The use of a carrier that supports cell replication is an attractive approach because it has the added advantage of delivering a contact-inhibited and functional cell monolayer to the correct place and in a controlled manner. In addition, fewer cells are needed to populate the carrier compared to cell injection, thereby increasing the number of patients that could benefit. Assuming a surface area of 57 mm^2 (8.5 mm circular carrier) and a final ECD of 2300 cells/mm^2 (usual threshold value set up by eye banks), an endothelial graft should contain about 1.3×10^5 CEC. Based on a simple calculation, the expanded CECs used to treat 11 patients by cell injection could hypothetically populate 84 carriers and treat patients by a delivery strategy similar to DMEK or DSEK. However, an ideal cell carrier should mimic key architectural and functional features of the DM and therefore be dense, thick enough to provide sufficient mechanical strength, relatively transparent, semi-permeable to aqueous humour, flexible enough to mould to the curvature of the cornea, biocompatible, promote cell adhesion and phenotype, and maybe biodegradable to enables cells to produce their own DM while simultaneously degrading the surrounding scaffold. Many *in vitro* studies have reported promising research results when using either natural tissues such as decellularized biological membranes (e.g., amniotic membrane, denuded DM or stroma of both human and animal origin, human anterior lens capsule)[157–167] or polymeric materials (natural and synthetic).[161,168–192] Subsequent *in vivo* testing of tissue-engineered corneal endothelial cell-carrier sheets in animal models has, however, not proven any of the constructs suitable to progress into clinical practise.[160,193–195]

The option to eliminate the transplant altogether and allow a person’s own endothelial cells to redistribute was introduced by Descemet stripping only (DSO) for the treatment of early FECD. In a primary analysis of DSO, the removal of a 6mm diameter area of the diseased DM led to an incomplete recovery.[116,196] Better clearance rates were reported where a smaller 4-5mm descemetorhexis was employed in selected cases of relatively young patients with central guttae and an adequate peripheral endothelial reserve.[116,197] Despite these limitations, DSO benefits from 0% rejection rate (no risk of immunologic graft rejection) and no need to use long term topical corticosteroids to prevent graft rejection thereby reducing the side effect of intraocular pressure elevation. However, DSO is not yet a replacement for DMEK for two primary reasons: clearing a smaller area may still lead to suboptimal vision, and corneal edema may persist for months hindering visual recovery, rendering its outcome unpredictable.[119] To improve its success, this technique may require the use of pharmacological modulators such as Rho-associated protein kinase (ROCK) inhibitors.[118] Although the biological action of ROCK-inhibitors is completely understood, they have been described to significantly speed up the visual recovery and induce higher central endothelial cell counts in a restored endothelium and with an improved cell architecture.[52] Therefore, DSO may be a suitable first-line surgical treatment option prior to DMEK or small diameter-DMEK, for those willing to try if stripping alone will resolve their vision problems. However, larger trials are still required to assess the effect of DSO in conjunction with pharmacological drugs on longer-term clinical efficacy and drug safety.

A potential hybrid technique between DSO and conventional, circular DMEK employs the use of endothelial graft substitutes comprising of tissue-derived or synthetic matrices.[120,198,199] Transplantation of an acellular DM into a patient has recently been reported as part of a larger clinical trial in Singapore [identification number NCT03275896]. The patient was transplanted with a 4 mm decellularized membrane and showed a four-line improvement in acuity 6 month after transplant, with near to normal restauration of central corneal

thickness and ECD values comparable to DSO.[120] Alternatively, a synthetic graft substitute (EndoArt) has been implanted to reverse corneal edema and promote sight recovery.[198] Attached to the back of the cornea, EndoArt should prevent the transfer of fluids into the cornea and inhibit the fluid accumulation leading to edema. A summary of the first results for two patients as part of a multi-center, prospective feasibility clinical study [identification number NCT03069521] showed that patients had a reduction of corneal edema with transparency recovery after EndoArt implantation. Limitations of implanting this synthetic construct include: (i) regular repositioning by rebubbling until complete adherence to the stromal bed, (ii) unclear timespan over which the cornea will remain transparent and properly hydrated, (iii) long-term effect of restricting diffusion of vitamin and essential nutrients from the aqueous humour to the cornea and (iv) inability of corneal endothelial cells to migrate and populate the artificial layer. Overall, natural-derived or engineered graft substitutes will still have to be evaluated in large clinical trials with long-term follow-up results to further determine their implementation success and also identify the right target populations.

Another strategy to increase corneal endothelial graft availability is to treat the genetic disorder by replacing the need for a corneal transplant. The current strategies able to correct the genetic alteration or avoid their associated effects are gene augmentation therapy (GAT), antisense oligonucleotide-based modulation (AON), and clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats (CRISPR/Cas9)-based modulation.[200–205] It has also been reported that FED pathophysiology manifests through a combination of various genetic and non-heritable factors, such as channel dysfunction (e.g., solute carrier family 4 member 11 – SLC4A11), abnormal extracellular matrix deposition (e.g., collagen type VIII alpha 2 chain – COL8A2), RNA toxicity, oxidative stress (e.g., nuclear factor, erythroid 2 like 2 transcription factor – NRF2), and apoptosis (e.g., zinc finger e-box binding homeobox 1 – ZEB1).[206,207] The most common genetic alteration in FECD is a microsatellite region comprising CTG trinucleotide repeats (TNRs) in the fourth intron of the TCF4 gene to be abnormally expanded and segregated. While the genetic mechanism responsible for the effect of this trinucleotide expansion on the TCF4 gene is unclear, it will contribute to cellular dysfunction by triggering RNA mis-splicing. The genetic modulation of TCF4 expression is done either by transferring a functioning copy of this defective gene aimed to correct the disease, by introducing antisense oligonucleotides such as small interference RNA (siRNA) or micro-RNA (miRNA) that could diminish the toxic effects associated with the defective gene, or by eliminating the CTG expansion in order to revert the mutation causing FECD.[208–214] Further research is also needed to explore the immune tolerance towards the transgene products following repeated administration in the anterior eye chamber, find the most efficient and cost-effective delivery methods, and identify the off-target effects.

Over the past several years, the use of pharmaceutical agents for the treatment of corneal endothelial diseases has been explored.[35] The working principle relies on promoting cell survival, proliferation, and migration with a minimally invasive approach of intracameral or topical drug delivery. ROCK-inhibitors have been the most studied drugs with great potential to trigger CEC repair *in vivo* in humans when administrated topically as an adjuvant to DSO.[51,52] Worldwide clinical series report on ROCK-inhibitors success to reverse corneal edema after surgical removal of diseased CEC, restore corneal anatomy after partially detached DM in BK eyes after cataract surgery, and regenerate the corneal endothelium through a presumed increase in cell proliferation.[118,215–217] Also, promising research has been reported for other pharmaceutical drugs such as epidermal growth factor, platelet-derived growth factor, or fibroblast growth factors.[218–220] However, they should be administered with caution as they show a dual mechanism of action, i.e., regeneration potential with the risk of causing an undesired EMT. Attention has also been directed to reduce oxidative stress by upregulating transcription factors to promote the expression of antioxidative stress proteins thereby decreasing CEC apoptosis.[221–226] Also, profiling new drug candidates require a systematic examination of the functional effect in a variety of *in vitro* and *in vivo* assays. Furthermore, patient assignment in a clinical trial requires extensive knowledge on the diseases to be treated. In order to conclude any beneficial effects of the drug candidates mentioned above, it is mandatory to perform large, randomized control trials to generate higher level evidence.

Conclusive remarks

Despite significant progress towards therapies to promote corneal endothelial regeneration, there is still a long way before such therapies are approved by regulatory bodies and become routine clinical practice. To date, replacing the diseased endothelium by DMEK is still the most efficient treatment option for endothelial dysfunction, but the number of procedures is still restricted by a worldwide shortage of suitable and available human donors, especially in resource-poor parts of the world. Moreover, considering the COVID-19 pandemic, tissue exclusion criteria have become even more stringent, limiting considerably the pool of available donors.[227] It is essential to make the added value of the donation process clear to people, to have an incentive to register for donation because they are more likely to gain from the system than to contribute to it,[228–230] while in the meantime new treatment options are being developed and translated into clinical practice.

