Iris Stromal Structural Resilience Following Selective Melanin Modulation: A Conceptual Framework

Mustafa Mete, MD
MyLumineyes Research, Istanbul, Türkiye
ORCID: 0009-0004-3128-2853 | Correspondence: info@mylumineyes.com
Reserved DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23645435
Conceptual Framework | Version 1.5 | 25 October 2026

Abstract

Purpose: To propose the Iris Stromal Structural Resilience (I-STROMAL) framework for investigating whether baseline iris architecture contributes to longitudinal structural outcomes following selective melanin modulation.

Background: Iris pigmentation and stromal architecture are biologically related but distinct tissue characteristics. Existing morphological and experimental studies provide methods for characterizing these dimensions, but their relationships following selective pigment modification remain insufficiently established.

Conceptual Framework: I-STROMAL considers architectural preservation, adaptive morphological change, and pathological structural alteration as possible observational outcomes rather than obligatory biological phases. Its principal hypothesis is that baseline stromal architecture may provide explanatory information about subsequent structural outcomes beyond baseline pigmentation and other relevant characteristics.

Testable Hypotheses: Three propositions are advanced: (1) pigmentary modification and structural alteration may exhibit non-proportional relationships; (2) baseline architectural descriptors may provide incremental explanatory or predictive value for longitudinal structural outcomes; and (3) pigmentary and structural measurements may follow different temporal trajectories.

Research Implications: The framework proposes independent pigmentary and morphological endpoints, standardized anterior segment imaging, and comparative analytical models incorporating measurement uncertainty and baseline anatomical variation.

Conclusion: I-STROMAL provides a hypothesis-generating framework for investigating longitudinal stromal structural responses. Its proposed contribution is the testable evaluation of whether baseline architectural characteristics explain structural outcomes beyond pigmentary observations alone.

Keywords: iris stroma; structural resilience; laser iris depigmentation; melanin modulation; anterior segment optical coherence tomography; quantitative iris phenotyping; longitudinal morphology; conceptual framework.

1. Introduction

The human iris is a specialized anterior segment structure whose visible appearance reflects interactions among pigmentation, stromal organization, and optical properties. Its architecture includes melanocytes, non-melanocytic stromal cells, extracellular matrix components, vascular elements, and neural structures [1].

These components contribute differently to iris appearance and tissue organization. Consequently, pigmentary characteristics and structural morphology should not be considered interchangeable biological measurements.

Experimental investigations of iris-directed laser exposure have demonstrated that pigmentary and selected morphological outcomes can be evaluated separately. In a rabbit model, Yildirim et al. reported reduced anterior stromal pigmentation without statistically significant changes in selected iris thickness measurements during the study period [2]. These observations do not establish structural equivalence or long-term preservation in human eyes.

Human anterior segment imaging studies have independently demonstrated regional variation in iris thickness and geometry, as well as relationships between morphological characteristics, pigmentation, and pupillary conditions [3–5].

Several complementary conceptual approaches have been proposed within the Lumineyes research programme. The Lumineyes Iris Pigmentation Scale (LIPS) addresses apparent anterior stromal pigmentation, while the Lumineyes Optical Architectural Typology (L-OAT) proposes a multimodal feature framework integrating visible appearance, image-derived architecture, and qualified OCT-derived signal characteristics [8,9].

A separate translational review, Beyond Melanin Clearance, examines melanocyte function, stromal cellular signalling, and extracellular matrix responses as distinct biological domains requiring direct investigation [10].

The I-STROMAL framework was developed within the research context of the Lumineyes™ approach and its Selective Stromal Melanin Modulation (SSMM) model, which incorporates response-guided staged treatment and longitudinal monitoring of pigmentary responses.

The present framework addresses a distinct question: whether independently characterized baseline iris architecture contributes information about subsequent measurable structural outcomes beyond that provided by pigmentation and baseline morphological measurements alone.

