

Community Eye Health Journal

VOLUME 35 • NUMBER 117 • 2022

Don't miss out

Download the free
Community Eye Health
Journal app today!
bit.ly/CEHJ-app



SCAN ME



A research coordinator collecting data from a health extension worker. ETHIOPIA

© NATNAEL KOKEB CC BY-NC-SA 4.0

Why does research matter?

A working knowledge of research – both how it is done, and how it can be used – is important for everyone involved in direct patient care and the planning & delivery of eye programmes.



Victor H Hu
Assistant Clinical Professor:
International Centre for Eye Health, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine and Consultant Ophthalmologist: Mid Cheshire NHS Hospitals, UK.

The mention of 'research' can be off-putting and may seem irrelevant in the busy environment of a clinic or hospital. However, research is central to all aspects of eye care delivery – both inside and outside the clinic.

Whether we are health workers, public health practitioners, managers, policy makers, or editors – all of us 'stand on the shoulders of giants': we rely on the research done by others before us. This can be as simple – and profound – as hand washing between patients; a habit that only became common practice in the 1870s, following the work of the Hungarian physician Ignaz Semmelweis and Scottish surgeon Joseph Lister. Or it can be as complex as making a diagnosis of glaucoma and knowing what treatment to give. All current eye care practice is based on research. Clinical, operational (eye care delivery) and public health practice will continue to be profoundly shaped by new research developments.

What is research?

In its simplest form, research is about investigating the world around us to increase our knowledge, so we can work out how to do things better.

In health care, we use a scientific approach to carry out research; there is a set way of doing things that ensures research is done in a logical way, and that results are published widely, so that other people can scrutinise what has been done. This gives us confidence that the results will be useful in everyday practice.

It is important to critically evaluate research and research findings, including checking that research has been carried out in the proper way, and whether the conclusions that have been made are reasonable and justified. One of the ways in which the scientific community ensures the quality of research is through the process of peer review.



About this issue

The mention of 'research' can be off-putting and may seem irrelevant in the busy environment of a clinic or hospital. However, research is central to all aspects of eye care delivery, both inside and outside the clinic. A working knowledge of research – both how it is done, and how it can be used – is important for everyone involved in direct patient care and the planning & delivery of eye programmes. We hope this issue will inspire you to learn more and perhaps even get involved.

Contents

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1 Why does research matter?
Victor H Hu</p> <p>5 The principles of good eye care research
Clare Gilbert and GVS Murthy</p> <p>7 Using research findings in my everyday practice: what is good evidence, where do I look, and how can I use it?
Victor H Hu, Jagadesh C Reddy, Dhivya Rauniya and Elmien Wolvaardt</p> <p>9 How the World Health Organization developed the <i>Guide for Action</i>
Andreas S Mueller, Alarcos Cieza and Stuart Keel</p> <p>10 Small-scale eye care research: why and how to do it
Esmael Habtamu, Priya Morjaria and Suzanne Gilbert</p> <p>13 Eye health: what research is needed, and where?
Jacqueline Ramke and Elena Schmidt</p> | <p>14 Building local capacity in operational research: a case study in Nepal and India
Suzanne S Gilbert, GVS Murthy and Kenneth L Bassett</p> <p>17 The benefits of developing research skills: an ophthalmologist's perspective
Ciku Mathenge</p> <p>19 Understanding the facilitators and barriers to integrating trachoma interventions into routine health systems
Sarity Dodson, Alemu Gemechu, Yeneneh Mulugeta Deneke, Mitiku Bekere and Shambel Belete</p> <p>21 How the World Council of Optometry produced new guidelines for myopia management
Peter Hendicott and Sandra S Block</p> <p>23 Optic neuropathies that mimic glaucoma
Michelle Dinsdale, José Manuel Guajardo-Beroiza, Jibrán Mohamed-Noriega and Neeru Amrita Vallabh</p> |
|--|--|

Before research papers are accepted for publication in a scientific journal, they are reviewed by other researchers (peer reviewed) to check the quality of the research and the validity of the results and conclusions. Even so, the quality of published research can vary.

This is why systematic reviews and meta-analyses are so valuable: they answer important questions by identifying, evaluating, and summarising good quality evidence from a range of published research papers. Often, systematic reviews conclude that there is not enough evidence to answer a question with absolute certainty, or to produce an answer that will be applicable in different countries or health care settings. This is useful, as it gives researchers

Types of health research

Basic science research, such as in molecular genetics or cell biology, fills the gaps in our understanding of disease mechanisms (pathogenesis).

Clinical research addresses how diseases in individuals can present and be diagnosed, and how a condition progresses and can be managed.

Epidemiological research, which is at the population level (as opposed to the individual level), answers questions about the number of people in the population who have a condition, what factors (called exposures) are causing the condition, and how it can be treated or prevented at the population level.

Going beyond epidemiology, there is also **operational and health systems research**, which focuses on how best to deliver health interventions, clinical and rehabilitation services, or behaviour change initiatives.

Other types of research, which are also important for public health, include health economics, social science, and statistical modelling.

Finally, **systematic literature reviews** can be very useful, as they identify and summarise the available evidence on a specific topic.

By Clare Gilbert and GVS Murthy

Community Eye Health Journal
VOLUME 35 • NUMBER 117 • 2022



INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR EYE HEALTH



Editor-in-Chief
Elmien Wolvaardt
editor@cehjournal.org

Editor: South Asia Edition
Kriti Shukla

Medical Editor
Victor Hu

Consulting Editor: issue 117
Victor Hu

Editorial Administrator
Anita Shah
admin@cehjournal.org

Online and social media
Astrid Leck
Hugh Bassett
Romulo Fabunan

Editorial Committee
Simon Arunga (Uganda)
João M Furtado (Brazil)
Clare Gilbert (UK)

Esmael Habtamu (Ethiopia)
Fatima Kyari (Nigeria)
Ciku Mathenge (Rwanda)
Nyawira Mwangi (Kenya)
GVS Murthy (India)
Heiko Philippin (Germany)
Thulsiraj Ravilla (India)
Serge Resnikoff (Geneva)
Jude Stern (Australia)
Sumrana Yasmin (Pakistan)
David Yorston (UK)

Editorial Advisors
Nick Astbury (Partnerships)
John Buchan (Ophthalmology)
Jenny Evans (Systematic reviews)
Michelle Hennelly (Ophthalmic nursing)
Islay Mactaggart (Disability)
Priya Marjoria (Optometry)
Daksha Patel (Education)

Regional Consultants
Hannah Faal (AFR)
Kovin Naidoo (AFR)
Van Lansingh (AMR)
Andrea Zin (AMR)
Ian Murdoch (EUR)
Janos Nemeth (EUR)
GVS Murthy (SEAR)
R Thulsiraj (SEAR)
Babar Qureshi (EMR)
Mansur Rabiu (EMR)
Leshan Tan (WPR)
Hugh Taylor (WPR)

Design
Lance Bellers

Printing
Newman Thomson

Proofreading
Astrid Leck
Anita Shah

Download our app
Download the free *Community Eye Health Journal* app today:
bit.ly/CEHJ-app

Visit us online
www.cehjournal.org

Subscribe
Visit: www.cehjournal.org/subscribe
Email: web@cehjournal.org
Readers in low- and middle-income countries receive print copies free of charge. To subscribe, send your name, occupation, and postal address to:
Anita Shah, International Centre for Eye Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Keppel Street, London WC1E 7HT, UK.
Email: admin@cehjournal.org

guidance about where more research is needed (see article on page 13).

But this can be a challenge for clinicians – how can we make good decisions in the absence of definitive evidence? Clinical experience is very important, but where possible this should be informed by good research – see page 6 for practical tips.

Health care practitioners and managers can also use guidance from professional bodies such as the World Health Organization. The article on page 8 explains the process by which guidelines are developed and shows why we can rely on them.

In conclusion, research is fundamental to the everyday practice of health care professionals, including eye care workers. Research allows us to find out new things and to provide better care for patients. There are many different types of research that can be carried out and these can vary enormously. It is important to ask the right question, as this will determine the type of research that is done (see page 5).

All of us can participate in research: it starts with asking questions and then going to find out the answers. The article on page 10 offers practical suggestions for carrying out small-scale research that is relevant and useful to eye care.

Examples of research questions and how they have been answered

Can povidone iodine prevent endophthalmitis?

In many eye departments, cataract surgery is a frequently preformed operation. One of the most serious complications is infection within the eye (endophthalmitis) which can lead to loss of vision. Several well conducted randomised controlled clinical trials have shown that instilling 0.5% aqueous povidone iodine eye drops, an antiseptic agent, before surgery reduces the risk of this devastating infection, with the first trial undertaken in 1991.¹

What is the best treatment for primary open-angle glaucoma?

Chronic glaucoma can be a very difficult condition to manage, particularly when patients often only present to eye departments once they have already had significant vision loss. Eye drops which lower intraocular pressure are often prescribed; however, patients may not use the eyedrops because they are expensive, can be difficult to instil, and do not improve their vision. Surgery is an option, but patients can be reluctant to undergo surgery on their only good eye, and there can be postoperative complications. Laser

treatment is another option. In a recent study in Tanzania, patients were randomly allocated to Timolol 0.5% eye drops or a form of laser called Selective Laser Trabeculoplasty (SLT).² After one year, SLT was found to be superior to drops for high-pressure glaucoma.

Why don't older adults in England have their eyes examined?

Focus group discussions among older adults in England revealed that, despite most participants being eligible for state-funded check-ups, wearing spectacles was associated with the appearance of being frail. They were also afraid of appearing to 'fail' tests, and had concerns about the cost of spectacles.³

How cost effective is a diabetic retinopathy screening programme?

An economic evaluation in South Africa compared alternative interventions. Screening using non-mydriatic retinal photographs taken by a technician supervised by an ophthalmic nurse and read by a general medical officer was cost-effective and the savings made allowed the government to fund disability grants for people who went blind.⁴

Acknowledgements

Stephen Gichuhi and Nyawira Mwangi contributed to preliminary work on this article.

References

- 1 Speaker MG, Menikoff JA. Prophylaxis of endophthalmitis with topical povidone-iodine. *Ophthalmology*. 1991;98(12):1769-75.
- 2 Philippin H, Matayan E, Knoll KM, Macha E, Mbishi S, Makupa A, et al. Selective laser trabeculoplasty versus 0.5% timolol eye drops for the treatment of glaucoma in Tanzania: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2021;9(11):e1589-e99.
- 3 Shickle D, Griffin M. Why don't older adults in England go to have their eyes examined? *Ophthalmic & physiological optics : the journal of the British College of Ophthalmic Opticians (Optometrists)*. 2014;34(1):38-45.
- 4 Khan T, Bertram MY, Jina R, Mash B, Levitt N, Hofman K. Preventing diabetes blindness: cost effectiveness of a screening programme using digital non-mydiatic fundus photography for diabetic retinopathy in a primary health care setting in South Africa. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract*. 2013;101(2):170-6.

