

Agreement of Optic Nerve Head Evaluation of Primary Open-Angle Glaucoma Between General Ophthalmologists and Glaucoma Specialists

Wenqing Zhu^{1,2}
Xiangmei Kong^{1,2,*}
Ying Huang^{1,2,*}
Mingshui Fu³
Xi Shen⁴
Fang Wang⁵
Xinghuai Sun^{1,2,6}

¹Department of Ophthalmology and Vision Science, Eye and ENT Hospital, Shanghai Medical College, Fudan University, Shanghai, People's Republic of China; ²Shanghai Key Laboratory of Visual Impairment and Restoration, Shanghai, People's Republic of China; ³Shanghai General Hospital, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai, People's Republic of China; ⁴Ruijin Hospital, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai, People's Republic of China; ⁵Shanghai Tenth People's Hospital, Tongji University, Shanghai, People's Republic of China; ⁶State Key Laboratory of Medical Neurobiology, Institutes of Brain Science, Fudan University, Shanghai, People's Republic of China

*These authors contributed equally to this work

Purpose: To investigate the agreement of optic nerve head evaluations and initial diagnoses of primary open-angle glaucoma (POAG) by general ophthalmologists and glaucoma specialists in Shanghai, China.

Methods: This multicenter, cross-sectional study involved the outpatients from the general ophthalmology departments of four top eye hospitals in Shanghai. The participants underwent ocular examinations, including intraocular pressure, fundus photography, corneal thickness, refractometry, visual acuity, visual field and gonioscopy. General ophthalmologists and glaucoma specialists performed the diagnoses and classified them as non-glaucoma, POAG suspects, and POAG. The consistency of initial diagnosis between general ophthalmologists and glaucoma specialists was measured using the weighted kappa coefficient. Logistic regression analysis was used to detect the risk factors for the reliability of POAG diagnosis.

Results: In 922 participants, the initial diagnosis rates of POAG and non-glaucoma were much higher in the glaucoma specialist group than in the general ophthalmologist group, while the initial diagnosis rates of POAG suspects were higher in the general ophthalmologist group. The weighted kappa coefficient between the two groups was 0.831 ± 0.027 (95% confidence interval, 0.779–0.884). Logistic regression analysis of the risk factors for the reliability of POAG diagnosis showed that the independent risk factors were intraocular pressure (OR 8.363, 95% CI: 4.27–16.37) and vertical cup-to-disc ratio (OR 3.459, 95% CI: 1.54–7.76).

Conclusion: The diagnosis consistency between the general ophthalmologists and the glaucoma specialists was similar among outpatients in the area of Shanghai. However, general ophthalmologists tended to classify the indefinite subjects as POAG suspects, and their accuracy in diagnosing POAG was low. By paying more attention to the risk factors of POAG diagnosis, general ophthalmologists could improve the diagnosis accuracy.

Keywords: primary open-angle glaucoma, initial diagnosis, risk factor, intraocular pressure, vertical cup-to-disc ratio

Introduction

Glaucoma is the leading cause of visual impairment worldwide. It is an irreversible disease, usually asymptomatic at an early phase, which causes vision loss and blindness by damaging the optic nerve. Given the large current population and expected future population growth, treatment of glaucoma (which is only partly effective and may alleviate symptoms and its progression) is an expensive disease that imposes a great burden on patients and society, placing enormous demands on the healthcare system.^{1–3}

Correspondence: Xiangmei Kong;
Ying Huang
Department of Ophthalmology and Vision Science, Eye & ENT Hospital, Fudan University, 83 Fenyang Road, Shanghai, 200031, People's Republic of China
Tel +86-21-64377134
Email kongxm95@163.com;
13661763815@163.com

Primary open-angle glaucoma (POAG) is the most common type of glaucoma. The prevalence of POAG in China ranges from 0.7% to 2.1%.^{4–8} In addition, data on the initial diagnosis of POAG in outpatients are still very limited. POAG tends to progress slowly; patients are often asymptomatic until the disease reaches an advanced stage. For example, an Indian study reported that 98.5% of cases are diagnosed at an advanced stage.⁹ Similar data (93% of cases) were reported by a Japanese study.¹⁰ Thus, early detection and treatment are crucial for preventing visual impairment caused by glaucoma.^{11,12}