I-STROMAL therefore focuses on the longitudinal interpretation of anatomical measurements rather than optical phenotype classification or the identification of specific molecular remodeling pathways.

2. Biological Basis of Structural Resilience

The iris stroma contains pigment-bearing and non-pigmented cellular populations embedded within a specialized connective tissue environment. These components collectively contribute to stromal architecture but are not equivalent measures of tissue structure [1].

Visible iris pigmentation depends on pigmentary and optical characteristics, whereas morphological integrity is evaluated through anatomical features such as tissue configuration, thickness, and regional structural continuity.

2.1. Pigmentation and Structural Morphology

A change in apparent pigmentation does not necessarily indicate a proportional change in measurable stromal dimensions.

However, this distinction does not establish preservation of melanocyte viability, connective tissue integrity, or physiological function.

Pigmentary and morphological outcomes must therefore be independently documented.

2.2. Operational Definition of Structural Resilience

Within I-STROMAL, structural resilience is defined as the maintenance of selected, reproducibly measurable characteristics of stromal architecture over a specified observation period following pigmentary modification.

This is an operational definition rather than evidence of an intrinsic biological resistance mechanism.

Structural stability may be demonstrated within the precision of a particular measurement system without establishing complete histological preservation. The framework therefore distinguishes measurable morphological stability from the broader biological condition of the tissue.

3. Proposed Trajectories of Structural Response

I-STROMAL considers three potential structural trajectories. They represent observational categories rather than obligatory stages of tissue response.

3.1. Architectural Preservation

Architectural preservation describes the maintenance of selected anatomical characteristics despite observable pigmentary modification.

Relevant observations may include stable regional thickness, contour, or other reproducible morphological measurements. Such findings would support measurable structural stability but would not independently establish the absence of microscopic cellular or extracellular matrix changes.

Demonstrating preservation requires predefined measurement limits rather than reliance on a non-significant statistical difference alone.

3.2. Adaptive Morphological Change

A second trajectory involves reproducible morphological variation without independently established pathological significance. Potential changes may be transient or persistent and may involve tissue configuration or other anatomical characteristics.

Possible underlying mechanisms remain hypothetical. The term adaptive morphological change is used descriptively and does not imply demonstrated fibroblast activation, collagen synthesis, stromal compaction, or compensatory regeneration.

Measurable changes should therefore be evaluated according to their magnitude, temporal stability, and clinical context.

3.3. Pathological Structural Alteration

Pathological structural alteration describes reproducible morphological abnormalities accompanied by evidence suggesting tissue injury or clinically relevant deterioration. Such findings require independent clinical interpretation.

I-STROMAL does not propose that pathological alteration is an inevitable consequence of pigment reduction or the endpoint of unsuccessful remodeling. No universal threshold separating physiological variation from structural injury is assumed.

3.4. Interpretation of Structural Trajectories

The proposed categories need not represent mutually exclusive cellular states. Different anatomical regions may demonstrate distinct morphological responses, and individual structural parameters may evolve differently.

Consequently, structural outcomes should be characterized by magnitude, anatomical distribution, temporal evolution, and clinical relevance. The framework does not assign predetermined probabilities to the three trajectories.

4. Baseline Phenotyping and the Independent Architectural Contribution Hypothesis

Baseline iris pigmentation and architecture may provide complementary information for evaluating subsequent structural outcomes. The central explanatory hypothesis of I-STROMAL is that architectural descriptors may contribute meaningful information beyond that obtained from pigmentation and baseline morphological measurements alone.

4.1. Baseline Pigmentation

The Lumineyes Iris Pigmentation Scale (LIPS) comprises four ordered grades of apparent diffuse anterior stromal pigmentation (Grades I–IV) and a distinct category describing substantial spatial heterogeneity (Grade V) [8]. Grade V should not be treated statistically as simply a higher pigmentation level than Grade IV.