Support our work

We rely on subscriptions and donations from charities and generous individuals to carry out our work.

To support us, visit:

www.cehjournal.org/donate

or contact Anita Shah:

admin@cehjournal.org

Published by the International Centre for Eye Health, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine.

Unless otherwise stated, authors share copyright for articles with the *Community Eye Health Journal*. Illustrators and photographers retain copyright for images published in the journal.

Please note that some articles are published online first and may have been shortened to fit the available space in this printed edition.

Unless otherwise stated, journal content is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY-NC) license which permits unrestricted use, distribution,

and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial purposes, provided that the copyright holders are acknowledged.

ISSN 0953-6833.

Disclaimer

Signed articles are the responsibility of the named authors alone and do not necessarily reflect the views of the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (the School). Although every effort is made to ensure accuracy, the School does not warrant that the information contained in this publication is complete and correct and shall not be liable for any damages incurred as a result of its use.

The mention of specific companies or of certain manufacturers' products does not imply that they are endorsed or recommended by the School in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned. The School does not endorse or recommend products or services for which you may view advertisements in this Journal.

The *Community Eye Health Journal* is supported by:





Allen Foster
Professor of International Eye Health: International Eye Health Centre, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK.

Case study: Clinical research

While working as an ophthalmologist in a hospital in Tanzania in the 1980s, I became interested in why so many children were blind due to corneal scarring. Keratomalacia (drying and clouding of the cornea) due to vitamin A deficiency had been reported in Asia, but Bitot's spots – normally associated with keratomalacia – were rarely seen in African children. The children's parents often said the eye problems and blindness was due to measles. In addition, herpes simplex keratitis had been reported as a cause of corneal ulceration after measles in Nigeria.

By good fortune, I met Prof Al Sommer, who was working on vitamin A deficiency in Indonesia and Nepal. With his advice and encouragement, we started a prospective study to investigate and photograph all cases of corneal ulceration in children who came to the hospital where I was working. Over three years, we documented 130 cases of corneal ulceration in children and found that, although herpes simplex virus was the commonest cause of ulceration overall, vitamin A deficiency was the major cause of bilateral ulceration, subsequent blindness, and mortality in this series of patients.

As so often happens, our research led to more questions and further studies, including one which



Giving vitamin A to a child. TANZANIA

showed that vitamin A supplementation reduced mortality in children hospitalised with measles. This work contributed to the evidence that led WHO and UNICEF in 1997 to announce a programme of vitamin A supplementation for children with measles.

What did I learn from this initial research experience?

- 1 Identify a clear research question
- 2 Take time to plan the study
- 3 Work with colleagues who have other expertise.

Further reading

Foster A, Sommer A. Corneal Ulceration in Tanzanian Children. *Br J Ophthalmol*. 1987;71:331-43.

Barclay AW, Foster A, Sommer A. Vitamin A Supplements and Mortality Related to Measles. *Randomised Clinical Trial*. *Br Medical J*. 1987;294(6567):294-6.



Ian McCormick
Research Fellow: International Centre for eye Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK.

The rapid assessment of avoidable blindness (RAAB) survey methodology

Rapid assessment of avoidable blindness (RAAB) is a population-based survey methodology that is designed to provide a simple and affordable – yet reliable – estimate of the prevalence and causes of vision impairment and blindness among people aged 50 years and older in a defined population.¹

The locally relevant data that RAAB surveys provide are used by governments and non-governmental eye health service providers to support evidence-based eye care planning, eye service monitoring and evaluation. RAAB is therefore an important tool in achieving the global eye health priorities set out by the World Health Organization's World Report on Vision and the Lancet Global Health Commission on Global Eye Health.^{2,3}

RAAB surveys provide the majority of the data used to estimate the global and regional prevalence and causes of vision impairment, as well as data which are vital for tracking progress towards eye health within universal health coverage, such as effective cataract surgical coverage and effective refractive error coverage.^{4,5}

The RAAB repository (www.raab.world) collates RAAB survey results and datasets and makes them available for secondary analyses; data from 118 of the 330 RAABs carried out since 2000 have been made available for this purpose. We encourage more RAAB survey principal investigators and data owners to share their data via the repository, so that the global eye health community collectively can have a more comprehensive and powerful evidence base for research and advocacy.



Visual acuity testing during a RAAB survey. MEXICO

References

- 1 Mactaggart I, Limburg H, Bastawrous A, et al. Rapid Assessment of Avoidable Blindness: looking back, looking forward. *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2019; 103: 1549-1552. 2019/07/04. DOI: 10.1136/bjophthalmol-2019-314015.
- 2 World Health Organization. World report on vision. 2019. Geneva.
- 3 Burton MJ, Ramke J, Marques AP, et al. The Lancet Global Health Commission on Global Eye Health: vision beyond 2020. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2021; 9: e489-e551. DOI: 10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30488-5.
- 4 Bourne R, Steinmetz JD, Flaxman S, et al. Trends in prevalence of blindness and distance and near vision impairment over 30 years: an analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2021; 9: e130-e143. DOI: 10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30425-3.
- 5 Steinmetz JD, Bourne RRA, Briant PS, et al. Causes of blindness and vision impairment in 2020 and trends over 30 years, and prevalence of avoidable blindness in relation to VISION 2020: the Right to Sight: an analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study. *The Lancet Global Health* 2021; 9: e144-e160. DOI: 10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30489-7.



Clare Gilbert
Professor of International Eye Health: International Centre for Eye Health, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK.



GVS Murthy
Director: Indian Institute of Public Health, Hyderabad, India.

The principles of good eye care research

Eye health research is important for closing the gaps in our knowledge, but it should be ethical and based on sound scientific principles.

The purpose of research is to fill the gaps in our knowledge by providing evidence that we can trust and build on. This applies to all areas of research, whether astrophysics, education, housing, or health.

Well-conducted health research provides a solid basis for decision-making in clinical management, planning of health services, and deciding what further studies are needed. In the absence of research evidence, we tend to make decisions based on our own experiences and assumptions or based on what our more senior colleagues say. However, if we want to give our service users the best possible care, it is important to realise that our own experience – and that of our senior colleagues – may be limited, subjective, or even biased.

Making decisions on the basis of sound evidence, whenever possible, is far more effective and ethical.

Unfortunately, most eye health research is undertaken in high-income countries, and the findings may not apply to other settings for a number of reasons – e.g., ethnic differences in disease presentation and treatment. Undertaking local research, which addresses local needs and knowledge gaps, is essential.

Research starts with a question

Regardless of the type of research, a critical first step is to form a research question, which may or may not be based on a hypothesis (defined as a supposition or proposed explanation, made on the basis of limited evidence, as a starting point for further investigation). The question should be clear, specific, and concise. Getting the question right is of critical importance, as the research objectives and methods, as well as the kind of participants to be recruited, depend on the research question.

Gathering data

The data collected in studies can be quantitative, such as the number of people who attend for cataract surgery and their age and sex; or qualitative, such as asking people for their opinions or views on a particular topic.

Sometimes, quantitative and qualitative methods are both helpful. As an example, let's suppose that a high proportion of people identified in outreach with operable cataract do not attend for cataract surgery.



Involving several researchers helps to improve objectivity. ST LUCIA

We may assume that the costs of transport and surgery are the main problems. But, despite the offer of free transport and free surgery only half of these people come for surgery. The research question could be: **What are the characteristics of people with operable cataract identified in outreach who do not attend for surgery at the base hospital and why do they not attend?** The aim would be “to describe the characteristics of people with operable cataract identified during outreach who do not access cataract surgery compared with those who do, and to identify the reasons they give for not accessing surgery”. The first group of participants would need to be traced, as they did not attend for surgery.

This research question has two parts:

- 1 **Who are the people who do and do not access surgery?**
- 2 **Why do some people not access surgery?**

To answer part 1 of the research question above, a questionnaire would need to be designed to collect data on the age, sex, and circumstances of people attending and not attending for cataract surgery. Medical records could be used for patients who do undergo surgery, but routinely collected hospital data may not provide all the information needed. To find out more about who is not coming for surgery, a survey could be done to find out more about both groups of patients, e.g., their marital status, socioeconomic status, place of residence, level of education, the size of their household, the gender of the head of their household, etc. This is a **quantitative study**.

To answer part 2, the same questionnaire could include questions about possible reasons that patients did or did not attend for surgery. There could be a list of possible reasons (decided by the researchers) that participants who did not undergo surgery can respond to with either a ‘yes’ or ‘no’, or a list from which they can select one or more options. This approach allows the most important reasons to be determined, as the

data collected are quantitative (i.e., the answers can be counted). The limitation of this approach is that the possible reasons participants can choose from will be limited by the researchers' current understanding of the most likely or common reasons.

A way to find out more is to use **qualitative methods**, e.g., interviewing people who did not come for surgery and asking them open-ended questions. For example, it would be useful to know what they understand about their eye condition and what caused it, as these factors greatly influence how people behave. So a question could be: "Please can you explain what you think is wrong with your eyes?" followed by "What do you think caused your eye problem?" And then, "Please can you tell me why you did not attend the hospital for cataract surgery?" After a reason has been given, the next question can be: "Are there any other reasons?" The advantage of this type of data is that participants can also be asked how they made their decision about the surgery, whether anything or anyone influenced their decision and how, and what might help them to access cataract surgery. What the participants say in the interviews is then carefully analysed to identify the main reasons and solutions, which can inform further action to improve uptake.

It is important to note that quantitative and qualitative study designs require and use different research methods, which influence how many participants are required, how they are selected, and how data are collected and analysed. Quantitative and qualitative studies are not, therefore, interchangeable as they answer different research questions; the best way is to use both, as they complement each other. In this example, researchers could select a smaller group of patients who did not attend and have informal, qualitative discussions with them – either individually or in small groups (known as focus groups) – to discover possible reasons for non-attendance. These reasons can then be used in a quantitative survey, which is quick to administer and can be more easily analysed.

Being objective

When conducting research of any kind, it is important to be objective, which means that you do not start the research with preconceived ideas about what the results might show – an open mind is essential. This means that the data collected, whether quantitative or qualitative, should not be influenced by the researchers at any stage in the research process, i.e., when the study is being designed and planned, or while data are being collected, analysed, and interpreted. These influences can lead to bias, which is defined as any systematic error in the design, conduct, or analysis of a study. For example, bias can occur if study participants are not appropriately selected, and care is not taken in how data are collected from them. There are several ways to avoid or reduce bias in health research, which include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Involve several researchers in the study from the outset and discuss every aspect. Ask experienced, independent researchers for their opinions.
- Carefully design all questionnaires and interview questions so that they are clear and unambiguous, and do not lead participants to respond in a particular way. These should be tested on a small number

of participants first (known as pilot testing). The questionnaires or interview questions can be then modified, if necessary, before the main study takes place.