References

1. Tuft SJ, Coster DJ. The corneal endothelium. *Eye (Lond)*. 1990;4 (Pt 3):389-424. <https://doi.org/10.1038/eye.1990.53> PMID: 2209904
2. Wong KH, Kam KW, Chen LJ, Young AL. Corneal blindness and current major treatment concern-graft scarcity. *Int J Ophthalmol*. 2017 Jul 18;10(7):1154-1162. <https://doi.org/10.18240/ijo.2017.07.21> PMID: 28730122
3. Gain P, Jullienne R, He Z, Aldossary M, Acquart S, Cognasse F, et al. Global survey of corneal transplantation and eye banking. *JAMA Ophthalmol*. 2016 Feb;134(2):167-73. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2015.4776> PMID: 26633035
4. Lam FC, Baydoun L, Dirisamer M, Lie J, Dapena I, Melles GRJ. Hemi-Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty transplantation: a potential method for increasing the pool of endothelial graft tissue. *JAMA Ophthalmol*. 2014 Dec;132(12):1469-73. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2014.3328> PMID: 25211529
5. Birbal RS, Hsien S, Zygoura V, Parker JS, Ham L, van Dijk K, et al. Outcomes of Hemi-Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty for Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy. *Cornea*. 2018 Jul;37(7):854-858. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000001578> PMID: 29557816
6. Müller TM, Baydoun L, Melles GRJ. 3-Year update on the first case series of Hemi-Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol*. 2017 Jan;255(1):213-215. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00417-016-3517-5> PMID: 27783157
7. Baydoun L, Zygoura V, Hsien S, Birbal RS, Spinozzi D, Lie JT, et al. Clinical feasibility of using multiple grafts from a single donor for Quarter-DMEK. *Acta Ophthalmol*. 2018 Aug;96(5):e656-e658. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aos.13720>. PMID: 29498213
8. Zygoura V, Baydoun L, Ham L, Bourgonje VJA, van Dijk K, Lie JT. Quarter-Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty (Quarter-DMEK) for Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy: 6 months clinical outcome. *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2018 Oct;102(10):1425-1430. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjophthalmol-2017-311398> PMID: 29343529
9. Müller TM, Lavy I, Baydoun L, Lie JT, Dapena I, Melles GRJ. Case report of Quarter-Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty for Fuchs endothelial dystrophy. *Cornea*. 2017 Jan;36(1):104-107. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000001008> PMID: 27583798
10. Birbal RS, Ni Dhubbghaill S, Baydoun L, Ham L, Bourgonje VJA, Dapena I, et al. Quarter-Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty: one- to two-year clinical outcomes. *Cornea*. 2020 Mar;39(3):277-282. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000002127> PMID: 31490274
11. Català P, Thuret G, Skottman H, Mehta JS, Parekh M, Ni Dhubbghaill S, et al. Approaches for corneal endothelium regenerative medicine. *Prog Retin Eye Res*. 2022 Mar;87:100987. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.preteyeres.2021.100987> PMID: 34237411
12. Deng SX, Lee WB, Hammersmith KM, Kuo AN, Li JY, Shen JF, et al. Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty: safety and outcomes: a report by the American Academy of Ophthalmology. *Ophthalmology*. 2018 Feb;125(2):295-310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ophtha.2017.08.015> PMID: 28923499
13. Terry MA. Endothelial keratoplasty: why aren't we all doing Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty? *Cornea*. 2012 May;31(5):469-71. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0b013e31823f8ee2> PMID: 22367047
14. Vasiliauskaitė I, Quilendrino R, Baydoun L, van Dijk K, Melles GRJ, Silke Oellerich. Effect of six-month postoperative endothelial cell density on graft survival after Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty. *Ophthalmology*. 2021 Dec;128(12):1689-1698. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ophtha.2021.05.022> PMID: 34033824
15. Vasiliauskaitė I, Oellerich S, Ham L, Dapena I, Baydoun L, van Dijk K, et al. Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty: ten-year graft survival and clinical outcomes. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2020 Sep;217:114-120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajo.2020.04.005> PMID: 32283096
16. Calvo-de-Mora MR, Quilendrino R, Ham L, Liarakos VS, van Dijk K, Baydoun L, et al. Clinical outcome of 500 consecutive cases undergoing Descemet's membrane endothelial keratoplasty. *Ophthalmology*. 2015 Mar;122(3):464-70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ophtha.2014.09.004> PMID: 25439596
17. Ham L, Dapena I, Liarakos VS, Baydoun L, van Dijk K, Ilyas A, et al. Midterm results of Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty: 4 to 7 years clinical outcome. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2016 Nov;171:113-121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajo.2016.08.038> PMID: 27609712
18. Hayashi T, Schrittenlocher S, Siebelmann S, Le VNH, Matthaai M, Franklin J, et al. Risk factors for endothelial cell loss after Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty (DMEK). *Sci Rep*. 2020 Jul 6;10(1):11086. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-68023-0> PMID: 32632151

19. Quilendrin R, Höhn H, Tse WHW, Chi H, Dapena I, Ham L, et al. Do we overestimate the endothelial cell "loss" after Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty? *Curr Eye Res.* 2013 Feb;38(2):260-5. <https://doi.org/10.3109/02713683.2012.753095> PMID: 23294140
20. Miron A, Bruinsma M, Ham L, Schaal SC, Baydoun L, Dapena I, et al. *In vivo* endothelial cell density decline in the early postoperative phase after Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty. *Cornea.* 2018 Jun;37(6):673-677. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000001484> PMID: 29737973
21. Dirisamer M, Dapena I, Ham L, van Dijk K, Oganen O, Frank LE, et al. Patterns of corneal endothelialization and corneal clearance after Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty for Fuchs endothelial dystrophy. *Am J Ophthalmol.* 2011 Oct;152(4):543-555.e1. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajo.2011.03.031> PMID: 21726849
22. Qazi Y, Hamrah P. Corneal allograft rejection: immunopathogenesis to therapeutics. *J Clin Cell Immunol.* 2013 Nov 20;2013(Suppl 9):006. <https://doi.org/10.4172/2155-9899.S9-006> PMID: 24634796
23. Parekh M, Borroni D, Ruzza A, Levis HJ, Ferrari S, Ponzin D, et al. A comparative study on different Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty graft preparation techniques. *Acta Ophthalmol.* 2018 Sep;96(6):e718-e726. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aos.13746> PMID: 29520992
24. Tran KD, Alabi RO, Odell K, Dye PK, Downes K, Sales CS. Measuring endothelial cell loss on DMEK grafts after transplantation in human cadaveric whole eyes: Description of the technique and pilot study. *Cornea.* 2018 Aug;37(8):1075-1080. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000001602> PMID: 29634671
25. Bhogal M, Balda MS, Matter K, Allan BD. Global cell-by-cell evaluation of endothelial viability after two methods of graft preparation in Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty. *Br J Ophthalmol.* 2016 Apr;100(4):572-8. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjophthalmol-2015-307534> PMID: 26740609
26. Borroni D, Gadhvi K, Wojcik G, Pennisi F, Vallabh NA, Galeone A. The Influence of Speed During Stripping in Descemet Membrane Endothelial Keratoplasty Tissue Preparation. *Cornea.* 2020 Sep;39(9):1086-1090. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000002338> PMID: 32301812
27. Downes K, Tran KD, Stoeger CG, Chamberlain W. Cumulative endothelial cell loss in Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty grafts from preparation through insertion with glass injectors. *Cornea.* 2018 Jun;37(6):698-704. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000001588> PMID: 29561351
28. Bhogal M, Lwin CN, Seah XY, Murugan E, Adnan K, Lin SJ. Real-time assessment of corneal endothelial cell damage following graft preparation and donor insertion for DMEK. *PLoS One.* 2017 Oct 4;12(10):e0184824. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0184824> PMID: 28977017
29. Birbal RS, Sikder S, Lie JT, Groeneveld-van Beek EA, Oellerich S, Melles GRJ. Donor tissue preparation for Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty: an updated review. *Cornea.* 2018 Jan;37(1):128-135. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000001368> PMID: 28990995
30. Miron A, Sajet A, Groeneveld-van Beek EA, Kok JS, Dedeci M, de Jong M, et al. Endothelial cell viability after DMEK graft preparation. *Curr Eye Res.* 2021 Nov;46(11):1621-1630. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02713683.2021.1927111> PMID: 34027768
31. Papadopoulos NG, Dedoussis GV, Spanakos G, Gritzapis AD, Baxevas CN, Papamichail M. An improved fluorescence assay for the determination of lymphocyte-mediated cytotoxicity using flow cytometry. *J Immunol Methods.* 1994 Dec 28;177(1-2):101-11. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1759\(94\)90147-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1759(94)90147-3) PMID: 7822816
32. Suuronen EJ, McLaughlin CR, Stys PK, Nakamura M, Munger R, Griffith M. Functional innervation in tissue engineered models for *in vitro* study and testing purposes. *Toxicol Sci.* 2004 Dec;82(2):525-33. <https://doi.org/10.1093/toxsci/kfh270> PMID: 15342958
33. Banfalvi G. Methods to detect apoptotic cell death. *Apoptosis.* 2017 Feb;22(2):306-323. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10495-016-1333-3> PMID: 28035493
34. Gatti R, Belletti S, Orlandini G, Bussolati O, Dall'Asta V, Gazzola GC. Comparison of annexin V and calcein-AM as early vital markers of apoptosis in adherent cells by confocal laser microscopy. *J Histochem Cytochem.* 1998 Aug;46(8):895-900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002215549804600804> PMID: 9671440
35. Vercammen H, Miron A, Oellerich S, Melles GRJ, Ní Dhubhghaill S, Koppen C, et al. Corneal endothelial wound healing: understanding the regenerative capacity of the innermost layer of the cornea. *Transl Res.* 2022 May 21:S1931-5244(22)00114-1. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trsl.2022.05.003> PMID: 35609782.
36. Maurizi E, Schirotti D, Zini R, Limongelli A, Mistò R, Macaluso C. A fine-tuned β -catenin regulation during proliferation of corneal endothelial cells revealed using proteomics analysis. *Sci Rep.* 2020 Aug 14;10(1):13841. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-70800-w> PMID: 32796906