Within I-STROMAL, these grades may serve as exploratory baseline descriptors. However, apparent pigmentation grades do not directly quantify melanin mass, melanocyte number, or pigment release after exposure. No LIPS grade is assumed to predict structural preservation or injury.

4.2. Baseline Architectural Characterization

L-OAT proposes the representation of iris phenotype through visible appearance, image-derived architecture, and OCT signal characteristics [9]. I-STROMAL may use suitably validated architectural descriptors arising from this measurement framework.

Potential variables include reproducible regional geometry, thickness, and selected measures of structural heterogeneity. OCT intensity characteristics must remain qualified as device-dependent optical measurements rather than direct markers of collagen density or mechanical resilience.

The presence of a compact-appearing or crypt-rich iris cannot, without independent evidence, establish greater or lesser structural resistance.

4.3. The Independent Architectural Contribution Hypothesis

The principal explanatory hypothesis of I-STROMAL is that independently characterized baseline iris architecture may contribute information about longitudinal structural outcomes beyond that provided by pigmentation, initial morphology, and relevant clinical characteristics.

This hypothesis requires a distinction between baseline measurements of the structural endpoint and additional architectural descriptors. For example, when regional iris thickness is selected as the primary outcome, its baseline value should be considered separately from architectural features such as crypt distribution or other reproducible geometric characteristics.

The proposed contribution of baseline architecture should not be inferred from associations arising solely from mathematical overlap between explanatory variables and outcome measurements.

I-STROMAL therefore asks whether non-redundant architectural descriptors provide incremental explanatory or predictive information when evaluated against an appropriately specified reference model.

The hypothesis does not presume that any particular architectural configuration is intrinsically protective or associated with greater tissue vulnerability. Its validity depends on reproducible measurement, appropriate adjustment, and independent evaluation of model performance.

The proposed comparison between the reference and architecture-enhanced models is summarized in Table 1; it represents a research proposition, not an observed outcome.

4.4. Pigmentation–Architecture Interaction

An additional exploratory hypothesis concerns whether the association between pigmentary response and morphological outcomes varies according to baseline architectural characteristics. Such interactions should be evaluated without assuming a predetermined direction.

Baseline morphology, regional anatomical variation, imaging conditions, and exposure-related variables require consideration before interpreting associations. The framework does not establish phenotype-specific treatment thresholds or an individual structural risk classification.

5. Methodological Implications for Longitudinal Assessment

Longitudinal assessment requires independent definitions of pigmentary and structural outcomes, reproducible imaging conditions, and appropriately specified analytical models.

5.1. Pigmentary and Structural Endpoints

Pigmentary outcomes may be characterized using standardized photography, apparent pigmentation grading, and reproducible visible-color measurements [7].

Structural outcomes may include iris thickness, cross-sectional area, and regional morphological characteristics where supported by the imaging system [3]. A primary structural endpoint should be specified before analysis.

Changes in visible color or OCT reflectivity must not be interpreted as direct evidence of tissue loss or preservation.

5.2. Anterior Segment Imaging

Swept-source anterior segment optical coherence tomography permits quantitative evaluation of selected iris morphological characteristics [3,4]. However, image acquisition and segmentation can be affected by optical properties, anatomical configuration, and instrument-specific processing.

Pigmentation-dependent attenuation may influence the visibility of deeper tissue boundaries. Segmentation errors may also produce misleading quantitative measurements [6]. Measurements for which anatomical boundaries cannot be reliably established should be considered technically indeterminate.

Total iris thickness should not automatically be described as isolated stromal thickness.

5.3. Pupillary and Regional Variability

Pupil diameter and illumination influence iris configuration. Studies have documented changes in iris volume with dilation and associations between iris crypt characteristics and dynamic morphological behavior [4,5].

Accordingly, longitudinal imaging should use comparable acquisition conditions, record pupil diameter, and account for residual variation. Regional measurements should be anatomically registered where feasible, with missing or unreliable sectors documented.