- Carefully select and rigorously train the fieldworkers who will collect the data, and monitor their performance during data collection. Poorly performing field workers may need to be retrained or replaced.
- Carefully select study participants to make sure they represent the group of people with the health condition or problem being investigated (important in quantitative studies) or are likely to reflect a range of perspectives (in qualitative research).
- Always take objective measurements whenever possible: e.g., take images of the retina that are later graded by experts or trained graders, rather than relying on clinical grading.
- Decide exactly how data will be analysed before data collection takes place, and keep to the analysis plan.
- Always report all the key findings of a study, even if they surprise or disappoint you.

“Do not start the research with preconceived ideas about what the results might show – an open mind is essential.”

Ethics

As in all research involving people, the ethical implications need to be carefully considered from the start. For example:

- Ensure the study is of high scientific value and researchers have the skills to deliver all aspects of it.
- Take informed consent from all participants to ensure they fully understand the study, the procedures, and possible side effects/harm.
- Take particular care when obtaining consent from vulnerable groups, which include children, the very elderly, the very sick, those with a mental health condition, and individuals in institutions.
- Make participants aware that they are free to leave the study at any time without having to give a reason.
- Protect the anonymity of study participants by asking for their consent to record interviews (if interviewing) and using anonymous quotes.
- Maintain strict confidentiality of all data (text files, databases, images, etc.) by using password-protected computer storage with access restricted to the researchers only.
- Ensure that compensation for participants (if being considered) is not so large as to persuade them to take part against their better judgement, but is enough to cover out-of-pocket costs (e.g., travel).
- Obtain approval from the relevant ethics committee or institutional review boards.
- Always provide services for those with a clinical need for care (the principle of 'no science without service').

Conclusions

Broad-ranging eye health research is required to provide evidence on which to base clinical decisions. Studies must be of a high scientific and ethical standard, and be conducted in a rigorous manner at every stage: from designing the study, through to collecting, analysing, and interpreting the data, and writing up the findings for dissemination. This applies to all studies, regardless of size.



Victor H Hu
 Assistant Clinical Professor:
 International Centre for Eye Health (ICEH) LSHTM, and Consultant Ophthalmologist, Mid Cheshire NHS Hospitals, UK.



Jagadesh C Reddy
 Founder and Managing Director:
 Pristine Eye Hospitals Hyderabad, India.



Dhivya Rauniyar
 Senior Optometrist:
 Pristine Eye Hospitals Hyderabad, India.



Elmien Wolvaardt
 Editor-in-Chief:
Community Eye Health Journal, ICEH, LSHTM, London, UK.

Using research findings in my everyday practice: what is good evidence, where do I look, and how can I use it?

The findings from research studies and best practice guidelines should form the foundation of eye care delivery.

As a health care practitioner, you are not best serving your patients if you make decisions based only on your experience and what you learnt during training – especially if you trained some time ago! Although both these sources of learning are valuable, they are not enough. Modern health practitioners are expected to stay up to date with the latest knowledge relevant to their field and to practice evidence-based medicine.

Evidence-based medicine is about using the best available evidence, combined with your own clinical expertise, to make decisions about a patient's health care that respect their values and expectations. But what is the best available evidence, and how can you find it?

If you consider that thousands of research articles are published in eye care journals every year, and that many of them charge high fees for access, it's no surprise that staying up to date with all the latest research in your field is a challenge for most people.

Instead, you may find yourself looking for evidence to answer a specific question. For example, say that you've heard about the potential of collagen crosslinking to prevent the progression of keratoconus, and you want to know whether to start using it. What is the evidence that it works, and that it is safe?

Levels of evidence

Before you start looking for evidence, it is helpful to remind yourself of the different levels of evidence (see panel). Strong sources of evidence, such as systematic reviews, allow you to be more confident in the decisions you make; however, when such evidence is not available, it is useful to know what other types of evidence to look for.

Finding relevant research

PubMed (www.pubmed.gov) is a large, open access (i.e., free of charge), online database which contains many of the medical research studies which are conducted around the world. Because it is free, and comprehensive, it is a useful starting point when looking for studies on a particular topic.

Another good reason for using PubMed, is that the website makes it easy to filter search results in several useful ways.

For example, try typing the keywords "corneal crosslinking keratoconus" into the search box on the PubMed home page. This produces over 1,800 results. It would be very difficult for an individual clinician to go through all of these before deciding whether to start performing crosslinking.

Figure 1 Search results on Pubmed: www.pubmed.gov




Figure 2 Selecting article type

Abstract

Free full text

Full text

ARTICLE ATTRIBUTE

Associated data

ARTICLE TYPE

Books and Documents

Clinical Trial

Meta-Analysis

Randomized Controlled Trial

Review

Systematic Review

Did you notice the panel highlighted on the left of the search results in Figure 1? These are options for limiting or 'filtering' the results by year, by the availability of the text, article attributes, article type, and so on.

Referring to the levels of evidence in the panel, and based on how much time we have available, we could decide to limit the PubMed search to randomised controlled trials, which provide a strong level of evidence. To do this, look further down the panel (see Figure 2) and tick the "Randomized Controlled Trial" box under "Article type." This produces only 85 results. If we limit the results to meta-analysis (a statistical analysis of the results produced by several studies) by ticking that box instead, there are just 23 results for us to evaluate and draw conclusions from.

Looking at well conducted systematic reviews and/or meta-analyses can save a lot of time compared to reading individual studies on a particular area. The Cochrane Library provides some of the highest quality and most trusted reviews available and it is always worthwhile to see if they have done a review on a particular topic: visit www.cochranelibrary.com.

Good practice guidelines

Despite having access to new online tools such as PubMed, it can still be a challenge to answer all the different questions you face every day by searching for research publications. A practical alternative for busy eye care workers is to use trustworthy, best-evidence clinical practice guidelines.¹ These are drawn up by teams of people with research experience and knowledge of the area being addressed, who have looked through all the research evidence themselves in a systematic manner. They weigh up all the evidence and come to a balanced judgement on the outcome and what it means for clinical practice. Examples of such guidelines include guidelines from the National Institute of Health and Care Excellence (NICE) in the UK,² the Preferred Practice Patterns from the American Academy of Ophthalmology,³ and many others, including disease-specific international societies.

Levels of evidence

The evidence in this list is arranged from strongest to weakest. Note that each level can be of high or low quality and have a high or low risk of bias or confounding.

- 1 **Systematic review of randomised controlled trials.** Systematic reviews look at all the studies that have been done on a specific health problem, selecting and assessing them using rigorous, standardised methods. It may include a meta-analysis, which is a statistical analysis of the quantitative results of the studies included in the systematic review. **Meta-analyses** can provide a more precise estimate of an effect than is possible by looking at individual studies.
- 2 **Randomised controlled trial (RCT).** Participants in the study are randomly allocated into groups, usually to receive or not receive an experimental treatment or intervention. The random allocation helps to ensure a fair comparison (see article 5: Good Research)
- 3 **Systematic review of cohort or case-control studies.**
- 4 **Cohort study.** This usually involves many study participants who are observed over a long period (commonly years). The onset of a particular disease (e.g., cancer) can then be compared between people with different levels of exposure (e.g., number of cigarettes smoked).
- 5 **Case-control study.** People who have a disease (cases, e.g., those with cancer) are compared to a similar group of people (e.g., same age, sex, and socioeconomic level) who don't have the disease (controls). Researchers then work out the level of exposure in the past (e.g., number of cigarettes smoked) and compare them between the two groups.
- 6 **Case series or case reports.** A single report, or a series of reports, involving patients with a particular disease and who may have been given a similar treatment.
- 7 **Expert opinion.** This is used where research studies haven't been done on a particular area and people who have experience or expertise on a particular area say what their opinion is.

Please see the references for more detailed definitions.

It is also important to look at national guidelines which have been drawn up in a particular country. You may even decide to help draw up suitable guidelines for your country or region; these would consider the needs of the local population, the skills of local health workers, and the availability of personnel, equipment, and medicines. The AGREE reporting checklist offers guidance that can help clinicians to evaluate whether a guideline is of high quality or not. It is equally valuable when drawing up clinical guidance.⁴

Incorporating evidence into everyday practice

The findings from research studies and best practice guidelines should form the foundation of eye care delivery. Alongside this, clinical experience and expertise also form very important aspects of good eye care. Experienced and able clinicians will use evidence in their work but will understand the situation of a particular patient (their medical and social history, risks for that patient, likely adherence to treatment, and so on), what is feasible/realistic in a particular health care context, and where there are gaps in the evidence. Another very important factor to consider is what patients themselves prefer once they have had the different options clearly and coherently explained to them. Practicing medicine is an art as well as a science, and it is important to personalise the management approach for each patient.

References

- 1 Tikkinen KAO, Guyatt GH. Understanding of research results, evidence summaries and their applicability-not critical appraisal-are core skills of medical curriculum. *BMJ Evid Based Med.* 2021; 26(5):231-3.
- 2 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. NICE guidance. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance>.
- 3 American Academy of Ophthalmologists. Preferred Practice Patterns. <https://www.aao.org/about-preferred-practice-patterns>.
- 4 AGREE reporting checklist. <https://www.agreetrust.org/resource-centre/agree-reporting-checklist/>



Andreas S Mueller

Technical Advisor:
Sensory Functions,
Disability and
Rehabilitation Unit,
World Health
Organization,
Geneva, Switzerland.



Alarcos Cieza

Coordinator:
Sensory Functions,
Disability and
Rehabilitation Unit,
World Health
Organization,
Geneva, Switzerland.



Stuart Keel

Technical Officer:
Sensory Functions,
Disability and
Rehabilitation Unit,
World Health
Organization,
Geneva, Switzerland.

How the World Health Organization developed the *Guide for Action*

The World Health Organization is often called upon to develop global guidance; here is how a range of evidence and expertise was used to develop one such guide.

Member States of the World Health Organization (WHO) adopted a resolution on integrated people-centred eye care at the 73rd World Health Assembly in 2021. The resolution urged Member States to implement this new approach to eye care in their own health systems, and tasked WHO with developing a set of tools and guidelines to support this process. This led to the development of the *Guide for Action* (the *Guide*), which was published in May 2022.¹

How was the *Guide* developed?