POAG patients usually exhibit a relatively normal appearance with regard to the anterior ocular segments and do not develop an acute attack, which represents an additional challenge to ophthalmologists, especially for those who were not specialized in glaucoma. According to the Preferred Practice Pattern guidelines of the American Academy of Ophthalmology,¹³ early diagnosis of POAG requires detailed ophthalmic examinations, including applanation tonometry, gonioscopy, optic disc evaluation, and automated perimetry. However, different ophthalmologists might give different diagnoses at the early stage of POAG, even if provided with the same examination results. Therefore, the diagnostic reliability of general ophthalmologists and the factors influencing the diagnostic reliability need to be investigated.

In the present study, we examined participants from four top eye hospitals in Shanghai, China's economic center. We investigated the agreement of optic nerve head evaluations and the initial diagnoses of POAG in outpatients by general ophthalmologists and glaucoma specialists and analyzed the risk factors for the reliability of POAG diagnosis.

Methods

Participants

This was a multicenter, cross-sectional, observational, hospital-based study. The outpatients from general ophthalmology departments of four eye hospitals, including A) Ruijin Hospital of Shanghai Jiaotong University; B) Shanghai Tenth People's Hospital of Tongji University; C) Shanghai General Hospital of Shanghai Jiaotong University; D) Eye and ENT Hospital of Fudan University, were recruited between 2016 and 2018. Exclusion criteria were following: 1) previous diagnosis of POAG; 2) age < 30 years old; 3) severe opacity of refractive media; 4) narrow or closed-angle; 5) the previous history of intraocular surgery; 6) any of the factors

(such as uveitis) causing secondary glaucoma; 7) anomalous discs, including tilted discs; 8) corneal diseases influencing the measurement of intraocular pressure (IOP). In this study, the general ophthalmologists were resident doctors from these four-eye hospitals, and the panel consisted of five glaucoma specialists from these four eye hospitals who were all the professors of ophthalmology. All 27 ophthalmologists received training in general ophthalmology lasting from 2 years to 6 years, while the glaucoma specialists received training on glaucoma for at least 5 years, except for the initial training of general ophthalmology.

The study was approved by the ethics committee of Eye and ENT Hospital of Fudan University and was conducted according to the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki for the use of human subjects in biomedical research. Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study. The data were labeled with serial numbers and analyzed in a manner that protected patient privacy.

Examination Protocol

The participants underwent a comprehensive ophthalmic examination. Uncorrected visual acuity was measured (E charts) at a distance of 5 m. Automatic refractometry (Auto Refractometer AR-610; Nidek Co, Ltd., Tokyo, Japan) was performed if uncorrected visual acuity was < 1.0. Slit-lamp examinations were also conducted. Gonioscopy was performed with a Goldmann one-mirror lens (Haag Streit, Bern, Switzerland) at 25x magnification with low ambient illumination. Central corneal thickness was measured by A-scan (Nidek Co., Ltd.). Digital stereoscopic photographs of the optic nerve and macula were taken using a fundus camera (CR-DGi non-mydriatic retinal camera; Canon Inc., Kyoto, Japan). VCDR, cup notch, narrowed optic disc rim, optic disc margin hemorrhage, and retinal nerve fiber layer defect were used as indicators of structural glaucomatous change. The grading process used VCDR from 0.1 to 1.0 in 0.1 increments. IOP was measured using a Goldmann applanation tonometer (Haag Streit AG, Bern, Switzerland). Visual field (VF) was then tested with the Humphrey Field Analyzer (Carl Zeiss Meditec Inc., Dublin, CA) Central 24–2 Swedish Interactive Threshold Algorithm standard program. Tests were considered reliable and eligible for analysis if there were < 33% false-positives, 33% false-negatives, and 20% fixation losses. Demographic information, including age, gender, ethnicity, family history of glaucoma, history of diabetes, and history of hypertension were also collected.