5.4. Measurement Reproducibility

Structural stability must be distinguished from measurement uncertainty. Repeat acquisitions, observer agreement, segmentation consistency, and appropriate repeatability statistics may help establish the reliability of selected endpoints.

The absence of a statistically significant difference does not demonstrate equivalence. Any proposed threshold for meaningful morphological change must be justified through measurement performance and relevant biological or clinical evidence.

5.5. Comparative Model Evaluation

The incremental contribution of baseline architectural descriptors may be investigated through comparisons between appropriately specified analytical models.

The reference model (Model A) should include baseline pigmentation, the initial value of the selected structural endpoint, and relevant baseline clinical covariates. The architecture-enhanced model (Model B) should incorporate the same variables together with predefined architectural descriptors that are not merely duplicates of the baseline outcome measurement. Both models should be evaluated against the same longitudinal structural endpoint.

For studies intended to develop baseline predictions, only information available at the specified prediction time should be incorporated. Subsequent pigmentary responses and treatment-related exposures occurring after baseline should not be introduced as baseline predictors.

Separate explanatory analyses may examine associations involving observed pigmentary change and documented exposure characteristics. Such analyses require careful consideration of temporal relationships, confounding, and potential bias arising from adjustment for post-exposure variables.

Incremental performance should be assessed using appropriate measures of model fit and predictive accuracy, with attention to overfitting, measurement uncertainty, and the correlation of observations from the same participant.

Candidate architectural descriptors should be defined before outcome analysis and evaluated for redundancy with baseline structural measurements. Features that merely duplicate existing variables or encode information from subsequent examinations should not be interpreted as independent explanatory contributions.

Where feasible, performance should be evaluated using participant-level validation and independent datasets. Improved statistical performance should not, by itself, be interpreted as evidence of a causal biological relationship or established clinical utility.

Table 1 summarizes the proposed variable groups, endpoints, and evaluation strategy.

Table 1. Proposed variables and analytical strategy for I-STROMAL. All items are prospective research propositions, not reported data.

Domain	Proposed measurement	Analytical role
Baseline pigmentation	LIPS I–IV; Grade V treated as a distinct heterogeneity category	Baseline descriptor
Initial morphology	Regional iris thickness or another predefined endpoint	Reference model; baseline outcome value
Architectural features	Crypt distribution; independent geometric descriptors; qualified OCT-derived features	Candidate incremental predictors
Pigmentary response	Standardized visible-color change	Secondary longitudinal outcome
Structural response	Longitudinal change in predefined morphological measurement	Primary outcome
Exposure characteristics	Documented intervention and exposure information	Context; separate explanatory analyses
Model comparison	Reference Model A versus architecture-enhanced Model B	Primary evaluation of H2

Domain	Proposed measurement	Analytical role
Validation	Repeatability; participant-level validation; sensitivity analyses	Reliability and generalizability

6. Testable Predictions and Falsifiability

I-STROMAL advances three related but independently evaluable hypotheses. H2 is the primary explanatory hypothesis; H1 and H3 concern complementary magnitude-related and temporal patterns.

6.1. Hypothesis I: Pigmentary–Structural Dissociation

Pigmentary modification and measurable structural alteration may exhibit non-proportional relationships.

Testable prediction: Comparable pigmentary changes may coexist with differing morphological outcomes after accounting for measurement uncertainty and relevant covariates.

Potential supporting evidence: Reproducible discordance between pigmentary and structural measurements.

Potential challenging evidence: A consistently proportional relationship with negligible independent structural variation across adequately measured observations.

The magnitude of association compatible with meaningful dissociation must be specified before formal hypothesis testing.

6.2. Hypothesis II: Independent Architectural Contribution

The primary hypothesis of I-STROMAL proposes that baseline stromal architectural characteristics may provide incremental explanatory or predictive information regarding subsequent structural outcomes.

This prediction is operationalized through the comparison of Models A and B (Table 1).