Establishment of expert groups

WHO established groups made up of experts in the fields of public health and methodology, as well as clinical experts from the field of eye care. A total of 360 experts were selected based on recommendations from professional associations and existing WHO networks, and to ensure balanced representation with respect to gender, geographical region, and income setting; their declarations of interest were also assessed. The groups provided technical input throughout the process of developing the *Guide* and its accompanying tools.

Scoping and systematic reviews

The groups, in collaboration with methodologists and academics from relevant disciplines, carried out literature reviews to identify the best available evidence that could inform the development of each tool. The literature reviews were published in well-known academic journals, which means they were subjected to independent and rigorous peer review.

Expert consensus

A stepwise process was then carried out among each expert group to achieve consensus on the technical elements of the tools. This included obtaining input from experts via online surveys, hosting virtual group consultations, and getting independent written feedback. Decision making was guided by two criteria:


- 1 What is the evidence for each tool?
- 2 Are they practical, and could they be realistically

Reference

- 1 Eye care in health systems: guide for action. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2022. bit.ly/GuideAction

Figure 1 The WHO Guide for Action's Analyse, Plan, Do, Review cycle

Analyse, Plan and Do –
approximately
3–5 years



The *Guide for Action* offers step-by-step support to member countries to plan, implement, and monitor integrated people-centred eye care. It recommends that countries carry out an 'Analyse-Plan-Do-Review' cycle (Figure 1) by using the four tools developed alongside the *Guide*.

The primary audiences for the *Guide* are governments of low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) and the agencies working with them; it is designed for use at the national level but can also be used at the sub-national level.

For further information on the *Guide*, please visit: bit.ly/GuideAction. To learn more about integrated people-centred eye care, sign up for the course here: bit.ly/3EQQHmH

implemented within low- and middle-income countries?

Peer review

Each tool underwent peer review to obtain feedback and recommendations for revisions. Peer reviewers included individuals from relevant WHO departments as well as eye care and public health experts.

Next steps

Government health planners and service providers, as well as non-governmental organisations supporting eye care, are now encouraged to use the *Guide* as needed.

In order to successfully implement action and improve eye care sustainably, it is important for governments to take lead in the implementation of the *Guide*, and for governments to ensure that any plans they develop are aligned and integrated within wider health plans and budgets.



Esmael Habtamu

Assistant Professor in Eye Health: International Centre for Eye Health, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK and Chief Executive Director: Eyu-Ethiopia Eye Health Research, Training and Service Centre, Bahirdar, Ethiopia.



Priya Morjaria

Assistant Professor and Public Health Optometrist: London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine and Head of Global Programme Design: Peek Vision, UK.



Suzanne Gilbert

Senior Director, Research & Strategic Opportunities Seva Foundation, Berkeley, CA, USA

Small-scale eye care research: why and how to do it

In resource-limited settings, small-scale research can focus on community-specific development needs and provide answers to context-specific challenges through pragmatic enquiry and data synthesis.



Collecting data through a community-based interview ETHIOPIA

Research is a systematic investigation of new or existing concepts, methodologies, and understanding. This systematic investigation can be done on a large or small scale. Table 1 summarises key differences between large- and small-scale research. Large-scale research is often needed for questions that require greater statistical reliability and generalisability. However, in resource-limited settings, the barriers to conducting large-scale research are often the financial and human resources required. Small-scale research, on the other hand, focuses on providing answers to context-specific challenges with limited resources, and does so through pragmatic enquiry and data synthesis. For instance, through the Integrated Management of Presbyopia in Rural Ethiopia (IMPiRE) study, we have piloted the feasibility and acceptability of integrated presbyopia management by primary health care workers as part of the routine primary health care (PHC) system, in four PHC facilities, with a very limited budget.

The focus of small-scale research is usually not generalisability or publication; rather, it is developmental, with the aim of making recommendations to address a particular challenge or to improve services.¹ Here we discuss some of the important aspects of conducting small-scale research.

Developing a scientific mindset

A common limiting factor in conducting small-scale research is the assumption that research has to be a complex and expensive undertaking. However, the quality of research doesn't depend upon its size or the resources it requires. Research can be simple, robust, and pragmatic. It can be conducted at minimal or no cost but be impactful. Developing a scientific mindset and culture is a vital starting point.

A scientific mindset is characterised by curiosity, open-mindedness, and scepticism.² Curiosity is constantly asking questions about why something works or doesn't work, how can it be improved, how a challenge can be addressed, and what tools are required to do this. For instance, in the IMPiRE pilot study, we were curious about whether we could improve the accessibility of presbyopia services for rural resource-limited communities.

Open-mindedness means to consider, at the beginning, that all possibilities are valid – until they are disproved. There should not be a predetermined idea of what works and what doesn't work until tested. In the IMPiRE study, we were ready for any possible result: for example, that the community and health service managers would either accept or not accept the delivery of presbyopia services by PHC workers.

However, such open-mindedness should also include systematic doubt or scepticism. As the research progresses, it is important to question procedures and results. This is related usually to questioning the quality of the research or the data produced. In the IMPiRE study, we needed to be clear about the procedure we used to conduct the study, and its limitations, so that the results could be interpreted within defined and sensible limits.

Curiosity, open-mindedness, and scepticism are linked, respectively, with developing the research question, formulating methodologies, and interpreting the results.

Research question

The first step in conducting any research is identifying the research question or challenge that needs to be investigated. In small-scale research, the questions that are addressed are those that are typically relevant

to the local context. Such questions often arise from curiosity about our clinical practices, engagement with stakeholders and the community, a review of medical records or reports, and questioning of the productivity, quality, access, or equity of the services delivered, and so on.

The most common types of small-scale research and the questions they try to address are listed in Table 2.

Our IMPIRE pilot study was conceived because presbyopia management services that can address the need of rural communities in Ethiopia are lacking. We wanted to answer the question: “How feasible and acceptable is the integrated management of presbyopia by primary health care workers in rural Ethiopia?”

Data collection and synthesis

By design, small-scale research data collection can be done with limited human resources, time, and money. Data that are gathered from facility-based services and resources as part of the routine health information system can be synthesised to answer various small-scale research questions related to service access, quality, and equity. Facility-based data, if analysed and interpreted appropriately, has the potential to provide ongoing evidence on service coverage and equitable utilisation, and to do so more efficiently than expensive population-based surveys.³ For instance, disaggregating data by gender, location, socioeconomic indicators, and disability status can help to quickly paint a picture of who is accessing the services and whether the eye care needs of the community are being met equitably. This indicates whether progress is being made towards achieving universal eye health coverage. Service quality monitoring data, such as for cataract surgery or diabetic eye care, can easily be incorporated into routine facility-based data collection without the need for additional resources.

One of the strengths of small-scale research is the flexibility of its design. Data can be collected in a way that is appropriate to the context, but still be systematic so that it can support reliable interpretation. Like any research, different quantitative and qualitative methods can be used in small-scale research.

Primary data can be systematically collected from small groups of people through observation or interviews embedded within clinical and community-based activities. For instance, interviews or focus group discussions can be used in patient satisfaction surveys or to collect feedback on the experience of health workers in a specific programme. In the IMPIRE project, we directly observed presbyopia service delivery by a PHC worker and conducted in-depth interviews with community members and health service managers to collect data on feasibility and acceptability.

Secondary data can be systematically collected from randomly selected medical records to assess the prognosis of a specific intervention in a particular clinical setting.

“Primary data can be systematically collected from small groups of people through observation or interviews embedded within clinical and community-based activities.”



© NATANIEL KOKEB CC BY-NC-SA 4.0

Ethics

As with any other type of research, ethics should be at the centre of small-scale research. Adherence to the ethical standards and requirements of the setting is paramount. Anonymity, confidentiality, and voluntary participation should be strictly maintained while reviewing medical records and engaging with patients and other vulnerable groups.

Data interpretation

A healthy dose of scepticism is required when interpreting all research data, but more so when carrying out small-scale research. Findings should be interpreted with caution, as the study purpose is more concerned with improving a service or addressing

contextual challenges through manageable recommendations, than with measuring the impact through statistical or monetary indicators. Data from small-scale research can often be analysed using easily accessible spreadsheet software and presented descriptively; provided the study is planned carefully, complex data analysis tools are not needed.

Regardless of the quality of the data presented, causality can rarely be inferred from small-scale studies,

as sample sizes are usually too small to produce statistically significant quantitative results. Controlling for different variables and confounders are likewise challenging.

The peer review process is an integral part of research data interpretation. However, small-scale research will often not have a chance for rigorous debate and review from a wider readership through a publication process. On the other hand, small-scale research can benefit from ‘collaborative review’ – where partners

Collecting data through clinical investigations.
ETHIOPIA

such as health care managers, health workers, and stakeholders, including patients and community leaders, are involved in data interpretation.

For example, our IMPIRE pilot study provided useful data that were presented to and discussed with eye health stakeholders. Its results fed into context-specific recommendations, appropriate to the pilot study districts, and led to a large-scale research proposal

that would involve investigating the equitability, quality, sustainability, and impact of the integrated management of presbyopia in a low-resource setting.

Overall, small-scale research is not conducted to test theories, but primarily to benefit the organisation conducting the research or the community it is serving. Therefore, the whole process should be a learning experience for all partners involved.¹

Table 1 Key differences between large- and small-scale research

Criteria	Large-scale research	Small-scale research
Research question	Theory evaluation or testing intervention; often relevant to the wider discipline	Typically, relevant to local and context-specific challenges
Design	Focus on greater statistical reliability and generalisability	Flexible design with the focus on benefits to the local organisation or community
Ethics	Adherence to the appropriate ethical codes and guidelines	Adherence to the appropriate ethical codes and guidelines, plus consideration of any locally sensitive issues
Data collection	Requires separate, often complex, data collection tools and processes	Can be easily embedded within existing facility or community-based data collection
Resources	Costly in terms of time and money	No or minimal cost
Scale	Involves a large number of researchers, participants, and geographic areas or multiple sites	Conducted within the organisation or confined to a limited area with a small team of researchers and participants
Data measurement	Focuses on statistical or monetary standards	Focuses on producing manageable recommendations
Data interpretation	Both correlation and causality are possible, depending on the design	Needs greater caution; no causality can be inferred
Review	Peer review in publications	Collaborative review with stakeholders

Table 2 Examples of small-scale research questions

Common small-scale research examples	Research questions
Service quality monitoring	Are we delivering a service that meets the required quality standards? What are the reasons for poor surgical outcomes (for example, cataract) in our setting? How could a particular medical or surgical service outcome be improved?
Service coverage and equity analysis	Which group(s) of people are accessing our services (by gender, socio-economic status, location, or disability)? Why are some groups not accessing our services or are not being reached by service delivery? What can be done to improve equitable access to our services?
Health worker feedback surveys	How satisfied are health workers in their work environment or management system? What is the opinion of health workers about a particular intervention?
Client satisfaction surveys	Are we meeting the needs of the community we are serving? How satisfied are our clients with the service being delivered?
Feasibility studies	What are the logistical feasibility, degree of acceptability, and costs of implementing a new health care intervention or the scaling-up of an existing intervention?
Pilot studies	Does a particular tool, process, or intervention work in the way that it is intended?