Definition of Non-Glaucoma, POAG Suspect and POAG

The ophthalmologist reviewed all data available for each eye of the participant, including optic nerve images, results of the Humphrey Field Analyzer VF testing, and clinical records. The doctor then determined whether the participant was of non-glaucoma, POAG suspect, or POAG. Finally, a panel consisting of five glaucoma specialists openly discussed all the cases and gave the final diagnosis according to the Preferred Practice Pattern guidelines of the American Academy of Ophthalmology.^{13,14}

Non-glaucoma individuals should meet all the criteria listed below: 1) healthy subjects with no history or presence of glaucoma; 2) IOP ≤ 21 mmHg adjusted by central corneal thickness on several visits; 3) open angles by gonioscopy; 4) normal-appearing optic nerve head; 5) normal Humphrey 24–2 visual field test. POAG suspects should meet all the criteria listed below: 1) IOP ≤ 30 mmHg; 2) normal visual field test; 3) asymmetric optic nerve head cupping (VCDR difference between both eyes ≥ 0.2 in the presence of a similar optic disc size) or increased cupping (VCDR > 0.6). POAG patients should meet all the criteria listed below: 1) an abnormal visual field defined as the presence of at least two of the following: a) a glaucoma hemifield test outside normal limits, b) $P < 5\%$ for corrected pattern standard deviation, or c) a cluster of at least three contiguous points with $P < 5\%$, including at least one of these with $P < 1\%$ in the pattern deviation plot; 2) one or more optic disc sign as follows: a) presence of a localized thinning or loss of the neuroretinal rim, b) optic disc excavation, c) VCDR > 0.6 , and d) VCDR asymmetry between both eyes ≥ 0.2 . POAG suspects and POAG patients were then defined as glaucoma suspects and glaucoma with open-angle, excluding other possible secondary causes.

Statistical Analysis

All analyses were performed in SPSS software, version 25.0 (IBM, Chicago, IL, USA). Continuous variables were presented as mean \pm standard deviation, while categorical variables were presented as frequency and percentage. The initial diagnosis rate of POAG suspects and POAG patients was calculated. For the comparison of variables among the non-glaucoma group, the POAG suspect group, and the POAG group, one-way analysis of variance was used to compare the means of

continuous variables. The chi-square test was used to identify the difference in categorical variables. The weighted kappa coefficient was used to measure the consistency between the two kinds of diagnoses, and the results were shown as point estimates and 95% confidence intervals (CI). Univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses were used to detect the risk factors for the reliability of POAG diagnosis. The dependent variable was the diagnosis agreement, which was consistent between the general ophthalmologists and glaucoma specialists. All p values were two-sided and were considered statistically significant when the values were < 0.05 .

Results

Demographic and Clinical Characteristics of the Participants

A total of 971 participants were enrolled in this study; 49 were excluded because of anomalous discs or low-quality fundus images. The proportion of valid data was 94.95%. The numbers of participants from hospitals A, B, C, and D were 318 (34.49%), 88 (9.54%), 111 (12.04%), and 405 (43.93%), respectively. The mean number of participants for 27 ophthalmologists was 33.82 ± 28.22 (ranging from 13 to 85). The sociodemographic and clinical data are shown in Table 1. Most of the participants were female (555, 60.20%), and the sample covered an age spectrum from 30 to 90 years, with a mean age of 51.03 years. A total of 342 (37.09%) participants had a history of hypertension, 149 (16.16%) had a history of diabetes, and 39 (4.23%) had a family history of glaucoma. In addition, 324 (35.14%) participants had myopia with refraction ≤ -3.0 Diopter, 63 (6.83%) had IOP > 21 mmHg, and 337 (36.55%) had VCDR > 0.3 .

General Participant Information with Different Diagnoses

According to the diagnoses made by the panel of glaucoma specialists, 833 (90.35%) cases were non-glaucoma, 41 (4.45%) were POAG suspects, and 48 (5.21%) had POAG. The percentage of male participants in the non-glaucoma group was 38.06%, while it showed a significant increase in the POAG suspect group and the POAG group (53.66% and 60.42%, respectively). The male to female ratio was 0.61, 1.16, and 1.53 in the non-glaucoma group, the POAG suspect group, and the POAG group, respectively. The participants' age in the three groups was comparable, ranging from 48.46