Testable prediction: A model incorporating predefined, non-redundant architectural descriptors will demonstrate improved performance relative to an otherwise equivalent reference model containing baseline pigmentation, initial morphology, and relevant clinical covariates.

Potential supporting evidence: Reproducible incremental performance that persists after appropriate adjustment, measurement-quality assessment, and validation would support the proposed architectural contribution.

Potential challenging evidence: The hypothesis would be weakened if architectural descriptors consistently failed to provide meaningful additional information, or if apparent improvements disappeared after controlling for measurement redundancy, confounding, or overfitting.

The absence of predictive value would not establish the biological irrelevance of iris architecture. It would, however, limit the explanatory contribution of the selected architectural variables within the I-STROMAL framework.

6.3. Hypothesis III: Temporal Dissociation

Pigmentary and structural outcomes may follow different temporal patterns.

Testable prediction: Changes in apparent pigmentation and selected morphological measurements may differ in timing or rate of evolution.

Potential supporting evidence: Reproducible divergence between longitudinal trajectories beyond measurement variability.

Potential challenging evidence: Consistent temporal coupling without meaningful independent variation in adequately sampled observations.

Temporal association alone would not establish biological causation.

6.4. Integrated Interpretation and Criteria for Model Revision

The hypotheses should not be treated as mutually dependent. Support for pigmentary–structural dissociation does not necessarily establish the predictive contribution of baseline architecture. Similarly, an architectural association may exist without demonstrating temporal dissociation.

An investigation may therefore support one proposition while challenging another. Primary outcomes, meaningful effect sizes, measurement precision, and analytical criteria should be defined prospectively.

The model should be reconsidered when adequately powered and technically reliable studies consistently show no meaningful incremental contribution of architectural descriptors. Inconclusive findings from inadequate imaging, insufficient follow-up, or uncontrolled confounding should not be described as confirmation or definitive refutation.

7. Clinical and Translational Implications

The potential clinical relevance of I-STROMAL lies in the independent characterization of stromal morphology during longitudinal assessment. Visible pigmentary outcomes, morphological findings, and physiological observations should remain distinct.

Structural stability on imaging is not equivalent to comprehensive ocular safety, and morphological change does not automatically establish pathological injury.

If future investigations demonstrate reproducible associations between baseline architecture and subsequent structural outcomes, architectural descriptors may improve the characterization of individual morphological variability.

However, I-STROMAL does not currently provide a validated risk score, treatment selection instrument, or basis for determining laser parameters.

Interpretation of structural observations also requires consideration of exposure characteristics. Findings derived from different laser interventions should not be assumed to represent identical biological responses without adequate methodological evidence.

The framework's immediate contribution is therefore methodological and hypothesis-generating rather than prescriptive.

8. Limitations and Future Directions

I-STROMAL remains an unvalidated conceptual model. Its principal limitation is the absence of sufficiently detailed longitudinal human evidence establishing the relationships between selective pigment modification, baseline architecture, and subsequent stromal morphological outcomes.

Experimental studies provide preliminary biological context but cannot establish long-term human structural preservation or universal response patterns [2].

Existing non-invasive imaging methods cannot independently characterize melanocyte viability, collagen integrity, or microscopic extracellular matrix remodeling.

Furthermore, LIPS and L-OAT require independent assessment of their reliability and potential predictive contribution before being used as explanatory instruments in clinical research.

The three structural trajectories proposed by I-STROMAL are conceptual observational categories and should not be interpreted as established histopathological phenotypes.

Future investigations should prioritize reproducible morphological endpoints, adequate characterization of exposure conditions, predefined analytical comparisons, and independent validation.

The possibility of mathematical coupling between baseline and change-score measurements, incomplete anatomical segmentation, and confounding by pupil dynamics must also be considered.

The framework should be revised if its proposed architectural variables provide no meaningful incremental information or if the anticipated pigmentary–structural relationships are not reproducible. Its scientific utility depends on empirical performance rather than the confirmation of a predetermined biological outcome.