References

- Hall I, Hall D. Evaluation and social research: introducing small-scale practice. London: Red Globe Press, 2004.
- Starwalker Studio. The scientific mindset. 2014 [Internet]. Available from: <https://bit.ly/3isfwGH>
- Ramke J, Mwangi N, Burn H, Habtamu E, Gilbert CE. Realizing the potential of routinely collected data for monitoring eye health services to help achieve universal health coverage. *IHOPE* J. 2022;1(1):5-8.



Jacqueline Ramke

Associate Professor Of Global Eye Health: International Centre for Eye Health, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK.



Elena Schmidt

Director of Evidence, Research and Innovations: Sightsavers United Kingdom, Haywards Heath, UK.

Eye health: what research is needed, and where?

Research in eye health is needed to fill evidence gaps, especially in low- and middle-income countries.

Research is key to our efforts to improve eye health and has been highlighted in recent global policies. Two of the five recommendations outlined in the World Health Organization's *World Report on Vision* focused on strengthening the quantity and quality of evidence available.¹

The *Lancet Global Health* Commission on Global Eye Health undertook a global study to identify the 'grand challenges' in global eye health. In this study, 470 people from 118 countries nominated and ranked the key issues that must be addressed to improve eye health at the global and regional levels.^{2,3} After a three-round process, the top five challenges in each region were identified (see <http://bit.ly/3Oy4xaR>) and 16 challenges were prioritised at the global level.³ The top 5 grand challenges globally are summarised in Figure 1.


Unfortunately, there are substantial gaps in the evidence on how to address these challenges. Evidence gap maps – a visual tool that shows the state of evidence from systematic reviews – were recently developed for cataract, glaucoma, trachoma, diabetic retinopathy, and unaddressed refractive error.⁴ These maps show that the number of systematic reviews summarising and assessing evidence relevant to eye care is growing. However, the available evidence is still dominated by clinical research (prevention, diagnosis, and treatment) and there are significant gaps in evidence about health systems related to eye care, and on how to improve access, equity, and cost-effectiveness of eye care services. In addition, there is unequal geographic representation among the studies included in most reviews, with most of the evidence being generated in Europe, the Americas, and the Western Pacific region.⁵

More research is needed to fill these evidence gaps, particularly in low- and middle-income countries. There is a need to invest more in vision impairment surveys to ensure the availability of accurate data to monitor progress towards universal eye health. Specific attention should also be given to implementation research: how to better connect people with the interventions that we know work, particularly cataract surgery and spectacles. Equally important is research which focuses on strategies that promote equity and improve access for historically underserved groups, as well as research to improve the cost-effectiveness and sustainability of eye care services.

Baseline estimates of service coverage

In 2020, at the 73rd World Health Assembly, all Member States committed to monitoring progress towards effective cataract and refractive error services coverage in the decade to 2030. However, many countries are without recent national baseline estimates of service coverage. Although around half the countries in the world had carried out at least one such survey between 2000 and 2020, many were conducted a long time ago or at sub-national (rather than national) level.

Figure 1 The top 5 grand challenges globally



References

- 1 World Health Organization. *World Report on Vision*. Geneva: WHO. 2019.
- 2 Burton M, Ramke J, Marques AP, et al. *Lancet Global Health Commission on Global Eye Health: Vision Beyond 2020*. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2021; 9(4):e489-e551.
- 3 Ramke J, Evans JR, Habtamu E, et al. *Grand Challenges in global eye health: a global prioritisation process using Delphi method*. *The Lancet Healthy Longevity*. 2022; 3(1): e31-e41.
- 4 Sightsavers Evidence Gap Maps. Available at: <https://research.sightsavers.org/evidence-gap-maps/>
- 5 Jolley E, Virendrakumar B, Pente V, Baldwin M, Mailu E, Schmidt E. *Evidence on cataract in low- and middle-income countries: an updated review of reviews using the evidence gap maps approach*. *International Health*. 2022;14:i68-i83.



Suzanne S Gilbert
Senior Director,
Research & Strategic
Opportunities:
Seva Foundation,
Berkeley, USA.



GVS Murthy
Director: Indian
Institute of Public
Health, Hyderabad,
India and Professor:
London School of
Hygiene and Tropical
Medicine, London, UK.



Kenneth L Bassett
Program Director,
Seva Canada and
Director: British
Columbia Centre for
Epidemiology and
International
Ophthalmology,
Vancouver, Canada.

**Operational
Research Capacity
Building Study
Group**
bit.ly/ORCB-study

Building local capacity in operational research: a case study in Nepal and India

A programme of mentor support and training has enabled eye teams in Nepal and India to carry out research to improve their own delivery of eye care services.

Operational research provides eye care personnel with evidence they can use to improve the equity, efficiency, and effectiveness of health services and systems.¹

Operational research builds on and uses monitoring and evaluation infrastructure, including routine administrative data and quality assurance programmes. It is relevant to almost all aspects of hospital and outreach services: reducing waiting times for cataract surgery, to testing the best ways of counselling patients to improve referral from a screening location. It does not include clinical research.


In 2019, the Indian Institute of Public Health – Hyderabad (IIPHH), together with Seva Foundation and Seva Canada (Seva), both international non-governmental organisations, launched the Operations Research Capacity Building (ORCB) programme. The goal of the programme was to strengthen operational research among four hospitals (three in Nepal and one in India) through a spectrum of activities and research projects, designed to be both opportunistic (to reflect immediate eye programme needs), and strategic (to optimise operational research capacity building, e.g., in health services, health systems, human resources, and public health).

The expected outcomes of the programme were as follows:

- 1 Eye hospitals would develop capacity to conduct operational research and experience the importance of evidence-informed practice.
- 2 Hospital management would understand the need for investing in operational research and provide dedicated resources for it.
- 3 Some of the partner hospitals would become research resource centers for their country or region.

The four hospitals who were invited to join had been involved with Seva previously. They all had an established appetite for research, support from their eye hospital leadership, and had at least one investigator in the team who had research skills at graduate level (e.g., MSc or PhD).

Figure 1 Operational research cycle



Mentorship model


Each interdisciplinary eye hospital team was assigned a dedicated mentor (from IIPHH) and a support person (from Seva) who consulted with the hospital-based team once a month, via Zoom. These sessions enabled the local teams to develop the skills needed to carry out the steps in the operational research cycle (Figure 1):

- analyse the root causes of any difficulties (through problem tree analysis)
- identify a research question
- conduct literature reviews
- create specific objectives
- finalise the research methodology, including sampling method and sample size estimation
- obtain ethical approval
- design data capture tools and code sheets
- implement the study
- conduct analyses
- prepare manuscripts for publication.

Additional support with data management, statistical analysis, and presentation of data was provided by a dedicated team based at IIPHH.

The partner hospital teams also attended a series of structured workshops (Figure 2), provided by a panel of research experts with expertise in a range of different disciplines.

Figure 2 At one of the workshops, the research teams generated ideas for operational research topics by category, e.g., efficiency of service delivery, quality of service delivery, coverage of service (relative to the population), and patient outcomes.



© SEVA FOUNDATION CC BY-NC-SA 4.0

Every two months, each of the four hospital teams gave a virtual progress update to one another and to the panel of research experts. Between these sessions, the dedicated mentors and support persons from IIPHH and Seva, respectively, met to refine next steps.

Outcomes

The mentorship process was resource intensive but yielded excellent results: to date, three of the four teams have published their research protocols in peer reviewed journals, and the fourth team’s manuscript has been submitted and is under review.

The participating institutions have become proficient in the key steps needed to carry out operational research, such as statistical analysis. Several of the hospital teams have started workshops and processes within their institutions designed to improve the quality of data collected and its systematic use in programme management, including sharing data analysis skills learnt during the workshops with team members at the hospital (Figure 3).

Figure 3 Gopal Bhandari shares STATA workshop learnings with Bharatpur Eye Hospital team members



© BHARATPUR EYE HOSPITAL CC BY-NC-SA 4.0

The operational challenges addressed by the four hospital teams are given below, alongside feedback from their team leaders.

Bharatpur Eye Hospital, Chitwan, Nepal: Improving the follow-up rates for pediatric department patients who are advised to return for follow-up visits.²

“This research training really helped me on the personal and professional level. Now, when I think about any problem, I think about the solution for the same. Initially I used to think research needs to be some big topic. But the day-to-day activities that we are doing, thinking about a new way to do it, also is research. We have set up a research team and have started training our internal staff as well as trying to build programs for other eye hospitals.”

– Manisha Shrestha, Pediatric Ophthalmologist

Reiyukai Eiko Masunaga Eye Hospital, Banepa, Nepal: Increasing the volume and uptake of retinal services (screening and treatment) through patient referrals from general community hospitals.³

“Through this workshop I learned how to identify a problem and analyse it. The research training and coaching was a great help to us. Through our intervention with the local general hospital, the number of referred people with Diabetic Retinopathy increased and there was a quite significant change in the knowledge of healthcare professionals. The project has brought a lot of changes in how our own team works.”

– Ruchi Shrestha, Medical Director and Vitreo-retinal Surgeon

Dr Shroff’s Charity Eye Hospital, New Delhi, India:

Determining the effect of screening and generating awareness in its three-million-person service area through a door-to-door intervention to increase the use of community-based vision centres.⁴

“During our research project the team learned about the seriousness of keeping good data and collecting different data points which may be contributing to the results in an indirect way. I think the way to go ahead is to make research like a culture. Have a group of people who are interested in starting small projects. We can make it a habit to collect that baseline data, which is important for comparison, and then see the impact in a very scientific way.”

– Shalinder Sabherwal, Head- Department of Community Ophthalmology and Public Health Research

Lumbini Eye Institute and Research Centre, Siddharthanagar, Nepal: Improving timely diabetic patient referral flow and compliance from peripheral eye centres to the main hospital.

“I have had a few publications and I was happy with it. This workshop gave me a deeper understanding of what research actually is. It has lead me to want to experience more. At the institutional level this project strengthened tracking of patient referrals which is very important for a tertiary setting. I feel very fortunate to be part of this team.”

– Binita Bhattarai, Associate Professor and Oculoplastic Surgeon

Future plans

The ORCB programme underscored the value of a long-term partnership and mentorship model in developing research skills in eye hospitals. While labour intensive, this level of long-term commitment seems necessary for programme success.