Table 1 General Information of the Included Subjects

Variables	Total Subjects
Number, n (%)	922 (100)
Gender, n (%)	
Male	367 (39.80)
Female	555 (60.20)
Age (Mean±SD, range)	51.03±16.71 (30–90)
Hypertension history, n (%)	342 (37.09)
Diabetes history, n (%)	149 (16.16)
Family history of glaucoma, n (%)	39 (4.23)
Refraction (Diopter, Mean±SD, range)	
Right eye	-2.07±3.37 (-23.00 to 3.00)
Left eye	-2.11±3.44 (-25.00 to 3.00)
Refraction ≤-3.0D, n(%)	324 (35.14)
IOP (Mean±SD, range)	
Right eye	16.17±4.39 (8.00 to 53.00)
Left eye	16.46±4.29 (7.00 to 44.00)
IOP >21mmHg, n (%)	126 (13.67)
VCDR (Mean±SD, range)	
Right eye	0.37±0.15 (0.10 to 1.00)
Left eye	0.38±0.15 (0.10 to 1.00)
VCDR difference of both eyes (Mean±SD, range)	0.03±0.08 (0 to 0.6)
VCDR > 0.3, n (%)	337 (36.55)
Hospitals, n (%)	
Hospital A	318 (34.49)
Hospital B	88 (9.54)
Hospital C	111 (12.04)
Hospital D	405 (43.93)

Abbreviations: SD, standard deviation; IOP, intraocular pressure; VCDR, vertical cup-to-disc ratio.

to 51.27 years old. There was a significant difference in hypertension history and diabetes history among the three groups, showing the obvious reduction in the POAG suspect group and the POAG group ($p<0.001$). The percentages of the family history of glaucoma showed a significant increase in the POAG group ($p<0.001$). The percentages of myopia with refraction ≤ -3.0 diopters in the three groups were comparable, ranging from 34.69% to 41.46%. The percentage of participants with IOP ≥ 21 mmHg significantly increased from 1.08%, 56.09% to 62.50%, and the difference of VCDR between both eyes increased from 0.02, 0.07 to 0.12 in the non-glaucoma group, the POAG suspect group, and the POAG group, respectively ($p<0.001$) (Table 2).

The Initial Diagnosis Rates of POAG Suspects and POAG Patients in This Hospital-Based Study

Using the diagnosis of the panel of glaucoma specialists as the golden standard, of all the 922 participants involved in our study, the initial diagnosis rate of POAG suspects and POAG patients was 4.45% and 5.21%, respectively. Of the 48 POAG patients, there were 29 males and 19 females. According to the general ophthalmologists, the initial diagnosis rate of POAG suspects and POAG patients was 7.48% and 4.34%, respectively. The consistency rate between these two diagnoses was measured by the weighted kappa coefficient, and the value was 0.831 ± 0.027 (95% CI, 0.779–0.884) (Table 3).

Information Regarding Participants with Different Diagnoses According to General Ophthalmologists and Glaucoma Specialists

In total, 40 (4.34%) participants received a different diagnosis. According to the specialist panel, among those who were diagnosed as non-glaucoma individuals, 23 were misdiagnosed as POAG suspects and 2 with POAG patients by the general ophthalmologists. That means that many non-glaucoma individuals might be overly diagnosed as POAG suspects by general ophthalmologists. Of those who were diagnosed as POAG patients according to the specialist panel, 9 were misdiagnosed as POAG suspects and 2 as non-glaucoma individuals, thus suggesting that the accuracy of POAG diagnosis by general ophthalmologists need to be improved (Table 4).

Independent Risk Factors for the Reliability of POAG Diagnosis

Univariate and multivariate logistic regression analysis identified larger VCDR ($p=0.003$) and higher IOP ($p<0.001$) as the significant independent risk factors for the reliable diagnosis of POAG, while the history of hypertension, history of diabetes, family history of glaucoma and myopia with refraction ≤ -3.0 diopter showed no significant relationship ($p>0.05$). The odds ratio was 8.363 (95% CI: 4.27–16.37) for IOP and 3.459 (95% CI: 1.54–7.76) for VCDR (Table 5).