37. Joyce NA. Cell cycle status in human corneal endothelium. *Exp Eye Res.* 2005 Dec;81(6):629-38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exer.2005.06.012> PMID: 16054624
38. Kikuchi M, Zhu C, Senoo T, Obara Y, Joyce NC. p27kip1 siRNA induces proliferation in corneal endothelial cells from young but not older donors. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2006 Nov;47(11):4803-9. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.06-0521> PMID: 17065491
39. Lee HT, Kay EDP. Regulatory role of cAMP on expression of Cdk4 and p27(Kip1) by inhibiting phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase in corneal endothelial cells. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2003 Sep;44(9):3816-25. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.03-0147> PMID: 12939297
40. Ando K, Fukuhara S, Moriya T, Obara Y, Nakahata N, Mochizuki N. Rap1 potentiates endothelial cell junctions by spatially controlling myosin II activity and actin organization. *J Cell Biol.* 2013 Sep 16;202(6):901-16. <https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.201301115> PMID: 24019534
41. Coleman ML, Marshall CJ, Olson MF. RAS and RHO GTPases in G1-phase cell-cycle regulation. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol.* 2004 May;5(5):355-66. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm1365> PMID: 15122349
42. Lee JG, Kay EDP. FGF-2-induced wound healing in corneal endothelial cells requires Cdc42 activation and Rho inactivation through the phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase pathway. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2006 Apr;47(4):1376-86. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.05-1223> PMID: 16565371
43. Roovers K, Klein EA, Castagnino P, Assoian RK. Nuclear translocation of LIM kinase mediates Rho-Rho kinase regulation of cyclin D1 expression. *Dev Cell.* 2003 Aug;5(2):273-84. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1534-5807\(03\)00206-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1534-5807(03)00206-5) PMID: 12919678
44. Roberts AB, Tian F, Byfield SDC, Stuelten C, Ooshima A, Saika S, et al. Smad3 is key to TGF-beta-mediated epithelial-to-mesenchymal transition, fibrosis, tumor suppression and metastasis. *Cytokine Growth Factor Rev.* 2006 Feb-Apr;17(1-2):19-27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cytogfr.2005.09.008> PMID: 16290023
45. Saika S. TGFbeta pathobiology in the eye. *Lab Invest.* 2006 Feb;86(2):106-15. <https://doi.org/10.1038/labinvest.3700375> PMID: 16341020
46. Itoh S, ten Dijke P. Negative regulation of TGF-beta receptor/Smad signal transduction. *Curr Opin Cell Biol.* 2007 Apr;19(2):176-84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ceb.2007.02.015> PMID: 17317136
47. Massagué J, Gomis RR. The logic of TGFbeta signaling. *FEBS Lett.* 2006 May 22;580(12):2811-20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.febslet.2006.04.033> PMID: 16678165
48. Byfield SDC, Roberts AB. Lateral signaling enhances TGF-beta response complexity. *Trends Cell Biol.* 2004 Mar;14(3):107-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcb.2004.01.001> PMID: 15055198
49. Mimura T, Yamagami S, Amano S. Corneal endothelial regeneration and tissue engineering. *Prog Retin Eye Res.* 2013 Jul;35:1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.preteyeres.2013.01.003> PMID: 23353595
50. Landsman N, Solomon A, Belkin M. Cell division in the healing of the corneal endothelium of cats. *Arch Ophthalmol.* 1989 Dec;107(12):1804-8. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archopht.1989.01070020886032> PMID: 2597071
51. Macsai MS, Shiloach M. Use of topical Rho kinase inhibitors in the treatment of Fuchs dystrophy after Descemet stripping only. *Cornea.* 2019 May;38(5):529-534. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000001883> PMID: 30720541
52. Davies E, Jurkunas U, Pineda R. Pilot study of corneal clearance with the use of a Rho-kinase inhibitor after descemetorhexis without endothelial keratoplasty for Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy. *Cornea.* 2021 Jul 1;40(7):899-902. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000002691> PMID: 33758139
53. Soh YQ, Peh G, George BL, Seah XY, Primalani NK, Adnan K, et al. Predictive factors for corneal endothelial cell migration. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2016 Feb;57(2):338-48. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.15-18300> PMID: 26842752
54. Kinoshita S, Koizumi N, Ueno M, Okumura N, Imai K, Tanaka H, et al. Injection of Cultured Cells with a ROCK Inhibitor for Bullous Keratopathy. *N Engl J Med.* 2018 Mar 15;378(11):995-1003. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1712770> PMID: 29539291
55. Numa K, Imai K, Ueno M, Kitazawa K, Tanaka H, John D Bush JD, et al. Five-year follow-up of first 11 patients undergoing injection of cultured corneal endothelial cells for corneal endothelial failure. *Ophthalmology.* 2021 Apr;128(4):504-514. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ophtha.2020.09.002> PMID: 32898516
56. Ichijima H, Petroll WM, Jester JV, Barry PA, Andrews PM, Dai M, et al. *In vivo* confocal microscopic studies of endothelial wound healing in rabbit cornea. *Cornea.* 1993 Sep;12(5):369-78. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00003226-199309000-00001> PMID: 8306656
57. Miyamoto T, Sumioka T, Saika S. Endothelial mesenchymal transition: a therapeutic target in retrocorneal membrane. *Cornea.* 2010 Nov;29 Suppl 1:S52-6. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0b013e3181efe36a> PMID: 20935543

58. Sumioka T, Ikeda K, Okada Y, Yamanaka O, Kitano A, Saika S. Inhibitory effect of blocking TGF-beta/Smad signal on injury-induced fibrosis of corneal endothelium. *Mol Vis*. 2008;14:2272-81. PMID: 19081766
59. Funaki T, Nakao A, Ebihara N, Setoguchi Y, Fukuchi Y, Okumura Ko, et al. Smad7 suppresses the inhibitory effect of TGF-beta2 on corneal endothelial cell proliferation and accelerates corneal endothelial wound closure *in vitro*. *Cornea*. 2003 Mar;22(2):153-9. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00003226-200303000-00015> PMID: 12605052
60. Choi SO, Jeon HS, Hyon JY, Oh YJ, Wee WR, Chung TY, et al. Recovery of corneal endothelial cells from periphery after injury. *PLoS One*. 2015 Sep 17;10(9):e0138076. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0138076> PMID: 26378928
61. Ying LY, Qiu WY, Wang BH, Zhou P, Zhang B, Yao YF. Corneal endothelial regeneration in human eyes using endothelium-free grafts. *BMC Ophthalmol*. 2022 Jan 21;22(1):32. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12886-022-02260-x> PMID: 35062892
62. Dirisamer M, Ham L, Dapena I, van Dijk K, Melles GRJ. Descemet membrane endothelial transfer: "free-floating" donor Descemet implantation as a potential alternative to "keratoplasty". *Cornea*. 2012 Feb;31(2):194-7. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0b013e31821c9afc> PMID: 22146548
63. Balachandran C, Ham L, Verschoor CA, Ong TS, van der Wees J, Melles GRJ. Spontaneous corneal clearance despite graft detachment in Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2009 Aug;148(2):227-234.e1. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajo.2009.02.033> PMID:19442962
64. Yam GHF, Seah X, Yusoff NZBM, Setiawan M, Wahlig S, Htoon HM, et al. Characterization of Human Transition Zone Reveals a Putative Progenitor-Enriched Niche of Corneal Endothelium. *Cells*. 2019 Oct 12;8(10):1244. <https://doi.org/10.3390/cells8101244> PMID: 31614883
65. He Z, Campolmi N, Gain P, Thi BMH, Dumollard JM, Duband S, et al. Revisited microanatomy of the corneal endothelial periphery: new evidence for continuous centripetal migration of endothelial cells in humans. *Stem Cells*. 2012 Nov;30(11):2523-34. <https://doi.org/10.1002/stem.1212> PMID: 22949402
66. van Beek EAG, Lie JT, van der Wees J, Bruinsma M, Melles GRJ. Standardized 'no-touch' donor tissue preparation for DALK and DMEK: harvesting undamaged anterior and posterior transplants from the same donor cornea. *Acta Ophthalmol*. 2013 Mar;91(2):145-50. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.17553768.2012.02462.x> PMID: 22672202
67. Lie JT, Birbal R, Ham L, van der Wees J, Melles GRJ. Donor tissue preparation for Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty. *J Cataract Refract Surg*. 2008 Sep;34(9):1578-83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrs.2008.05.036> PMID: 18721723
68. Miron A, Spinozzi D, Bruinsma M, Lie JT, Birbal RS, Baydoun L, et al. Asymmetrical endothelial cell migration from *in vitro* Quarter-Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty grafts. *Acta Ophthalmol*. 2018 Dec;96(8):828-833. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aos.13841> PMID: 30171674
69. Konomi K, Joyce NC. Age and topographical comparison of telomere lengths in human corneal endothelial cells. *Mol Vis*. 2007 Jul 23;13:1251-8. PMID: 17679950
70. Egan CA, Train IS, Shay JW, Wilson SE, Bourne WM. Analysis of telomere lengths in human corneal endothelial cells from donors of different ages. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 1998 Mar;39(3):648-53. PMID: 9501879
71. Kataoka K, Huh N. Application of a thermo-reversible gelation polymer, Mebiol gel, for stem cell culture and regenerative medicine. *J Stem Cells Regen Med*. 2010 Apr 5;6(1):10-4. <https://doi.org/10.46582/jsrm.0601003> PMID: 24693055
72. Sudha B, Madhavan HN, Sitalakshmi G, Malathi J, Krishnakumar S, Mori Y, Yoshioka H, et al. Cultivation of human corneal limbal stem cells in Mebiol gel--A thermo-reversible gelation polymer. *Indian J Med Res*. 2006 Dec;124(6):655-64. PMID: 17287553
73. Bray LJ, Binner M, Holzheu A, Friedrichs J, Freudenberg U, Huttmacher DW, et al. Multi-parametric hydrogels support 3D *in vitro* bioengineered microenvironment models of tumour angiogenesis. *Biomaterials*. 2015;53:609-20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2015.02.124> PMID: 25890757
74. Jooybar E, Abdekhoodaie MJ, Alvi M, Mousavi A, Karperien M, Dijkstra PJ. An injectable platelet lysate-hyaluronic acid hydrogel supports cellular activities and induces chondrogenesis of encapsulated mesenchymal stem cells. *Acta Biomater*. 2019 Jan 1;83:233-244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actbio.2018.10.031> PMID: 30366137
75. Miron A, Spinozzi D, Lie J, Melles GR, Oellerich S, Ni Dhubhghaill S. Improving endothelial explant tissue culture by novel thermoresponsive cell culture system. *Curr Eye Res*. 2021 Mar;46(3):290-293. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02713683.2020.1798468> PMID: 32727221