Two online courses are being developed as part of Seva's e-Learning platform, InSight, to make evidence competency a part of the skill development library. These courses will be accessible to eye care workers (anytime, anywhere) with less intensive mentoring input; they include a module on evidence-informed practice and an intermediate-level blended learning path for practitioners. For more information, please email Insight@seva.org

The authors would like to acknowledge the valuable contributions of all members of the Operational Research Capacity Building Study Group: bit.ly/ORCB-study

References

- 1 Bradley BD, Jung T, Verma AT, Khoury B, Chan CYT, Cheng YL. Operations Research in global health: a scoping review with a focus on themes of health equity and impact. *Health Serv Policy Systems* 2017; 32: 15.
- 2 Shrestha M, Bhandari G, Rathi SK, Gudlavalleti AG, Pandey B, Ghimire R, Ale D, Kayastha S, Chaudhary DS, Byanju R, Operational Research Capacity Building Study Group. Improving the Follow-up Rate for Pediatric Patients (0-16 years) of an Eye Hospital in Nepal: Protocol for a Public Health Intervention Study. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2021;10(10):e31578.
- 3 Shrestha R, Singh P, Dhakhwa P, Tetali S, Batchu T, Shrestha Thapa P. Augmenting the Referral Pathway for Retinal Services Among Patients With Diabetes Mellitus at Reiyukai Eiko Masunaga Eye Hospital, Nepal: Protocol for a Nonrandomized, Pre-Post Intervention Study. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2021;10(12):e33116.
- 4 Sabherwal S, Chinnakaran A, Sood I, Garg GK, Singh BP, Shukla R, Reddy PA, Gilbert S, Bassett K, Murthy GVS, Operational Research Capacity Building Study Group. Effect of Door-to-Door Screening and Awareness Generation Activities in the Catchment Areas of Vision Centers on Service Use: Protocol for a Randomized Experimental Study. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2021;10(11):e31951.



Ciku Mathenge
 Professor of Ophthalmology: University of Rwanda and Director of Training and Research: Rwanda International Institute of Ophthalmology, Rwanda.

The benefits of developing research skills: an ophthalmologist's perspective

Learning how to carry out research can help you to contribute to innovation in eye care and will expand your scope as a member of the eye team.

Research improves treatments and services for all of society. For ophthalmologists with an interest in research, there are many ways to develop further, such taking an online course for personal or professional development, undergoing training towards a certificate or diploma in clinical or public health research, or even pursuing a research degree such as a master's (MSc) or a doctoral (PhD) degree.

But why would you want to dedicate time and financial resources to this? Won't research become a distraction from your clinical work, and isn't it a waste of your clinical training? These are all valid questions, to be weighed against the many benefits of learning how to carry out research.

1. Learning how to carry out research can help you to answer your clinical questions or dilemmas

If you have a passion for discovering or understanding things, the skills you can learn by undertaking a research degree can be useful. Ophthalmologists working in Nakuru Eye unit in Kenya were puzzled when they regularly encountered adult prisoners with xerophthalmia and vitamin A deficiency; conditions



Teaching research skills to other members of the eye team. RWANDA

that are more often associated with children. One of the ophthalmologists, who was studying for a master's degree, used this opportunity to collect evidence about the relationship between the conditions at the prison and the cases of xerophthalmia they were seeing. This research benefited their patients, and also made their studies more relevant and meaningful.

2. You will become an expert in your field

A research degree gives you knowledge that you can build on to engage with complex topics in a specialised field. Understanding the epidemiology of retinal diseases motivated one PhD graduate to pursue a retina specialisation. This enabled them to become an expert in the field, and they are now in a position to further our knowledge about retinal ophthalmology and clinical challenges – by both developing theoretical approaches and testing their application through research.

3. You will learn how to communicate effectively and in a scientific manner

A research degree, besides helping you to develop expertise in your subject area, also teaches you how to share your findings with your peers and to develop research questions together. You will acquire communication skills that allow you to discuss complex topics with academics, health professionals and peers, both through oral presentations and in writing, including writing and reviewing papers for scientific journals. As you develop your communication skills, actively seeking feedback from others will help you to grow.

Combining clinical and research work. RWANDA



Learning research skills can benefit everyone in the eye team

Research skills can benefit everyone in the eye team. For nurses and clinical officers, developing research skills and/or undertaking a research degree can allow you to support clinical trials, contribute to the growing body of evidence that supports nursing and/or clinical officer practice, and build a career at an academic institution. Many optometrists also build academic and research careers after undertaking a research degree.

Each member of the eye care team has a unique skill set and perspective on eye care practice and delivery. Encouraging everyone with an interest in research to develop those skills and study further makes for very strong research teams that can accomplish great things.

Contributing to research and innovation also supports relevant, evidence-based clinical practice and contributes to education and training for everyone in the eye team; this in turn increases our capacity to reach more patients and provide better eye care.

If you want to see if research is for you, you can try this free online course in ophthalmic epidemiology, which introduces many of the analytical skills that form the basis of a research degree:

<https://www.lshtm.ac.uk/study/courses/short-courses/free-online-courses/ophthalmic-epidemiology>

“Encouraging everyone with an interest in research to develop those skills and study further makes for very strong research teams that can accomplish great things.”

As a next step, enquire with universities in your area about what research degree courses are available.

We know of two institutions (one in Cape Town, South Africa and one in London, UK) with master's degrees in public health with a focus on eye care; both have a strong research component. If you know of other institutions that offer similar, high quality courses, please get in touch so we can share their details with

other readers of the *Community Eye Health Journal*.

- The University of Cape Town offers the Master's of Public Health (Community Eye Health track) <http://www.cehi.uct.ac.za/master-public-health-community-eye-health-track-mpchceh>
- The London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, which publishes the *Community Eye Health Journal*, offers the MSc Public Health for Eye Care; scholarships are available for eye care professionals working in low- or middle-income countries. See <https://www.lshtm.ac.uk/study/courses/masters-degrees/public-health-eye-care>

4. You will become part of a group of engaged peers

During your training, you will learn alongside other motivated individuals, each bringing their own perspectives and experiences to the same problems. Over time, you can develop good working relationships with fellow students and academic staff members, who you can call on and who can call on you for future collaborations. Indeed, some research training institutions reach out to their alumni first when seeking collaborators.

5. You will get your academic career rolling

As noted above, a research degree accelerates you towards being a subject matter expert. It is also the most direct pathway to an academic job at a university where a master's or doctoral degree are almost always required. Other opportunities include employment in industrial research and development, or advising on government policy.

6. Expanding your network

Being engaged in research is a great chance to expand your network and meet diverse people with similar interests, knowledge, and passion. Taking part in virtual or in-person workshops or seminars, for example, enables you to gain new insights and build connections with other researchers, potential funders, and experts across borders.

7. Improves team approach and collaboration in service delivery

Research expands team members' knowledge about specific problems and broadens everyone's

understanding of the roles of each team member. This leads to better understanding of the need for collaborative problem solving and a team approach to service delivery.

In summary, a research degree provides an opportunity for you to undertake extensive and in-depth study in a chosen area of focus. You will gain other skills, for example: skills in analysis and critique, problem-solving skills, improved attention to detail, technological skills (including use of online research tools), and life skills that are fundamental to building a successful career: communication, professionalism, time management, and multitasking.

A multidisciplinary research team comprising nurses, ophthalmic nurses, ophthalmic clinical officers, optometrists, and an ophthalmologist on their way to undertake research.

KENYA



© FRED HOLLOWAY FOUNDATION CC BY-NC-SA 4.0



Sarity Dodson
Research Director:
The Fred Hollows
Foundation,
Melbourne, Australia.



Alemu Gemechu
Programme Manager:
The Fred Hollows
Foundation, Addis
Ababa, Ethiopia.



Yeneneh Mulugeta Deneke
Medical advisor for
Africa and the
Middle East: The
Fred Hollows
Foundation, Addis
Ababa, Ethiopia.



Mitiku Bekere
TT-surgery
Transitioning Project
Coordinator: The
Fred Hollows
Foundation, Addis
Ababa, Ethiopia.



Shambel Belete
NTD Technical Advisor:
Federal Ministry of
Health, Addis Ababa,
Ethiopia

Understanding the facilitators and barriers to integrating trachoma interventions into routine health systems

Identifying context-specific barriers to integration is essential to achieve the elimination of trachoma as a public health problem.

Achieving vision for all requires eye care services and health systems that are equipped to manage the full spectrum of eye conditions affecting populations. However, in many settings, interventions for trachoma, the world's leading infectious cause of blindness, are delivered outside of countries' routine health care system. In part, this is due to trachoma's classification as one of the neglected tropical diseases (NTDs) that are addressed via national NTD programmes. In other situations, this is necessary due to the lack of eye care services at primary health care level that is available to the communities affected by trachoma.

There is wide recognition that sustaining the elimination of trachoma as a public health problem will require moving trachoma interventions out of NTD programmes and integrating them into routine public health services and sustainable health systems. One reason for this is so that incident cases of trachomatous trichiasis (TT) can be managed by national eye health services in a post-elimination setting.

Moving trachoma interventions into existing health systems is complicated by numerous factors which are highly context specific and must be understood in order to effectively transition the services. In 2021, the Ethiopian Federal Ministry of Health, in collaboration with The Fred Hollows Foundation and the Oromia Regional Health Bureau, began implementation research to understand how best to do this. Although Ethiopia has been proactive in developing trachoma transition guidelines, the complexity of this work warranted further research to understand:

- the detail of the activities involved across all levels of the health system
- the costs
- the mode of care
- the barriers and enablers to transitioning.

So far, four key areas have been identified as affecting the successful transition of trachoma interventions into Ethiopia's national health system.



Health extension workers in Sude district training for the transition of trachomatous trichiasis case referral. ETHIOPIA

© THE FRED HOLLOWES FOUNDATION CC BY-NC-SA 2.0

1. Health system capacity

Capacity assessments have identified many primary health care facilities that experience human resource constraints, including a lack of trained personnel to deliver trachoma interventions. Many of these health facilities also lack the infrastructure and medical supplies to effectively manage patients with TT.

2. Supply chain challenges

Ongoing global economic challenges also have a local impact and have resulted in a reduced number of suppliers as well as significant delays in the delivery of medical products, including materials for TT operations.

3. Persistent and recrudescing trachoma

This study selected two *woredas* (districts) due to their low prevalence of trachoma (less than the elimination threshold). However, recent surveillance surveys found that, in one of the two *woredas*, the prevalence of trachoma had increased to above the World Health Organization (WHO) threshold for trachoma elimination. Persistent and recrudescing trachoma have several implications for transition planning. Most notably, settings above the WHO elimination threshold

must receive trachoma interventions, including surgery and antibiotics, through community outreach rather than facility-based care.