Table 2 Characteristics of the Participants Diagnosed as Non-Glaucoma, POAG Suspect, and POAG by the Panel of Glaucoma Specialists

Variables	Non-Glaucoma	POAG Suspect	POAG	P-value
Number	833	41	48	–
Gender, n(%)				
Male	317 (38.06)	22 (53.66)	29 (60.42)	<0.001
Female	516 (61.94)	19 (46.34)	19 (39.58)	<0.001
Ratio of male to female	0.61	1.16	1.53	<0.001
Age (Mean±SD)	51.27±16.75	48.46±15.89	48.94±16.86	0.892
Hypertension history, n(%)	326 (39.14)	9 (21.95)	7 (14.58)	<0.001
Diabetes history, n(%)	137 (16.45)	6 (14.63)	6 (12.50)	<0.001
Family history of glaucoma, n(%)	34 (4.08)	2 (4.88)	3 (6.25)	<0.001
Refraction (Diopter, Mean±SD, range)				
Righteye	-2.06±3.34 (-21.00 to3.00)	-1.93±2.42 (-7.00 to 3.00)	-2.44±4.45 (-23.00 to3.00)	0.317
Left eye	-2.08±3.40 (-21.00to3.00)	-2.00±2.71 (-9.50to 3.00)	-2.69±4.58 (-25.00 to3.00)	0.368
Refraction ≤-3.0D, n(%)	289 (34.69)	17 (41.46)	18 (37.50)	0.131
IOP (Mean±SD, range)				
Right eye	15.57±3.46 (8.00 to32.00)	20.32±4.67 (11.00 to29.60)	23.14±8.66 (12.00 to53.00)	<0.001
Left eye	15.92±3.56 (8.00 to31.00)	20.54±4.93 (11.00 to33.00)	22.45±7.69 (12.00 to44.00)	<0.001
IOP >21mmHg, n(%)	70 (8.40)	23 (56.09)	30 (62.50)	<0.001

Abbreviations: POAG, primary open-angle glaucoma; SD, standard deviation; IOP, intraocular pressure; VCDR, vertical cup-to-disc ratio; NS, not significant.

Discussion

This multicenter study showed that the diagnosis consistency between general ophthalmologists and glaucoma specialists was similar. However, general ophthalmologists tended to diagnose non-glaucoma or POAG as POAG suspects, and their accuracy in diagnosing POAG was low. In addition, we found that larger VCDR and higher IOP were the independent risk factors for the reliable diagnosis of POAG. By paying more attention to the risk factors of POAG diagnosis, general ophthalmologists could improve the accuracy of glaucoma diagnosis.

Table 3 Comparison of the Diagnostic Information of General Ophthalmologists and Glaucoma Specialists

Diagnosis	General Ophthalmologists	Glaucoma Specialists
Non-glaucoma	813 (88.18%)	833 (90.35%)
POAG suspect	69 (7.48%)	41 (4.45%)
POAG	40 (4.34%)	48 (5.21%)
Kappa coefficient	0.831±0.02 (95% Confidence Interval: 0.779–0.884)	

Abbreviation: POAG, primary open-angle glaucoma.

In the present study, we found that the initial diagnosis rate of POAG was 5.21%, which is higher than the prevalence of POAG described in other population-based studies.^{15–21} The major reason was that participants were recruited among outpatients, which would make the rate higher with a smaller screening population. However, this proved to be a cost-effective way to screen POAG. On the other hand, the diagnostic criteria used were similar to those of the Korean Study.^{22,23} We did not follow the criteria of the International Society of Geographic and Epidemiologic Ophthalmology (ISGEO),²⁴ as the former was more easily adapted for outpatient studies and more closely adheres to clinical practice. In summary, this study provided data on the initial diagnosis rate of POAG in outpatients in the area of Shanghai, which might provide some insight into clinical practice.

The diagnoses made by the general ophthalmologists were in accordance with those made by the panel of glaucoma specialists with the Kappa coefficient of 0.831±0.027 [95% CI: 0.779–0.884]. This suggested that the general ophthalmologists in the study were qualified to diagnose POAG, but there were still some shortages in the diagnostic accuracy. Importantly, the initial diagnosis of POAG

Table 4 Information of Those Subjects Who Got Different Diagnosis Between General Ophthalmologists and Glaucoma Specialists