76. Miron A, Spinozzi D, Ní Dhubhghaill S, Lie JT, Oellerich S, Melles GRJ. *In vitro* endothelial cell migration from limbal edge-modified Quarter-DMEK grafts. *PLoS One*. 2019 Nov 20;14(11):e0225462. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0225462> PMID: 31747441
77. Maruthamuthu V, Schaus YA, Gardel ML. Conserved F-actin dynamics and force transmission at cell adhesions. *Curr Opin Cell Biol*. 2010 Oct;22(5):583-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccb.2010.07.010> PMID: 20728328
78. Gardel ML, Sabass B, Ji L, Danuser G, Schwarz US, Waterman CM. Traction stress in focal adhesions correlates biphasically with actin retrograde flow speed. *J Cell Biol*. 2008 Dec 15;183(6):999-1005. <https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.200810060> PMID: 19075110
79. Schoenwaelder SM, Burridge K. Bidirectional signaling between the cytoskeleton and integrins. *Curr Opin Cell Biol*. 1999 Apr;11(2):274-86. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0955-0674\(99\)80037-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0955-0674(99)80037-4) PMID: 10209151
80. Small JV, Rottner K, Kaverina I, Anderson KL. Assembling an actin cytoskeleton for cell attachment and movement. *Biochim Biophys Acta*. 1998 Sep 16;1404(3):271-81. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-4889\(98\)00080-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-4889(98)00080-9) PMID: 9739149
81. Heath JP, Holfield BF. On the mechanisms of cortical actin flow and its role in cytoskeletal organisation of fibroblasts. *Symp Soc Exp Biol*. 1993;47:35-56. PMID: 8165576
82. Trepas X, Chen Z, Jacobson K. Cell migration. *Compr Physiol*. 2012 Oct;2(4):2369-92. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cphy.c110012> PMID: 23720251
83. Gaggioli C, Hooper S, Carcedo CH, Grosse R, Marshall JF, Harrington K, et al. Fibroblast-led collective invasion of carcinoma cells with differing roles for Rho GTPases in leading and following cells. *Nat Cell Biol*. 2007 Dec;9(12):1392-400. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncb1658> PMID: 18037882
84. Wolf K, Wu YI, Liu Y, Geiger J, Tam E, Overall C, et al. Multi-step pericellular proteolysis controls the transition from individual to collective cancer cell invasion. *Nat Cell Biol*. 2007 Aug;9(8):893-904. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncb1616> PMID: 17618273
85. Tavella S, Bellese G, Castagnola P, Martin I, Piccini D, Doliana R, et al. Regulated expression of fibronectin, laminin and related integrin receptors during the early chondrocyte differentiation. *J Cell Sci*. 1997 Sep;110 (Pt 18):2261-70. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jcs.110.18.2261> PMID: 9378775
86. Edwards DC, Sanders LC, Bokoch GM, Gill GN. Activation of LIM-kinase by Pak1 couples Rac/Cdc42 GTPase signalling to actin cytoskeletal dynamics. *Nat Cell Biol*. 1999 Sep;1(5):253-9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/12963> PMID: 10559936
87. Hall A. Rho GTPases and the actin cytoskeleton. *Science*. 1998 Jan 23;279(5350):509-14. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.279.5350.509> PMID: 9438836
88. Cort JH, Sedláková E, I Kluh. Neurophysin binding and natriuretic peptides from the posterior pituitary. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 1975 Feb 21;248:336-44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1975.tb34196.x> PMID: 1054550
89. Linder S. The matrix corroded: podosomes and invadopodia in extracellular matrix degradation. *Trends Cell Biol*. 2007 Mar;17(3):107-17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcb.2007.01.002> PMID: 17275303
90. Ram SE, Doyle AD, Conti MA, Matsumoto K, Adelstein RS, Yamada KM. Myosin IIA regulates cell motility and actomyosin-microtubule crosstalk. *Nat Cell Biol*. 2007 Mar;9(3):299-309. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncb1540> PMID: 17310241
91. Manzanares MV, Zareno J, Whitmore L, Choi CK, Horwitz AF. Regulation of protrusion, adhesion dynamics, and polarity by myosins IIA and IIB in migrating cells. *J Cell Biol*. 2007 Feb 26;176(5):573-80. <https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.200612043> PMID: 17312025
92. Pipparelli A, Arsenijevic Y, Thuret G, Gain P, Nicolas M, Majo F. ROCK Inhibitor enhances adhesion and wound healing of human corneal endothelial cells. *PLoS ONE* 8(4): e62095. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0062095> PMID: 23626771
93. Pamies D, Reig JA, Vilanova E, Sogorb MA. Expression of Neuropathy Target Esterase in mouse embryonic stem cells during differentiation. *Arch Toxicol*. 2010 Jun;84(6):481-91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00204-010-0518-8> PMID: 20112100
94. Zhang J, Ahmad AM, Ng H, Shi J, McGhee CNJ, Patel DV. Successful culture of human transition zone cells. *Clin Exp Ophthalmol*. 2020 Jul;48(5):689-700. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ceo.13756> PMID: 32249477
95. Raviola G. Schwalbe line's cells: a new cell type in the trabecular meshwork of *Macaca mulatta*. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 1982 Jan;22(1):45-56. PMID: 7056624
96. Stone RA, Kuwayama Y, Laties AM, Marangos PJ. Neuron-specific enolase-containing cells in the rhesus monkey trabecular meshwork. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 1984 Nov;25(11):1332-4. PMID: 6490334.