9. Conclusion

I-STROMAL proposes a longitudinal framework for investigating iris stromal structural responses following selective melanin modulation.

Its central hypothesis is that baseline architectural characteristics may contribute information about subsequent morphological outcomes beyond pigmentation and initial anatomical measurements alone.

By separating pigmentary and structural observations, defining alternative morphological trajectories, and establishing testable comparative hypotheses, the framework provides a basis for future investigation without assuming obligatory remodeling, structural injury, or preservation.

The scientific value of I-STROMAL will depend on whether these proposed relationships demonstrate reproducible and independently validated explanatory value.

References

1. Makovoz B, Eriksen AZ, Warrington RE, Williams D, Blenkinsop TA. Neuroectoderm-derived iris muscle characterization at the single-cell resolution in native human iris and a pluripotent stem cell eye model. Nature Communications. 2025;16:10648. doi:10.1038/s41467-025-65653-8.

2. Yildirim Y, Duzgun E, Kar T, Sonmez M, Kucukodaci Z, Ersanli D, et al. Evaluation of Color-Changing Effect and Complications After Nd:YAG Laser Application On Iris Surface. Medical Science Monitor. 2016;22:107–114. doi:10.12659/MSM.895086.

3. Invernizzi A, Giardini P, Cigada M, Viola F, Staurenghi G. Three-Dimensional Morphometric Analysis of the Iris by Swept-Source Anterior Segment Optical Coherence Tomography in a Caucasian Population. Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science. 2015;56:4796–4801. doi:10.1167/iovs.15-16483.

4. Mak H, Xu G, Leung CKS. Imaging the Iris With Swept-Source Optical Coherence Tomography: Relationship Between Iris Volume and Primary Angle Closure. Ophthalmology. 2013;120:2517–2524. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2013.05.009.

5. Chua J, Thakku SG, Tun TA, et al. Iris Crypts Influence Dynamic Changes of Iris Volume. Ophthalmology. 2016;123:2077–2084. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2016.06.034.

6. Chen H, Meng J, Lu P, et al. Segmentation Errors in the Measurement of Volumetric Parameters by Swept-Source Anterior Segment Optical Coherence Tomography. Frontiers in Medicine. 2021;8:761550. doi:10.3389/fmed.2021.761550.

7. Edwards M, Gozdzik A, Ross K, Miles J, Parra EJ. Technical note: quantitative measures of iris color using high resolution photographs. American Journal of Physical Anthropology. 2012;147:141–149. doi:10.1002/ajpa.21637.

8. Mete M. The Lumineyes Iris Pigmentation Scale (LIPS): A Proposed Clinical Framework for Grading Anterior Stromal Iris Pigmentation. Unpublished/submitted conceptual manuscript. 2026. Publication status and final citation to be updated.

9. Mete M. Lumineyes Optical Architectural Typology (L-OAT): A Multimodal Hypothesis for Quantitative Iris Phenotyping. Preprint. 2026. doi:10.5281/zenodo.23066772.

10. Mete M. Beyond Melanin Clearance: Melanocyte–Fibroblast Crosstalk and Stromal Matrix Responses to Pigment-Targeted Laser Exposure. Critical translational review/preprint. 2026. doi:10.5281/zenodo.23270055.

Declarations

Funding: This work received no specific grant from public, commercial, or not-for-profit funding agencies.

Competing Interests: Mustafa Mete is the developer of the Lumineyes™ method and has proposed the associated LIPS, L-OAT, and I-STROMAL frameworks. These relationships are disclosed as potential competing interests.

Ethics and Consent: This manuscript presents a conceptual framework and does not report new human or animal experiments or analyze individual patient records. Ethics approval and informed consent were therefore not required for the preparation of this manuscript.

Data Availability: No original participant-level dataset was generated or analyzed in this work.