Variables	General Ophthalmologists → Glaucoma Specialists					
	Suspect→Non-Glaucoma	POAG→Non-Glaucoma	Suspect→POAG	Non-Glaucoma→POAG	Non-Glaucoma→Suspect	POAG→Suspect
Number	23	2	9	2	3	1
Refraction, Right eye	-1.86	-1.50	-2.55	0.75	-4.50	0.00
Refraction, Left eye	-2.00	-1.13	-2.30	0.50	-4.67	0.00
IOP, Right eye	20.3	19.65	21.1	20.9	16.3	22
IOP, Left eye	20.9	20.15	19.8	22.6	16.9	16
VCDR, Right eye	0.46	0.45	0.64	0.55	0.43	0.5
VCDR, Left eye	0.53	0.45	0.55	0.4	0.43	0.4

Abbreviations: POAG, primary open-angle glaucoma; IOP, intraocular pressure; VCDR, vertical cup-to-disc ratio.

Table 5 Multivariate Logistic Regression Analysis of Risk Factors for POAG Accurate Diagnosis

Variable	Univariable Analysis		Multivariable Analysis	
	OR (95% CI)	P	OR (95% CI)	P
Gender	0.894 (0.471–1.698)	0.733		
Age	0.646 (0.338–1.233)	0.185		
Hypertension history	0.410 (0.187–0.901)	0.026		
Diabetes history	0.565 (0.198–1.611)	0.285		
Family history of glaucoma	0.570 (0.076–4.256)	0.583		
Myopia	1.232 (0.653–2.325)	0.518		
IOP	10.580 (5.465–20.481)	<0.0001	9.248 (4.663–18.340)	<0.0001
VCDR	4.842 (2.206–10.627)	<0.0001	3.261 (1.445–7.361)	0.004

Abbreviations: POAG, primary open-angle glaucoma; IOP, intraocular pressure; VCDR, vertical cup-to-disc ratio; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval.

suspects by general ophthalmologists was rather higher than that by glaucoma specialists for approximately 3%. The general ophthalmologists tended to classify the indefinite subjects as POAG suspects, leading to misdiagnosis of 23 non-glaucoma individuals and 9 POAG patients. For such subjects, referral to glaucoma specialists or long-term follow up is necessary. Moreover, gathering more experience from glaucoma specialists according to the risk factors for accurate diagnosis of POAG was a shortcut for general ophthalmologists to improve the level of diagnosis. One study in Korea also investigated the interobserver agreement between a glaucoma specialist and residents, indicating the weighted kappa values varied from 0.28 to 0.70.²³ The subspecialists in their study had less experience (junior grade) compared to those in our study. The disagreement also suggested that the clinical skill and awareness related to glaucoma detection needed to be improved in general ophthalmologists.

Many risk factors for POAG have been reported over the years, including older age, male gender, family history, diabetes mellitus, myopia, elevated IOP, larger sup-to-disc ratio, thin central cornea.^{25–31} However, risk factors for

accurate diagnosis of POAG are still missing. In the present study, we demonstrated that IOP and VCDR were the independent risk factor for reliable diagnosis of POAG. The odds ratio was 8.363 (95% CI: 4.27–16.37) for IOP and 3.459 (95% CI: 1.54–7.76) for VCDR. This suggested that participants with high IOP or large VCDR were at a higher risk of being misdiagnosed with POAG by general ophthalmologists, thus implying that the diagnosis of POAG should not just rely on the high IOP or large VCDR but on the optic disc sign and abnormal visual field as well. Thus, more clinical training should focus on understanding the optic disc sign and the visual field.

Our study has some limitations. It was a hospital-based cross-sectional study involving four top eye hospitals in the area of Shanghai. Still, among the participants, who were outpatients, those previously diagnosed with glaucoma were excluded, and therefore the initial diagnosis rate in outpatients was lower than the reality. Moreover, the findings of this hospital-based study could not be generalized to other population-based studies. Finally, the study focused only on POAG because primary angle-closure glaucoma and

secondary glaucoma have different diagnostic criteria and might be more complicated, which needs further study.

In conclusion, our data suggest that general ophthalmologists' level and awareness for glaucoma diagnosis need to be improved. There is a need for public health measures and research into appropriate and cost-effective screening strategies for detecting glaucoma.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank all the members for their participating in the four-eye hospital's study and Dr. Yu Donghui for the statistical suggestion.