97. Rodrigues MM, Spaeth GL, Donohoo P. Electron microscopy of argon laser therapy in phakic open-angle glaucoma. *Ophthalmology*. 1982 Mar;89(3):198-210. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0161-6420\(82\)34806-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0161-6420(82)34806-x) PMID: 7088502
98. Alexander RA, Grierson I. Morphological effects of argon laser trabeculoplasty upon the glaucomatous human meshwork. *Eye (Lond)*. 1989;3 (Pt 6):719-26. <https://doi.org/10.1038/eye.1989.111> PMID: 2630352
99. Amann J, Holley GP, Lee SB, Edelhauser HF. Increased endothelial cell density in the paracentral and peripheral regions of the human cornea. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2003 May;135(5):584-90. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0002-9394\(02\)02237-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0002-9394(02)02237-7) PMID: 12719063
100. Laing RA, Neubauer L, Oak SS, Kayne HL, Leibowitz HM. Evidence for mitosis in the adult corneal endothelium. *Ophthalmology*. 1984 Oct;91(10):1129-34. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0161-6420\(84\)34176-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0161-6420(84)34176-8) PMID: 6392976
101. Treffers WF. Human corneal endothelial wound repair. *In vitro and in vivo*. *Ophthalmology*. 1982 Jun;89(6):605-13. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0161-6420\(82\)34757-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0161-6420(82)34757-0) PMID: 6181449.
102. Mimura T, Joyce NC. Replication competence and senescence in central and peripheral human corneal endothelium. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2006 Apr;47(4):1387-96 <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.05-1199> PMID: 16565372
103. Whikehart DR, Parikh CH, Vaughn AV, Mishler K, Edelhauser HF. Evidence suggesting the existence of stem cells for the human corneal endothelium. *Mol Vis*. 2005 Sep 26;11:816-24. PMID: 16205623
104. Kelley MJ, Rose AY, Keller KE, Hessle H, Samples JR, Acott TS. Stem cells in the trabecular meshwork: present and future promises. *Exp Eye Res*. 2009 Apr;88(4):747-51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exer.2008.10.024> PMID: 19061887
105. Braunger BM, Ademoglu B, Koschade SE, Fuchshofer R, Gabelt BT, Kiland JA, et al. Identification of adult stem cells in Schwalbe's line region of the primate eye. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2014 Oct 16;55(11):7499-507. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.14-14872> PMID: 25324280
106. Mimura T, Yamagami S, Yokoo S, Usui T, Amano S. Selective isolation of young cells from human corneal endothelium by the sphere-forming assay. *Tissue Eng Part C Methods*. 2010 Aug;16(4):803-12. <https://doi.org/10.1089/ten.TEC.2009.0608> PMID: 19852617
107. Yokoo S, Yamagami S, Yanagi Y, Uchida S, Mimura T, Usui T, et al. Human corneal endothelial cell precursors isolated by sphere-forming assay. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2005 May;46(5):1626-31. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.04-1263> PMID: 15851561
108. Mimura T, Yamagami S, Yokoo S, Araie M, Amano S. Comparison of rabbit corneal endothelial cell precursors in the central and peripheral cornea. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2005 Oct;46(10):3645-8. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.05-0630> PMID: 16186345
109. Amano S, Yamagami S, Mimura T, Uchida S, Yokoo S. Corneal stromal and endothelial cell precursors. *Cornea*. 2006 Dec;25(10 Suppl 1):S73-7. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.icc.0000247218.10672.7e> PMID: 17001199
110. Yamagami S, Yokoo S, Mimura T, Takato T, Araie M, Amano S. Distribution of precursors in human corneal stromal cells and endothelial cells. *Ophthalmology*. 2007 Mar;114(3):433-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ophtha.2006.07.042> PMID: 17324693
111. Ní Dhubhghaill S, Miron A, Lie JT, Dapena I, Oellerich S, Melles GRJ. Preclinical testing of small diameter Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty grafts to increase tissue availability. *PLoS One*. 2021 Feb 4;16(2):e0246516. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0246516> PMID: 33539395
112. Bachmann B, Händel A, Siebelmann S, Matthaei M, Cursiefen C. Mini-Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty for the early treatment of acute corneal hydrops in Keratoconus. *Cornea*. 2019 Aug;38(8):1043-1048. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000002001> PMID: 31276462
113. Tu EY. Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty patch for persistent corneal hydrops. *Cornea*. 2017 Dec;36(12):1559-1561. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000001351> PMID: 28872520
114. Händel A, Siebelmann S, Matthaei M, Cursiefen C, Bachmann B. Mini-DMEK for the treatment of chronic focal corneal endothelial decompensation. *Cornea*. July 5, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000003048>
115. Moloney G, Chan UT, Hamilton A, Zahidin AM, Grigg JR, Devasahayam RN. Descemetorhexis for Fuchs' dystrophy. *Can J Ophthalmol*. 2015 Feb;50(1):68-72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cjco.2014.10.014> PMID: 25677286
116. Borkar DS, Veldman P, Colby KA. Treatment of Fuchs Endothelial Dystrophy by Descemet Stripping Without Endothelial Keratoplasty. *Cornea*. 2016 Oct;35(10):1267-73. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000000915> PMID: 27310885
117. Iovieno A, Neri A, Soldani AM, Adani C, Fontana L. Descemetorhexis without graft placement for the treatment of Fuchs endothelial dystrophy: preliminary results and review of the literature. *Cornea*. 2017 Jun;36(6):637-641. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000001202> PMID: 28410355

118. Moloney G, Petsoglou C, Ball M, Kerdraon Y, Höllhumer R, Spiteri N, et al. Descemetorhexis without grafting for Fuchs endothelial dystrophy-supplementation with topical ripasudil. *Cornea*. 2017 Jun;36(6):642-648. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000001209> PMID: 28476048
119. Garcerant D, Hirschall N, Toalster N, Zhu M, Wen L, Moloney G. Descemet's stripping without endothelial keratoplasty. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol*. 2019 Jul;30(4):275-285. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICU.0000000000000579> PMID: 31033737
120. Soh YQ, Mehta JS. Regenerative therapy for Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy. *Cornea*. 2018 Apr;37(4):523-527. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000001518> PMID: 29384808
121. Chen J, Li Z, Zhang L, Ou S, Wang Y, He X, et al. Descemet's membrane supports corneal endothelial cell regeneration in rabbits. *Sci Rep*. 2017 Aug 1;7(1):6983. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-07557-2> PMID: 28765543
122. Wunderlich K, Senn BC, Reiser P, Pech M, Flammer J, Meyer P. Connective tissue growth factor in retrocorneal membranes and corneal scars. *Ophthalmologica*. 2000 Sep-Oct;214(5):341-6. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000027517> PMID: 10965248
123. Maycock NJ, Marshall J. Genomics of corneal wound healing: a review of the literature. *Acta Ophthalmol*. 2014 May;92(3):e170-84. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aos.12227> PMID: 23819758
124. Heinzelmann S, Böhlinger D, Eberwein P, Reinhard T, Maier P. Outcomes of Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty, Descemet stripping automated endothelial keratoplasty and penetrating keratoplasty from a single centre study. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol*. 2016 Mar;254(3):515-22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00417-015-3248-z> PMID: 26743748
125. Melles GR. Posterior lamellar keratoplasty: DLEK to DSEK to DMEK. *Cornea*. 2006 Sep;25(8):879-81. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.ico.00000243962.60392.4f> PMID: 17102659
126. Dapena I, Ham L, Melles GR. Endothelial keratoplasty: DSEK/DSAEK or DMEK--the thinner the better? *Curr Opin Ophthalmol*. 2009 Jul;20(4):299-307. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICU.0b013e32832b8d18> PMID: 19417653.
127. Melles GR, Ong TS, Ververs B, van der Wees J. Preliminary clinical results of Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2008 Feb;145(2):222-227. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajo.2007.09.021> PMID: 18061137
128. Price MO, Fairchild KM, Price DA, Price FWJ. Descemet's stripping endothelial keratoplasty five-year graft survival and endothelial cell loss. *Ophthalmology*. 2011 Apr;118(4):725-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ophtha.2010.08.012> PMID: 21035862
129. Soh YQ, Kocaba V, Pinto M, Mehta JS. Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy and corneal endothelial diseases: East meets West. *Eye (Lond)*. 2020 Mar;34(3):427-441. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41433-019-0497-9> PMID: 31267087
130. Oellerich S, Baydoun L, Peraza-Nieves J, Ilyas A, Frank L, Binder PS, et al. Multicenter Study of 6-Month Clinical Outcomes After Descemet Membrane Endothelial Keratoplasty. *Cornea*. 2017 Dec;36(12):1467-1476. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000001374> PMID: 28957979.
131. Price, M.O., Lass, J.H. & Price, F.W. Clinical factors for early and late endothelial cell loss after corneal transplantation. *Curr Ophthalmol Rep* 6, 191–199 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40135-018-0179-y>
132. Price MO, Mehta JS, Jurkunas UV, Price FW Jr. Corneal endothelial dysfunction: evolving understanding and treatment options. *Prog Retin Eye Res*. 2021 May;82:100904. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.preteyeres.2020.100904> PMID: 32977001
133. Birbal RS, Ni Dhubhghaill S, Bourgonje VJA, Hanko J, Ham L, Jager MJ, et al. Five-Year Graft Survival and Clinical Outcomes of 500 Consecutive Cases After Descemet Membrane Endothelial Keratoplasty. *Cornea*. 2020 Mar;39(3):290-297. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000002120> PMID: 31478948
134. Oellerich S, Ham L, Frank LE, Gorges S, Bourgonje VJA, Baydoun L, et al. Parameters associated with endothelial cell density variability after Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2020 Mar;211:22-30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajo.2019.10.017> PMID: 31647928
135. Hayashi T, Schrittenlocher S, Siebelmann S, Le VN, Matthaei M, Franklin J, et al. Risk factors for endothelial cell loss after Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty (DMEK). *Sci Rep*. 2020 Jul 6;10(1):11086. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-68023-0> PMID: 32632151
136. Birbal RS, Baydoun L, Ham L, Miron A, van Dijk K, Dapena I, et al. Effect of surgical indication and preoperative lens status on Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty outcomes. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2020 Apr;212:79-87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajo.2019.12.011> PMID: 31863726
137. Rodríguez-Calvo de Mora M, Groeneveld-van Beek EA, Frank LE, van der Wees J, Oellerich S, Bruinsma M, et al. Association between graft storage time and donor age with endothelial cell density and graft adherence after

- Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty. *JAMA Ophthalmol.* 2016 Jan;134(1):91-4. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2015.4499> PMID: 26562408
138. Baydoun L, Ham L, Borderie V, Dapena I, Hou J, Frank LE, et al. Endothelial survival after Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty: effect of surgical indication and graft adherence status. *JAMA Ophthalmol.* 2015 Nov;133(11):1277-85. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2015.3064> PMID: 26355238
 139. Gundlach E, Spiller N, Pilger D, Dietrich-Ntoukas T, Jousen AM, Torun N, et al. Impact of difficult unfolding and attachment of the graft lamella on the long-term outcome after Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol.* 2020 Nov;258(11):2459-2465. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00417-020-04852-z> PMID: 32705337
 140. Musayeva A, Livny E, Dragnea DC, Ham L, Vasiliauskaitė I, Ni Dhubhghaill S, et al. Endothelial cell density changes in the corneal center versus paracentral areas after Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty. *Cornea.* 2020 Sep;39(9):1091-1095. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000002326> PMID: 32282357
 141. Guindolet D, Crouzet E, He Z, Herbepin P, Jumelle C, Perrache C, et al. Storage of Porcine Cornea in an Innovative Bioreactor. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2017 Nov 1;58(13):5907-5917. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.17-22218> PMID: 29164231
 142. Garcin T, Gauthier AS, Crouzet E, He Z, Herbepin P, Perrache C, et al. Innovative corneal active storage machine for long-term eye banking. *Am J Transplant.* 2019 Jun;19(6):1641-1651. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajt.15238> PMID: 30589181
 143. Parekh M, Romano V, Hassanin K, Testa V, Wongvisavavit R, Ferrari S, et al. Biomaterials for corneal endothelial cell culture and tissue engineering. *J Tissue Eng.* 2021 Feb 16;12:2041731421990536. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041731421990536> PMID: 33643603
 144. De Pieri A, Rochev Y, Zeugolis DI. Scaffold-free cell-based tissue engineering therapies: advances, shortfalls and forecast. *NPJ Regen Med.* 2021 Mar 29;6(1):18. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41536-021-00133-3> PMID: 33782415
 145. Spinozzi D, Miron A, Bruinsma M, Dapena I, Kocaba V, Jager MJ, et al. New developments in corneal endothelial cell replacement. *Acta Ophthalmol.* 2021 Nov;99(7):712-729. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aos.14722> PMID: 33369235
 146. Hussain Z and Pei R. Scaffold-free and scaffold-based cellular strategies and opportunities for cornea tissue engineering. *Prog. Biomed. Eng.* 2021 Jul 26; 3(3):032003 <https://doi.org/10.1088/2516-1091/ac12d7>
 147. Wongvisavavit R, Parekh M, Ahmad S, Daniels JT. Challenges in corneal endothelial cell culture. *Regen Med.* 2021 Sep;16(9):871-891. <https://doi.org/10.2217/rme-2020-0202> PMID: 34380324
 148. Hatou S, Shimmura S. Review: corneal endothelial cell derivation methods from ES/iPS cells. *Inflamm Regen.* 2019 Oct 3;39:19. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41232-019-0108-y> PMID: 31592286
 149. Shao C, Fu Y, Lu W, Fan X. Bone marrow-derived endothelial progenitor cells: a promising therapeutic alternative for corneal endothelial dysfunction. *Cells Tissues Organs.* 2011;193(4):253-63. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000319797> PMID: 20962503
 150. Ju C, Zhang K, Wu X. Derivation of corneal endothelial cell-like cells from rat neural crest cells *in vitro*. *PLoS One.* 2012;7(7):e42378. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0042378>. Erratum in: *PLoS One.* 2012;7(10). <https://doi.org/10.1371/annotation/931e92e2-ee2d-4f4f-b0b6-89a7a3f8fbad> PMID: 22860120
 151. Hatou S, Yoshida S, Higa K, Miyashita H, Inagaki E, Okano H, et al. Functional corneal endothelium derived from corneal stroma stem cells of neural crest origin by retinoic acid and Wnt/ β -catenin signaling. *Stem Cells Dev.* 2013 Mar 1;22(5):828-39. <https://doi.org/10.1089/scd.2012.0286> PMID: 22974347
 152. Inagaki E, Hatou S, Higa K, Yoshida S, Shibata S, Okano H, et al. Skin-derived precursors as a source of progenitors for corneal endothelial regeneration. *Stem Cells Transl Med.* 2017 Mar;6(3):788-798. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sctm.16-0162> PMID: 28186681
 153. Yamashita K, Inagaki E, Hatou S, Higa K, Ogawa A, Miyashita H, et al. Corneal endothelial regeneration using mesenchymal stem cells derived from human umbilical cord. *Stem Cells Dev.* 2018 Aug 15;27(16):1097-1108. <https://doi.org/10.1089/scd.2017.0297> PMID: 29929442
 154. Joyce NC, Harris DL, Markov V, Zhang Z, Saitta B. Potential of human umbilical cord blood mesenchymal stem cells to heal damaged corneal endothelium. *Mol Vis.* 2012;18:547-64. PMID: 22419848
 155. Mimura T, Yokoo S, Araie M, Amano S, Yamagami S. Treatment of rabbit bullous keratopathy with precursors derived from cultured human corneal endothelium. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2005 Oct;46(10):3637-44. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.05-0462> PMID: 16186344

156. Ueno M, Toda M, Numa K, Tanaka H, Imai K, Bush J, et al. Superiority of mature differentiated cultured human corneal endothelial cell injection therapy for corneal endothelial failure. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2022 May;237:267-277. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajo.2021.11.012> PMID: 34788595
157. Fan T, Zhao J, Ma X, Xu X, Zhao W, Xu B. Establishment of a continuous untransfected human corneal endothelial cell line and its biocompatibility to denuded amniotic membrane. *Mol Vis*. 2011 Feb 15;17:469-80. PMID: 21365020
158. Ishino Y, Sano Y, Nakamura T, Connon CJ, Rigby H, Fullwood NJ, et al. Amniotic membrane as a carrier for cultivated human corneal endothelial cell transplantation. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2004 Mar;45(3):800-6. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.03-0016> PMID: 14985293
159. Fan T, Ma X, Zhao J, Wen Q, Hu X, Yu H, et al. Transplantation of tissue-engineered human corneal endothelium in cat models. *Mol Vis*. 2013;19:400-7. PMID: 23441111
160. Diao YM, Hong J. Feasibility and safety of porcine Descemet's membrane as a carrier for generating tissue-engineered corneal endothelium. *Mol Med Rep*. 2015 Aug;12(2):1929-34. <https://doi.org/10.3892/mmr.2015.3665> PMID: 25937160
161. Spinozzi D, Miron A, Bruinsma M, Dapena I, Lavy I, Binder PS, et al. Evaluation of the Suitability of Biocompatible Carriers as Artificial Transplants Using Cultured Porcine Corneal Endothelial Cells. *Curr Eye Res*. 2019 Mar;44(3):243-249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02713683.2018.1536215> PMID: 30339045
162. Bayyoud T, Thaler S, Hofmann J, Maurus C, Spitzer MS, Bartz-Schmidt KU, et al. Decellularized bovine corneal posterior lamellae as carrier matrix for cultivated human corneal endothelial cells. *Curr Eye Res*. 2012 Mar;37(3):179-86. <https://doi.org/10.3109/02713683.2011.644382> PMID: 22335804
163. Arnalich-Montiel F, Moratilla A, Fuentes-Julian S, Aparicio V, Cadenas Martin M, Peh G, et al. Treatment of corneal endothelial damage in a rabbit model with a bioengineered graft using human decellularized corneal lamina and cultured human corneal endothelium. *PLoS One*. 2019 Nov 21;14(11):e0225480. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0225480> PMID: 31751429
164. Choi JS, Williams JK, Greven M, Walter KA, Laber PW, Khang G, et al. Bioengineering endothelialized neo-corneas using donor-derived corneal endothelial cells and decellularized corneal stroma. *Biomaterials*. 2010 Sep;31(26):6738-45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2010.05.020> PMID: 20541797
165. He Z, Forest F, Bernard A, Gauthier AS, Montard R, Peoc'h M, et al. Cutting and decellularization of multiple corneal stromal lamellae for the bioengineering of endothelial grafts. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2016 Dec 1;57(15):6639-6651. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.16-20256> PMID: 27926756
166. Spinozzi D, Miron A, Lie JT, Rafat M, Lagali N, Melles GRJ, et al. *In vitro* Evaluation and transplantation of human corneal endothelial cells cultured on biocompatible carriers. *Cell Transplant*. 2020 Jan-Dec;29:963689720923577. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963689720923577> PMID: 32363924
167. Kopsachilis N, Tsinopoulos I, Tourtas T, Kruse FE, Luessen UW. Descemet's membrane substrate from human donor lens anterior capsule. *Clin Exp Ophthalmol*. 2012 Mar;40(2):187-94. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-9071.2011.02678.x> PMID: 21902779
168. Bourget JM, Proulx S. Characterization of a corneal endothelium engineered on a self-assembled stromal substitute. *Exp Eye Res*. 2016 Apr;145:125-129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exer.2015.11.019> PMID: 26658713
169. Koizumi N, Sakamoto Y, Okumura N, Okahara N, Tsuchiya H, Torii R, et al. Cultivated corneal endothelial cell sheet transplantation in a primate model. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2007 Oct;48(10):4519-26. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.07-0567> PMID: 17898273
170. Levis HJ, Peh GS, Toh KP, Poh R, Shortt AJ, Drake RA, et al. Plastic compressed collagen as a novel carrier for expanded human corneal endothelial cells for transplantation. *PLoS One*. 2012;7(11):e50993. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0050993> PMID: 23226443
171. Mimura T, Yamagami S, Yokoo S, Usui T, Tanaka K, Hattori S, et al. Cultured human corneal endothelial cell transplantation with a collagen sheet in a rabbit model. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2004 Sep;45(9):2992-7. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.03-1174> PMID: 15326112
172. Palchesko RN, Funderburgh JL, Feinberg AW. Engineered Basement Membranes for Regenerating the Corneal Endothelium. *Adv Healthc Mater*. 2016 Nov;5(22):2942-2950. <https://doi.org/10.1002/adhm.201600488> PMID: 27723276
173. Vázquez N, Chacón M, Rodríguez-Barrientos CA, Merayo-Llves J, Naveiras M, Baamonde B, et al. Human bone derived collagen for the development of an artificial corneal endothelial graft. *In vivo* results in a rabbit model. *PLoS One*. 2016 Dec 1;11(12):e0167578. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0167578> PMID: 27907157

