



Correction to: Diagnostic accuracy of AS-OCT vs gonioscopy for detecting angle closure: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Thomas Desmond^{1,2} · Vincent Tran² · Monish Maharaj^{3,4} · Nicole Carnt^{1,2,5,6} · Andrew White^{1,2,5}

Published online: 28 September 2021

© Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2021

Correction to: Graefe's Archive for Clinical and Experimental Ophthalmology
<http://doi.org/10.1007/s00417-021-05271-4>

The authors would like to fully acknowledge that in error two incorrect statements were made.

The first incorrect statement is:

A Cochrane review by Jindal et al (2020) assessed non-contact tests for angle closure but did not compare against gonioscopy as a reference standard.

A systematic review and meta-analysis that was published in the Cochrane Library in May 2020 [1], evaluated a range of non-contact tests that including anterior segment optical coherence tomography (AS-OCT) for the detection of an occludable angle. For all 47 studies included in the review (including the 27 AS-OCT studies) the authors compared their accuracy to a gonioscopic reference standard.

The published paper found 23 studies that evaluated AS-OCT to gonioscopy whereas in the Cochrane review by Jindal et al., they investigated 27 studies that evaluated AS-OCT compared to the reference standard of gonioscopy, therefore this that may affect the published paper's findings.

The online version of the original article can be found at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00417-021-05271-4>

✉ Thomas Desmond
thomas@thomasdesmond.net

- ¹ Sydney Medical School, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia
- ² School of Optometry and Vision Science, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia
- ³ Faculty of Medicine, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia
- ⁴ Department of Neurosurgery, Waikato Hospital, Hamilton, New Zealand
- ⁵ Westmead Institute for Medical Research, Sydney, Australia
- ⁶ Institute of Ophthalmology, University College London, London, UK

Furthermore the published paper has not discussed how their meta-analysis, discussion and conclusions differs from the published Cochrane review by Jindal et al.

In the current review it was reported that '*AS-OCT allows for earlier detection and provides a tool for screening where there is very little else available.*' This statement is contrary to the findings of the Cochrane library [1] where the meta-analysis and comparisons of non-contact tests demonstrated that LACD had superior specificity to AS-OCT and similar sensitivity. Furthermore it is generally acknowledged that LACD is a test that can be performed without the need of additional equipment and where a conventional slit-lamp can be used therefore LACD is particularly applicable in settings where costs may be a barrier for implementation.

The second incorrect statement is:

'Our review has been the first to perform a meta-analysis of data that assesses the accuracy of AS-OCT for detecting angle closure against gonioscopy as a reference standard.

The authors would also like to confirm that Jindal et al. published the first systematic review to include a meta analysis of the accuracy of AS-OCT against a gonioscopic reference standard.

Reference

1. Jindal A, Ctori I, Virgili G, Lucenteforte E, Lawrenson JG (2020) Non-contact tests for identifying people at risk of primary angle closure glaucoma. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 5(5):CD012947. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD012947.pub2>

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.