Funding

The authors were supported by the Surface Project of National Natural Science Foundation of China (81770922, 82070957), the project of Shanghai Municipal Commission of Health and Family Planning (201740204), the clinical science and technology innovation project of Shanghai Shengkang Hospital Development Center (SHDC12017X18), the western medicine guidance project of Shanghai Committee of Science and Technology (19411961600), Experimental Animal Research Project of Shanghai Science and Technology Commission (201409006600), and Double Excellence Project of Eye & ENT Hospital of Fudan University (SYB202003). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Disclosure

The authors declared that no conflicts of interest exist.

References

- Weinreb RN, Aung T, Medeiros FA. The pathophysiology and treatment of glaucoma: a review. *JAMA*. 2014;311(18):1901–1911. doi:10.1001/jama.2014.3192
- Tham YC, Li X, Wong TY, Quigley HA, Aung T, Cheng CY. Global prevalence of glaucoma and projections of glaucoma burden through 2040: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ophthalmology*. 2014;121(11):2081e2090. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2014.05.013
- Pascolini D, Mariotti SP. Global estimates of visual impairment: 2010. *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2012;96(5):614e618. doi:10.1136/bjophthalmol-2011-300539
- Zhong H, Li J, Li C, et al. The prevalence of glaucoma in adult rural Chinese populations of the Bai nationality in Dali: the Yunnan minority eye study. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2012;53(6):3221e3225.
- Sun J, Zhou X, Kang Y, et al. Prevalence and risk factors for primary open-angle glaucoma in a rural northeast China population: a population-based survey in Bin County, Harbin. *Eye (Lond)*. 2012;26(2):283–291. doi:10.1038/eye.2011.243
- Song W, Shan L, Cheng F, et al. Prevalence of glaucoma in a rural northern China adult population: a population-based survey in Kailu county, inner Mongolia. *Ophthalmology*. 2011;118(10):1982e1988. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2011.02.050
- Wang YX, Xu L, Yang H, Jonas JB. Prevalence of glaucoma in North China: the Beijing eye study. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2010;150(6):917e924. doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2010.06.037
- He M, Foster PJ, Ge J, et al. Prevalence and clinical characteristics of glaucoma in adult Chinese: a population-based study in Liwan District, Guangzhou. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2006;47(7):2782–2788. doi:10.1167/iovs.06-0051
- Vijaya L, George R, Paul PG, et al. Prevalence of open-angle glaucoma in a rural south Indian population. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2005;46(12):4461–4467. doi:10.1167/iovs.04-1529
- Iwase A, Suzuki Y, Araie M, et al. Characteristics of undiagnosed primary open-angle glaucoma: the Tajimi Study. *Ophthalmic Epidemiol*. 2014;21(1):39–44. doi:10.3109/09286586.2013.867510
- Fang Y, Cheng J, Zhu L, Xiao M, Sun X. Evaluation of Routine health examination for screening primary open angle glaucoma in Eastern China: a hospital-based Cross-Sectional Study. *Risk Manag Healthc Policy*. 2020;13:883–892. doi:10.2147/RMHP.S258524
- Weinreb RN, Khaw PT. Primary open-angle glaucoma. *Lancet*. 2004;363(9422):1711–1720. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(04)16257-0
- Prum BE Jr, Rosenberg LF, Gedde SJ, et al. Primary open-angle glaucoma preferred practice pattern[®] guidelines. *Ophthalmology*. 2016;123(1):P41–P111. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2015.10.053
- Prum BE Jr, Lim MC, Mansberger SL, et al. Primary open-angle glaucoma suspect preferred practice pattern[®] guidelines. *Ophthalmology*. 2016;123(1):P112–51. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2015.10.055
- Chamard C, Villain M, Bron A, et al. Prevalence of unknown ocular hypertension, glaucoma suspects, and glaucoma in patients seen in an ophthalmology center in France. *Ophthalmic Res*. 2020;63(3):295–301. doi:10.1159/000504717
- Keel S, Xie J, Foreman J, et al. Prevalence of glaucoma in the Australian National Eye Health Survey. *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2019;103(2):191–195. doi:10.1136/bjophthalmol-2017-311786
- Gupta P, Zhao D, Guallar E, Ko F, Boland MV, Friedman DS. Prevalence of glaucoma in the United States: the 2005–2008 national health and nutrition examination survey. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2016;57(6):2905–2913. doi:10.1167/iovs.15-18469
- Baskaran M, Foo RC, Cheng CY, et al. The prevalence and types of glaucoma in an Urban Chinese Population: the Singapore Chinese Eye Study. *JAMA Ophthalmol*. 2015;133(8):874–880. doi:10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2015.1110
- Kolko M, Horwitz A, Thygesen J, Jeppesen J, Torp-Pedersen C. The prevalence and incidence of glaucoma in denmark in a fifteen year period: a nationwide Study. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(7):e0132048. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0132048
- Friedman DS, Jampel HD, Munoz B, West SK. The prevalence of open-angle glaucoma among blacks and white 73 years and older: the Salisbury eye evaluation glaucoma study. *Arch Ophthalmol*. 2006;124(11):1625–1630. doi:10.1001/archophth.124.11.1625
- Topouzis F, Wilson MR, Harris A, et al. Prevalence of open-angle glaucoma in Greece: the Thessaloniki Eye Study. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2007;144(4):511–519. doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2007.06.029
- Abdul Majid AS, Kwag JH, Jung SH, Yim HB, Kim YD, Kang KD. Correlation between disc damage likelihood scale and optical coherence tomography in the diagnosis of glaucoma. *Ophthalmologica*. 2010;224(5):274–282. doi:10.1159/000287350
- Han JW, Cho SY, Kang KD. Correlation between optic nerve parameters obtained using 3d nonmydriatic retinal camera and optical coherence tomography: interobserver agreement on the disc damage likelihood scale. *J Ophthalmol*. 2014;ID:931738.
- Foster PJ, Buhrmann R, Quigley HA, Johnson GJ. The definition and classification of glaucoma in prevalence surveys. *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2002;86(2):238–242. doi:10.1136/bjo.86.2.238