174. Yamaguchi M, Shima N, Kimoto M, Ebihara N, Murakami A, Yamagami S. Optimization of cultured human corneal endothelial cell sheet transplantation and post-operative sheet evaluation in a rabbit model. *Curr Eye Res.* 2016 Sep;41(9):1178-84. <https://doi.org/10.3109/02713683.2015.1101774> PMID: 26828450
175. Kimoto M, Shima N, Yamaguchi M, Hiraoka Y, Amano S, et al. Development of a bioengineered corneal endothelial cell sheet to fit the corneal curvature. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2014 Apr 11;55(4):2337-43. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iov.13-13167> PMID: 24651553
176. Watanabe R, Hayashi R, Kimura Y, Tanaka Y, Kageyama T, et al. A novel gelatin hydrogel carrier sheet for corneal endothelial transplantation. *Tissue Eng Part A.* 2011 Sep;17(17-18):2213-9. <https://doi.org/10.1089/ten.TEA.2010.0568> PMID: 21534849
177. Aghaei-Ghareh-Bolagh B, Guan J, Wang Y, Martin AD, Dawson R, Mithieux SM, et al. Optically robust, highly permeable and elastic protein films that support dual cornea cell types. *Biomaterials.* 2019 Jan;188:50-62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2018.10.006> PMID: 30317114
178. Choi JH, Jeon H, Song JE, Oliveira JM, Reis RL, Khang G. Biofunctionalized lysophosphatidic acid/silk fibroin film for cornea endothelial cell regeneration. *Nanomaterials (Basel).* 2018 Apr 30;8(5):290. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nano8050290> PMID: 29710848
179. Kim DK, Sim BR, Kim JI, Khang G. Functionalized silk fibroin film scaffold using β -Carotene for cornea endothelial cell regeneration. *Colloids Surf B Biointerfaces.* 2018 Apr 1;164:340-346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colsurfb.2017.11.052> PMID: 29413615
180. Kim do K, Sim BR, Khang G. Nature-derived aloe vera gel blended silk fibroin film scaffolds for cornea endothelial cell regeneration and transplantation. *ACS Appl Mater Interfaces.* 2016 Jun 22;8(24):15160-8. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acsami.6b04901> PMID: 27243449
181. Madden PW, Lai JN, George KA, Giovenco T, Harkin DG, Chirila TV. Human corneal endothelial cell growth on a silk fibroin membrane. *Biomaterials.* 2011 Jun;32(17):4076-84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2010.12.034> PMID: 21427010
182. Ramachandran C, Gupta P, Hazra S, Mandal BB. *In vitro* culture of human corneal endothelium on non-mulberry silk fibroin films for tissue regeneration. *Transl Vis Sci Technol.* 2020 Mar 9;9(4):12. <https://doi.org/10.1167/tvst.9.4.12> PMID: 32818099
183. Vázquez N, Rodríguez-Barrientos CA, Aznar-Cervantes SD, Chacón M, Cenis JL, Riestra AC, et al. Silk fibroin films for corneal endothelial regeneration: transplant in a rabbit Descemet membrane endothelial keratoplasty. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2017 Jul 1;58(9):3357-3365. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iov.17-21797> PMID: 28687847
184. Kruse M, Walter P, Bauer B, Rütten S, Schaefer K, et al. Electro-spun Membranes as scaffolds for human corneal endothelial cells. *Curr Eye Res.* 2018 Jan;43(1):1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02713683.2017.1377258> PMID: 29281419
185. Ozcelik B, Brown KD, Blencowe A, Ladewig K, Stevens GW, Scheerlinck JP, et al. Biodegradable and biocompatible poly(ethylene glycol)-based hydrogel films for the regeneration of corneal endothelium. *Adv Healthc Mater.* 2014 Sep;3(9):1496-507. <https://doi.org/10.1002/adhm.201400045> PMID: 24652807
186. Van Hoorick J, Delaey J, Vercammen H, Van Erps J, Thienpont H, Dubruel P, et al. Designer Descemet membranes containing PDLLA and functionalized gelatins as corneal endothelial scaffold. *Adv Healthc Mater.* 2020 Aug;9(16):e2000760. <https://doi.org/10.1002/adhm.202000760> PMID: 32603022
187. Liang Y, Liu W, Han B, Yang C, Ma Q, Zhao W, et al. Fabrication and characters of a corneal endothelial cells scaffold based on chitosan. *J Mater Sci Mater Med.* 2011 Jan;22(1):175-83. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10856-010-4190-6> PMID: 21107657
188. Rizwan M, Peh GS, Adnan K, Naso SL, Mendez AR, Mehta JS, et al. *In vitro* topographical model of Fuchs dystrophy for evaluation of corneal endothelial cell monolayer formation. *Adv Healthc Mater.* 2016 Nov;5(22):2896-2910. <https://doi.org/10.1002/adhm.201600848> PMID: 27701826
189. Seow WY, Kandasamy K, Peh GSL, Mehta JS, Sun W. Ultrathin, Strong, and Cell-Adhesive Agarose-Based Membranes Engineered as Substrates for Corneal Endothelial Cells. *ACS Biomater Sci Eng.* 2019 Aug 12;5(8):4067-4076. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acsbomaterials.9b00610> PMID: 33448808
190. Song JE, Sim BR, Jeon YS, Kim HS, Shin EY, Carlomagno C, et al. Characterization of surface modified glycerol/silk fibroin film for application to corneal endothelial cell regeneration. *J Biomater Sci Polym Ed.* 2019 Mar;30(4):263-275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09205063.2018.1535819> PMID: 30324858
191. Wang TJ, Wang IJ, Lu JN, Young TH. Novel chitosan-polycaprolactone blends as potential scaffold and carrier for corneal endothelial transplantation. *Mol Vis.* 2012;18:255-64. PMID: 22328821