4. Community awareness

A knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) survey conducted in the study area highlighted low levels of community awareness about trachoma. Inadequate understanding of trachoma in the community affects transition by reducing service uptake by the affected community members.

In response to some of these challenges, the Oromia Regional Health Bureau, in collaboration with The Fred Hollows Foundation, is strengthening the capacity of primary health centres to provide trachoma interventions, including TT surgery. This includes training integrated eye care workers to be able to provide TT surgery, and training Health Extension Workers (HEWs) to identify trachoma and TT, so that people suspected to have either could be referred to the nearest health centre. HEWs are also being provided with a counselling guide in local languages so that they can effectively communicate about trachoma to affected communities and raise awareness about the disease, thereby improving the uptake of interventions.

Going forward, the lessons learnt from this project will be critical to informing national transitioning efforts in Ethiopia and overcoming barriers to successful transition. Investment in human resources and community sensitisation will help to overcome some of these challenges. Other challenges, including persistent and renewed outbreaks of trachoma, and external challenges such as consistent and reliable supply chains, threaten the successful transition of services.

For Ethiopia to eliminate trachoma as a public health problem and to achieve universal eye health coverage, a clear plan is needed to respond to incident cases and prevent a resurgence of the disease. Ethiopia's National Transitioning Guidelines, and other resources, including the International Coalition for Trachoma Control's transition toolkits, provide important support for this process. Continued structured research and effective knowledge exchange is needed to support NTD programmes.

We hope that sharing these experiences with eye health professionals across all trachoma endemic countries will help to drive global progress and navigate these complex trachoma end-game challenges.



Peter Hendicott
Adjunct Associate
Professor: School
of Optometry and
Vision Science,
Queensland
University of
Technology, Australia
and President:
World Council of
Optometry, USA.



Sandra S Block
Professor Emeritus,
Illinois College of
Optometry and
President-Elect:
World Council of
Optometry, USA.

How the World Council of Optometry produced new guidelines for myopia management

The World Council of Optometry (WCO) relies on scientific practices and high quality research to develop eye care guidelines.

The World Council of Optometry (WCO) is an international organisation focused on promoting eye health and vision care as a human right; as part of its mission, the WCO also seeks to advance the role of optometry in health care through advocacy, education, and collaboration.

At WCO, we feel strongly that any information we share with eye care providers worldwide, or in our advocacy, needs to be based on published, scientific evidence that has been vetted (peer reviewed) by experts in the field. However, scientific publications are often inaccessible to practicing clinicians for many reasons.

One of our goals is therefore to help translate the outcomes of well-designed studies – published in reputable, peer-reviewed scientific journals – into guidelines for clinical care that can be used by optometrists.

Myopia guidelines: an example

Myopia is a rapidly growing public health issue in many countries. In 2021, WCO passed a resolution that highlighted myopia and the need to both rethink how eye care providers identify children at risk of developing myopia, and how they can better manage myopia in children. The resolution defined an evidence-based standard of care for myopia with three main components:

- Mitigation.** Optometrists educating and counselling parents and children, during early and regular eye examinations, on lifestyle, dietary, and other factors that prevent or delay the onset of myopia.
- Measurement.** Optometrists evaluating the myopic status of a patient during regular, comprehensive vision and eye health examinations, i.e., measuring refractive error and axial length whenever possible.
- Management.** Optometrists addressing patients' current needs by correcting myopia, while also providing evidence-based interventions (e.g., contact lenses, spectacles, and/or pharmaceuticals) that slow the progression of myopia and offer improved quality of life and better eye health, both now and in the future.



© JAYASHREE KUMAR CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0

Myopia is a rapidly growing public health issue in many countries.

INDIA

The resolution also advised optometrists to incorporate the above standard of care for myopia management within their practice, and therefore to not only correct vision, but also to include in their work, public education and early and frequent discussions with parents that explain:

- what myopia is
- lifestyle factors that may impact myopia
- the available approaches that can be used to manage myopia and slow its progression.

In order to support optometrists to implement the new standard of care, WCO, in collaboration with CooperVision, invited a group of experienced clinicians and educators to help identify and evaluate high quality current evidence on myopia and develop *Standard of Care Guidelines for Myopia Management*,¹ a set of practical guidelines and tools available online. Each of the practical recommendations (for mitigation, measurement, and management) is accompanied by a list of the research publications that informed its development.

The group used the following criteria when deciding whether to include a research study in their deliberations:

- The study was approved by an institutional ethics committee or review board (see panel).
- The research question is clearly defined, so that the study provides a quantitative outcome for a specific question.
- The study design and methodology is set out clearly, so that the investigators could strictly follow the guidelines, eliminating as many confounding factors as possible and enabling others to replicate their methods.
- The data is collected and recorded in a clear, consistent manner, so that the analysis of the data yields clear outcome measures that answer the original research question.
- The results and conclusions are based on the evidence.
- The characteristics of subjects included in the studies are fully described, so that there is a clear understanding about the relevance of the outcomes to particular groups.
- Authors or principal investigators state the limitations of their findings so that the results can be interpreted correctly.

Ethics

When attempting to answer clinical practice questions, as in this example of myopia, WCO strives to adhere to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki – protection of the health, wellbeing, and rights of patients, including those involved in medical research.² We therefore require that human subjects are protected during any research that we support or report on. This includes ensuring that any personal, medical, educational, or other private information is not shared without the written authorisation of the individual.

WCO therefore requires that any research studies we report have been approved by a reputable institutional review board or ethics committee. These boards or committees are typically made up of experts and community members who review the design of the study to ensure that it is appropriate for the hypothesis posed by the principal investigator and that appropriate consideration has been given to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki.

As the WCO does not directly conduct investigative research, we rely on the work of dedicated researchers who are conducting impactful studies that inform how we can best serve our patients. We will continue to look to them for ways to reduce the impact of visual impairment and blindness globally.

References

- 1 World Council of Optometry. The standard of care for myopia management by optometrists [Internet]. Available from: <https://bit.ly/3izBjwo>
- 2 World Medical Association. World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. *JAMA*. 2013;310(20):2191-4.



Michelle Dinsdale
Ophthalmologist:
St. Paul's Eye Unit,
Liverpool University
Hospital NHS
Foundation Trust,
Liverpool, UK.



**José Manuel
Guajardo-Beroiza**
Ophthalmologist:
Ophthalmology Unit,
Clínica Alemana,
Universidad del
Desarrollo, Santiago,
Chile.



**Jibrán
Mohamed-
Noriega**
Ophthalmologist:
Department of
Ophthalmology,
University Hospital
and Faculty of
Medicine, Autonomous
University of Nuevo
Leon (UANL), Mexico.



**Neeru Amrita
Vallabh**
Ophthalmologist:
St. Paul's Eye Unit,
Liverpool University
Hospital NHS
Foundation Trust and
Department of Eye
and Vision Science,
University of
Liverpool, Liverpool,
United Kingdom.

Optic neuropathies that mimic glaucoma

It can be difficult to tell the difference between a glaucomatous optic nerve and a glaucoma mimic. Here are some tips that will help you to avoid diagnosing glaucoma when there is something else going on.

Glaucoma is a neurodegenerative disease of the optic nerve (optic neuropathy) and is characterised by the progressive, irreversible loss of retinal ganglion cells resulting in irreversible visual impairment and eventual blindness. Glaucoma is the most common optic neuropathy, with a global prevalence of 3.5% in people above the age of 40 years.¹ There are many other causes of optic neuropathy, and these can easily be mistaken for glaucoma. This article will consider various ways that clinicians can differentiate between these by means of history taking, examination, investigations, and observation.

Some other causes of an optic neuropathy

- Optic neuritis
- Ischaemic optic neuropathy
- Compressive causes
- Nutritional deficiencies, drugs, and alcohol
- Trauma

History taking

- **Age.** Glaucoma usually (but not exclusively) affects people over the age of 50. If your patient is younger, consider an alternative diagnosis.
- **Symptoms.** Open-angle glaucoma is a painless and asymptomatic condition, unlike optic neuritis (which causes pain on eye movement) or an arteritic ischaemic optic neuropathy, which results in headache and discomfort when chewing (jaw claudication).
- **Length of time.** Primary open-angle glaucoma is a gradually progressive condition, whereas optic neuritis and ischemic optic neuropathies have an acute onset. Compressive causes tend to be subacute.
- **Previous ocular history.** Ask if your patient has previously had any episodes of optic neuritis or ischaemic optic neuropathy. This may not have been previously diagnosed or explained to them, so ask about previous symptoms which may suggest these.
- **Past medical history.** A history of vascular risk factors, such as raised blood pressure or cholesterol, may suggest a potential diagnosis of non-arteritic anterior ischaemic optic neuropathy.
- **Nutrition, drug, and alcohol use.** Patients with a poor or unbalanced diet are at risk of nutritional optic neuropathies, and those known to have alcohol dependence are at high risk of vitamin B12 deficiency. Intentionally inhaling volatile solvents or drinking methanol causes toxic neuropathy.

Examination

- **Visual acuity.** Central vision, which is what is tested using a Snellen or LogMAR chart, is usually preserved in glaucoma, unless the patient has very advanced disease. However, central vision is often reduced much earlier in other optic neuropathies.

Figure 1 A healthy optic nerve. The rim is orange in colour with a small central cup which is yellow in appearance.³



RUPERT BOURNIE CC BY-NC-SA 4.0

- **Colour vision.** This is often preserved in glaucoma until a very advanced stage, while in other causes of optic neuropathy it is often affected at an early stage. If colour vision is reduced, but the nerve looks reasonably preserved, this should encourage you to consider a glaucoma mimic. Colour vision is usually assessed using Ishihara colour plates; however, if these are not readily available, another option is to use a smartphone and the free Eye Handbook app,² which has a colour vision testing section.
- **Intraocular pressure (IOP).** Although IOP is not always raised in glaucoma, if the pressure is below 21 mmHg, it is worthwhile considering whether this could be a glaucoma mimic.
- **Gonioscopy.** This allows assessment of the angle in the anterior chamber and may help to confirm the diagnosis of narrow-angle or angle-closure glaucoma, in which the IOP spikes intermittently.
- **Optic nerve.** This is best assessed during a dilated slit lamp examination (assuming the angle is open on gonioscopy) using a higher magnification lens; for example, a 78D or 60D lens. A dilated assessment with a magnified lens allows careful and close inspection of the nerve.

Examining the optic nerve


Look at the **vertical cup-to-disc ratio**. The central part of the nerve is called the cup and is yellow or white in colour, and the rim of the nerve is usually more orange in colour. The disc is the cup and the rim together, and the cup-to-disc ratio is the size of the cup, relative to the size of the whole disc. Figure 1 shows a healthy optic nerve.³

Figure 2 A cupped optic nerve. The centre of the optic nerve (the cup) is pale, but the rim remains a healthy colour; this is suggestive of glaucoma. Note that the cup-to-disc ratio in this image is greater than the cup-to-disc ratio in Figure 1.