25. Pan CW, Yang WY, Hu DN, et al. Longitudinal cohort study on the incidence of primary open-angle glaucoma in Bai Chinese. *Am J Ophthalmol.* 2017;176:127–133.
26. Kim KE, Kim MJ, Park KH, et al. Prevalence, awareness, and risk factors of primary open-angle glaucoma: korea national health and nutrition examination survey 2008–2011. *Ophthalmology.* 2016;123(3):532–541. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2015.11.004
27. Pan CW, Yang WY, Hu DN, et al. Longitudinal cohort study on the incidence of primary open-angle glaucoma in Bai Chinese. *Am J Ophthalmol.* 2017;176:127–133. doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2017.01.008
28. Chiam N, Baskaran M, Li Z, et al. Social, health and ocular factors associated with primary open-angle glaucoma amongst Chinese Singaporeans. *Clin Exp Ophthalmol.* 2018;46(1):25–34. doi:10.1111/ceo.13008
29. Zhao D, Cho J, Kim MH, et al. Diabetes, fasting glucose, and the risk of glaucoma: a meta-analysis. *Ophthalmology.* 2015;122(1):72–78. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2014.07.051
30. Shen L, Melles RB, Metlapally R, et al. The association of refractive error with glaucoma in a multiethnic population. *Ophthalmology.* 2016;123(1):92–101. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2015.07.002
31. Kapetanakis VV, Chan MP, Foster PJ, et al. Global variations and time trends in the prevalence of primary open angle glaucoma (POAG): a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Ophthalmol.* 2016;100(1):86–93. doi:10.1136/bjophthalmol-2015-307223

Risk Management and Healthcare Policy

Dovepress

Publish your work in this journal

Risk Management and Healthcare Policy is an international, peer-reviewed, open access journal focusing on all aspects of public health, policy, and preventative measures to promote good health and improve morbidity and mortality in the population. The journal welcomes submitted papers covering original research, basic science, clinical & epidemiological studies, reviews and evaluations,

guidelines, expert opinion and commentary, case reports and extended reports. The manuscript management system is completely online and includes a very quick and fair peer-review system, which is all easy to use. Visit <http://www.dovepress.com/testimonials.php> to read real quotes from published authors.

Submit your manuscript here: <https://www.dovepress.com/risk-management-and-healthcare-policy-journal>