192. Young TH, Wang JJ, Hu FR, Wang TJ. Fabrication of a bioengineered corneal endothelial cell sheet using chitosan/polycaprolactone blend membranes. *Colloids Surf B Biointerfaces*. 2014 Apr 1;116:403-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colsurfb.2014.01.024> PMID: 24531150
193. Honda N, Mimura T, Usui T, Amano S. Descemet stripping automated endothelial keratoplasty using cultured corneal endothelial cells in a rabbit model. *Arch Ophthalmol*. 2009 Oct;127(10):1321-6. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archophthalmol.2009.253> PMID: 19822849
194. Peh GSL, Ang HP, Lwin CN, Adnan K, George BL, Seah XY et al. Regulatory compliant tissue-engineered human corneal endothelial grafts restore corneal function of rabbits with bullous keratopathy. *Sci Rep*. 2017 Oct 26;7(1):14149. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-14723-z> PMID: 29074873
195. Telinius N, Spinozzi D, Rasic D, Dapena I, Baandrup U, Miron A, et al. Göttingen minipig is not a suitable animal model for *in vivo* testing of tissue-engineered corneal endothelial cell-carrier sheets and for endothelial keratoplasty. *Curr Eye Res*. 2020 Aug;45(8):945-949. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02713683.2019.1706747> PMID: 31851850
196. Arbelaez JG, Price MO, Price FWJ. Long-term follow-up and complications of stripping Descemet membrane without placement of graft in eyes with Fuchs endothelial dystrophy. *Cornea*. 2014 Dec;33(12):1295-9. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000000270> PMID: 25299425
197. Shah RD, Randleman JB, Grossniklaus HE. Spontaneous corneal clearing after Descemet's stripping without endothelial replacement. *Ophthalmology*. 2012 Feb;119(2):256-60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ophtha.2011.07.032> PMID: 21982414
198. Auffarth GU, Son HS, Koch M, Weindler J, Merz P, Daphna O, et al. Implantation of an Artificial Endothelial Layer for Treatment of Chronic Corneal Edema. *Cornea*. 2021 Dec 1;40(12):1633-1638. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0000000000002806> PMID: 34294634
199. Bhogal M, Lwin CN, Seah XY, Peh G, Mehta JS. Allogeneic Descemet's membrane transplantation enhances corneal endothelial monolayer formation and restores functional integrity following Descemet's stripping. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2017 Aug 1;58(10):4249-4260. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iov.17-22106> PMID: 28850636
200. Robbins PD, Ghivizzani SC. Viral vectors for gene therapy. *Pharmacol Ther*. 1998 Oct;80(1):35-47. PMID: 9804053
201. Lebherz C, Maguire A, Tang W, Bennett J, Wilson JM. Novel AAV serotypes for improved ocular gene transfer. *J Gene Med*. 2008 Apr;10(4):375-82. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgm.1126> PMID: 18278824
202. Rinaldi C, Wood MJA. Antisense oligonucleotides: the next frontier for treatment of neurological disorders. *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2018 Jan;14(1):9-21. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrneurol.2017.148> PMID: 29192260
203. Moore CBT, Christie KA, Marshall J, Nesbit MA. Personalised genome editing - The future for corneal dystrophies. *Prog Retin Eye Res*. 2018 Jul;65:147-165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.preteyeres.2018.01.004> PMID: 29378321
204. Cox DB, Platt RJ, Zhang F. Therapeutic genome editing: prospects and challenges. *Nat Med*. 2015 Feb;21(2):121-31. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nm.3793> PMID: 25654603
205. Jiang F, Doudna JA. CRISPR-Cas9 Structures and Mechanisms. *Annu Rev Biophys*. 2017 May 22;46:505-529. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-biophys-062215-010822> PMID: 28375731
206. Nanda GG, Alone DP. REVIEW: Current understanding of the pathogenesis of Fuchs' endothelial corneal dystrophy. *Mol Vis*. 2019 Jun 5;25:295-310. PMID: 31263352
207. Ong Tone S, Kocaba V, Böhm M, Wylegala A, White TL, Jurkunas UV. Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy: the vicious cycle of Fuchs pathogenesis. *Prog Retin Eye Res*. 2021 Jan;80:100863. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.preteyeres.2020.100863> PMID: 32438095
208. Wu Z, Yang H, Colosi P. Effect of genome size on AAV vector packaging. *Mol Ther*. 2010 Jan;18(1):80-6. <https://doi.org/10.1038/mt.2009.255> PMID: 19904234
209. Hu J, Rong Z, Gong X, Zhou Z, Sharma VK, Xing C, et al. Oligonucleotides targeting TCF4 triplet repeat expansion inhibit RNA foci and mis-splicing in Fuchs' dystrophy. *Hum Mol Genet*. 2018 Mar 15;27(6):1015-1026. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hmg/ddy018> PMID: 29325021
210. Hu J, Shen X, Rigo F, Prakash TP, Mootha VV, Corey DR. Duplex RNAs and ss-siRNAs Block RNA Foci Associated with Fuchs' Endothelial Corneal Dystrophy. *Nucleic Acid Ther*. 2019 Apr;29(2):73-81. <https://doi.org/10.1089/nat.2018.0764> PMID: 30676271
211. Zarouchlioti C, Sanchez-Pintado B, Hafford Tear NJ, Klein P, Liskova P, Dulla K, et al. Antisense Therapy for a Common Corneal Dystrophy Ameliorates TCF4 Repeat Expansion-Mediated Toxicity. *Am J Hum Genet*. 2018 Apr 5;102(4):528-539. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajhg.2018.02.010> PMID: 29526280
212. Chau VQ, Hu J, Gong X, Hulleman JD, Ufret-Vincenty RL, Rigo F, et al. Delivery of Antisense Oligonucleotides to the Cornea. *Nucleic Acid Ther*. 2020 Aug;30(4):207-214. <https://doi.org/10.1089/nat.2019.0838> PMID: 32202944

213. Rong Z, Gong X, Hulleman JD, Corey DR, Mootha VV. Trinucleotide Repeat-Targeting dCas9 as a Therapeutic Strategy for Fuchs' Endothelial Corneal Dystrophy. *Transl Vis Sci Technol*. 2020 Aug 31;9(9):47. <https://doi.org/10.1167/tvst.9.9.47> PMID: 32934897
214. Uehara H, Zhang X, Pereira F, Narendran S, Choi S, Bhuvanagiri S, et al. Start codon disruption with CRISPR/Cas9 prevents murine Fuchs' endothelial corneal dystrophy. *Elife*. 2021 Jun 8;10:e55637. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.55637> PMID: 34100716
215. Koizumi N, Okumura N, Ueno M, Nakagawa H, Hamuro J, Kinoshita S. Rho-associated kinase inhibitor eye drop treatment as a possible medical treatment for Fuchs corneal dystrophy. *Cornea*. 2013 Aug;32(8):1167-70. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ICO.0b013e318285475d> PMID: 23715376
216. Okumura N, Koizumi N, Kay EP, Ueno M, Sakamoto Y, Nakamura S, et al. The ROCK inhibitor eye drop accelerates corneal endothelium wound healing. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2013 Apr 3;54(4):2493-502. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.12-11320> PMID: 23462749
217. Okumura N, Inoue R, Okazaki Y, Nakano S, Nakagawa H, Kinoshita S, et al. Effect of the Rho Kinase Inhibitor Y-27632 on Corneal Endothelial Wound Healing. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2015 Sep;56(10):6067-74. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.15-17595> PMID: 26393474
218. Hoppenreijns VP, Pels E, Vrensen GF, Oosting J, Treffers WF. Effects of human epidermal growth factor on endothelial wound healing of human corneas. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 1992 May;33(6):1946-57. PMID: 1582800
219. Hoppenreijns VP, Pels E, Vrensen GF, Treffers WF. Effects of platelet-derived growth factor on endothelial wound healing of human corneas. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 1994 Jan;35(1):150-61. PMID: 8300342
220. Lu J, Lu Z, Reinach P, Zhang J, Dai W, Lu L, et al. TGF-beta2 inhibits AKT activation and FGF-2-induced corneal endothelial cell proliferation. *Exp Cell Res*. 2006 Nov 1;312(18):3631-40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yexcr.2006.08.004> PMID: 16963022
221. Halilovic A, Schmedt T, Benischke AS, Hamill C, Chen Y, Santos JH, et al. Menadione-Induced DNA Damage Leads to Mitochondrial Dysfunction and Fragmentation During Rosette Formation in Fuchs Endothelial Corneal Dystrophy. *Antioxid Redox Signal*. 2016 Jun 20;24(18):1072-83. <https://doi.org/10.1089/ars.2015.6532> PMID: 26935406
222. Kim EC, Meng H, Jun AS. N-Acetylcysteine increases corneal endothelial cell survival in a mouse model of Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy. *Exp Eye Res*. 2014 Oct;127:20-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exer.2014.06.002> PMID: 24952277
223. Liu C, Miyajima T, Melangath G, Miyai T, Vasanth S, Deshpande N, et al. Ultraviolet A light induces DNA damage and estrogen-DNA adducts in Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy causing females to be more affected. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2020 Jan 7;117(1):573-583. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1912546116> PMID: 31852820
224. Lovatt M, Kocaba V, Hui Neo DJ, Soh YQ, Mehta JS. Nrf2: A unifying transcription factor in the pathogenesis of Fuchs' endothelial corneal dystrophy. *Redox Biol*. 2020 Oct;37:101763. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.redox.2020.101763> PMID: 33099215
225. Ziaei A, Schmedt T, Chen Y, Jurkunas UV. Sulforaphane decreases endothelial cell apoptosis in Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy: a novel treatment. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2013 Oct 15;54(10):6724-34. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.13-12699> PMID: 24030461
226. Kim EC, Toyono T, Berlinicke CA, Zack DJ, Jurkunas U, Usui T, et al. Screening and Characterization of Drugs That Protect Corneal Endothelial Cells Against Unfolded Protein Response and Oxidative Stress. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2017 Feb 1;58(2):892-900. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.16-20147> PMID: 28159976
227. Thuret G, Courrier E, Poinard S, Gain P, Baud'Huin M, et al. One threat, different answers: the impact of COVID-19 pandemic on cornea donation and donor selection across Europe. *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2022 Mar;106(3):312-318. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjophthalmol-2020-317938> PMID: 33243832
228. Cronin AJ. Points mean prizes: priority points, preferential status and directed organ donation in Israel. *Isr J Health Policy Res*. 2014 Feb 24;3(1):8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2045-4015-3-8> PMID: 24565060
229. Iyer TK. Kidneys for transplant—"opting out" law in Singapore. *Forensic Sci Int*. 1987 Oct-Nov;35(2-3):131-40. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0379-0738\(87\)90048-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/0379-0738(87)90048-x) PMID: 3322992
230. Zúñiga-Fajuri A. Increasing organ donation by presumed consent and allocation priority: Chile. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2015 Mar 1;93(3):199-202. <https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.14.139535> PMID: 25767299