© RUPERT BOURNE CC BY-NC 4.0

Figure 3 A colour photo of a pale optic nerve. The whole nerve is pale and this is described as disc pallor.⁶



© DS GREENFIELD AND S RATHI, 2017

The orange rim becomes thinned in glaucoma, and thus the yellow cup becomes larger. **Enlargement of the cup-to-disc ratio** is one of the signs suggestive of glaucoma. In glaucoma mimics, the cup-to-disc ratio is generally preserved so, generally, if the cup-to-disc ratio is less than 0.4, it is unlikely to be glaucomatous. A cup-to-disc ratio of greater than 0.8 is very suggestive of glaucoma, however. Between these ratios, you will need to rely on other findings to make a diagnosis.

The following are all suggestive of glaucoma:

- **A cupped optic nerve** (see Figure 2)³
- **Asymmetry of the cup-to-disc ratio** between the two eyes.
- **Optic disc haemorrhages** are often seen in unstable glaucoma⁴ and are not a feature of glaucoma mimics.⁵

The articles by Bourne and Khatib³ and Tsai⁵ offer useful guidance on assessing the optic nerve.

It is important to look at the **colour of the nerve**. If, rather than having a healthy, orange-coloured rim, the whole nerve appears to be yellow/white in colour, this is described as optic disc pallor. Figure 3 illustrates a pale optic nerve/optic disc pallor.⁶ If you see **optic disc pallor**, consider another cause of optic neuropathy, i.e., a glaucoma mimic. You can still see optic disc pallor in glaucoma, but this is in end-stage glaucoma when the-cup-to disc ratio is more than 0.99.

Another warning sign for a unilateral optic neuropathy (or a glaucoma mimic) would be seeing **just one eye with optic disc pallor**.

Some optic neuropathies may initially present with **swelling of all or part of the optic nerve** prior to the onset of optic disc pallor. Glaucoma does not present as optic nerve swelling. Further techniques and training for optic nerve evaluation can be learnt using the online glaucomatous optic neuropathy evaluation (GONE) project.⁷



Investigations: visual field assessment

Visual field assessment would ideally be performed using automated Humphrey visual field analysis or a Goldmann perimeter with an experienced operator. However, even visual fields to confrontation can give valuable information if performed well.⁸

Glaucoma affects the retinal nerve fibre layer (RNFL), which is anatomically distributed superiorly and inferiorly. Therefore, a glaucomatous visual field defect tends to affect the superior visual field or the inferior visual field and will progress within that hemifield prior to affecting the other hemifield.

Figure 4 demonstrates a superior visual field defect⁹ which is sparing the inferior visual field; this is typical of glaucoma. **The visual field defect does not cross the horizontal midline** (referred to as respecting the horizontal midline). Glaucoma can also affect the inferior visual field and spare the superior visual field.

Figure 4 A superior visual field defect which does not cross the horizontal midline, highly suspicious of glaucoma. The red dotted circle indicates a corresponding thinning of the optic disc inferiorly.⁹



© JONATHAN AMICELIJ

Furthermore, if the diagnosis is glaucoma, the visual field should correlate with the optic nerve assessment. For example, if the inferior rim of the optic nerve is thin, this will correlate with a superior visual field defect (as seen in Figure 4). If the optic nerve assessment and visual field do not correlate, you should consider whether this is a glaucoma mimic.

Due to the anatomy of the visual pathway posterior to the eye, a visual field defect which occurs due to a pathology behind the eye at either the chiasm or more posteriorly often affects the nasal or the temporal visual field.

Figure 5 demonstrates a temporal visual field defect in both eyes where the nasal visual field is spared.¹⁰ This is **typical of a lesion behind the eye**, at the chiasm and therefore not typical of glaucoma. **The visual field does not cross the vertical midline** (referred to as respecting the vertical midline). If you see a visual field which respects the vertical midline, it is worth arranging some imaging of the brain, such as a coherence tomography (CT) or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scan.

Observation of the patient

Glaucoma is a **progressive optic neuropathy** which means, the optic nerve appearance and function will deteriorate over time. Most (but not all) glaucoma mimics may be stable, such as a previous ischaemic optic neuropathy or a congenital disc anomaly. If the appearance is stable, it may be worth considering whether this is a glaucoma mimic.

Alternative causes of an optic neuropathy

Optic neuritis


This is due to inflammation of the optic nerve which can happen anywhere along its length. Typical optic neuritis is retrobulbar, so visual examination of the optic nerve may appear normal. It is typically caused by demyelination of the nerve and therefore may precede or be secondary to a diagnosis of a demyelinating disease.

Ischaemic optic neuropathy

This occurs as a result of disruption of the blood supply to the optic nerve. There are two types:

- **Arteritic.** This is secondary to giant cell arteritis. In this condition, inflammation of the walls of the blood vessels causes narrowing of the blood vessels and thus reduces the blood supply to the optic nerve. This is an ophthalmic emergency requiring urgent systemic steroids. Patients have symptoms including a headache and discomfort or pain when chewing (jaw claudication).
- **Non-arteritic.** This affects patients with vascular risk factors. Atherosclerosis causes gradual narrowing of the blood vessels supplying the optic nerve. This eventually results in sudden optic nerve hypoperfusion and ischaemia.

Figure 5 A visual field defect in the temporal aspect of both eyes which does not cross the vertical midline, highly suggestive of a non-glaucomatous lesion and suggests a lesion posterior to the eye, such as a neurological lesion.¹⁰



© A. CURATOLA, 2019

Compressive causes

This occurs due to compression of the optic nerve or optic pathway, anywhere along its course. The signs and symptoms are therefore dictated by the location. Like other compressive causes, these are often progressive.

Nutritional deficiencies, drugs, and alcohol

Nutritional optic neuropathy and toxic neuropathy are systemic causes of optic nerve damage and result in symmetrical symptoms – affecting both eyes equally. Patients with poor diets or nutrition are at risk of nutritional optic neuropathy, and vitamin B12 deficiency is particularly likely in those with alcohol dependence. A history of intentional inhalation of volatile solvents such as toluene, or consumption of methanol, can cause pale and cupped optic nerves with profound visual loss.

Traumatic optic neuropathy

This can occur after trauma to the eye which is significant enough to damage the optic nerve.

The above is not an exhaustive list, but includes examples of some of the common causes of optic neuropathies, excluding glaucoma.

Remember, it is often difficult to differentiate between a glaucomatous optic nerve and a glaucoma mimic; even the best glaucoma experts struggle.¹¹ However, applying the tips outlined in this article will help you to avoid diagnosing glaucoma when something else is going on.

Continues overleaf ▶

“It can be difficult to differentiate between a glaucomatous optic nerve and a glaucoma mimic; even the best glaucoma experts struggle.”

Signs that it may be a glaucoma mimic

- Normal or low intraocular pressure
- Pale optic nerve, which is not cupped
- A visual field or OCT defect which respects the vertical midline but not the horizontal midline
- Reduced colour vision and a rapid afferent pupillary defect (unless advanced)
- A stable/non-progressive optic neuropathy
- Young age
- Symptoms of headache or jaw claudication or pain
- Sudden onset

Case study 1

An 80-year-old woman was referred for a diagnosis of atypical glaucoma. Five years earlier she had a history of acute headache and visual loss in the left eye. At the time, she complained of stiffness around the shoulders and hips after resting, which was diagnosed as a rheumatological disease (polymyalgia rheumatica). Temporal artery biopsy also identified giant cell arteritis. Current ophthalmic examination revealed an asymmetric optic neuropathy with pallor and cupping only in the left eye (see Figure 6), probably due to a previous arteritic anterior ischaemic optic neuropathy.¹²

Case study 2

A 46-year-old patient presented at the eye clinic with a history of bumping into things over the last two months, and an awareness that her visual field was reduced. She also had a mild headache. Her visual acuity was normal, and her eye pressures were 12 mmHg in both eyes with open angles on gonioscopy. Her optic nerves demonstrated bilateral optic nerve pallor (Figure 7).¹³ She had a confrontational visual field test which demonstrated a visual field defect in the temporal aspect of both eyes (a bitemporal hemianopia) which respected the vertical midline. She went on to have a CT scan of her head, which demonstrated a pituitary lesion with compression of the optic nerve.

Figure 6 Left eye optic pallor.¹²



Figure 7 Image of bilateral optic nerve pallor.¹³



References

- O'Neill EC, Danesh-Meyer HV, Kong GX, Hewitt AW, Coote MA, Mackey DA, Crowston JG; Optic Nerve Study Group. Optic disc evaluation in optic neuropathy: the optic disc assessment project. *Ophthalmology*. 2011 May;118(5):964-70.
- Eye Handbook. Ophthalmology for your smartphone. <https://eyehandbook.com/EHBweb/>
- Bourne RRA and Khatib T. The optic nerve head in glaucoma. *Community Eye Health Journal*. 2021; October. www.cehjournal.org/article/the-optic-nerve-head-in-glaucoma-3
- Ozuturker ZK, Munro K, Gupta N. Optic disc haemorrhages in glaucoma and common clinical features. *Can J Ophthalmol*. 2017 Dec;52(6):583-591.
- Tsai J. How to evaluate the suspicious optic disc. *Review of Ophthalmology*. 2015; June. <https://www.reviewofophthalmology.com/article/how-to-evaluate-the-suspicious-optic-disc>
- Rathi S, Greendfield DS. Beware of the imposter. Differentiating glaucoma from anterior ischaemic optic neuropathy. *Glaucoma Today*. 2017; May/June:50-52. <https://glaucomatoday.com/articles/2017-may-june/beware-the-impostor>
- Glaucomatous Optic Neuropathy Evaluation (GONE) project. www.gone-project.com
- Broadway DC, Kyari F. Examining visual fields. *Comm Eye Health*, 2019;32(107): 58-59.
- Mieli JA. Nonglaucomatous cupping. <https://casebasedneuroophthalmology.pressbooks.com/chapter/nonglaucomatous-cupping/>
- Curatola A. Not your typical visual field. Available from: <https://www.nweyes.com/september-2019/>
- Trobe JD, Glaser JS, Cassady JC. Optic atrophy. Differential diagnosis by fundal observation alone. *Arch Ophthalmol*. 1980. Jun;98(6):1040-5.
- Fitzgibbon EJ, Wendt S. Optic Atrophy. Available from: eyewiki.aao.org/Optic_Atrophy
- Pelino CJ, Pizzimenti JJ. The Endocrine System: Part II. *Review of Optometry*. 2010;July. www.reviewofoptometry.com/article/the-endocrine-system-part-ii