Prevalence of Persistent Refractive Amblyopia amongst School-Children in North India: A Population-Based Observational Study of Childhood Visual Deficit and Its Correlation with Heterophoria & NPC

Kamal Pant¹, Salal Khan², Rajat Bansal³

¹Associate Professor & HOD; ^{2,3}Optometry Scholar, Department of Optometry, UP University of Medical Sciences, Saifai.

Corresponding Author: Kamal Pant

ABSTRACT

Aim: The aim and purpose of this populationbased cross-sectional study was to determine the prevalence of persistent refractive Amblyopia and its correlation with heterophoria as well as NPC (Near point of convergence) in schoolchildren in Etawah, UP.

Material & Methods: This population-based cross-sectional study was conducted in the govt. schools during July to December, 2019. Total 2966 subjects were enrolled by exhaustive-stratified sampling procedure to represent the underlying population. All were subjected to eye examination (Monocular LogMAR visual acuity, objective & subjective refraction, cover test, PBCT & NPC) and the responses/ data were recorded & evaluated with the Pearson Chi-square test in IBM SPSS version 21, to know the prevalence and the major cause of Amblyopia their correlation with Heterophoria & NPC in those subjects.

Results: Out of 2966 subjects (Males=1594 & Females=1372), 36 subject, (1.21%) were having amblyopia. The common symptoms including headache, watery eyes, itching, and redness of eyes were observed. Commonly experienced symptoms (statistically significant with the Pearson Chi-square test in IBM SPSS version 21) amongst amblyopes (in order of prevalence) were Headache (100%, p<0.05), Watery eyes (83.3%, p<0.05), Itching (41.6%, p<0.05), Redness (5.5%, p<0.05). Statistically highly significant (p<0.05) correlation was

found between amblyopia & Heterophoria as well as NPC with the BCVA.

Conclusion: Amblyopia prevalence persisting beyond traditional treatment ages was significantly higher amongst school-children. Early detection of the cases of amblyopia by the eye screening at the time of admission in the school with the help of optometrists may prevent the bad consequences.

Key words- Persistent amblyopia, Amblyogenic factors, Visual impairment, Occlusion, Vision screening.

INTRODUCTION

Amblyopia is a condition that permanently affects the vision if not treated early and it could later affect the health and quality of life of the child. The decline of visual acuity at an early age can be easily treated, but if left untreated, it can lead to an amblyopia.¹ Amblyopia has been defined as a "decrease of visual acuity for which no causes can be detected by the physical examination of the eve, caused by vision deprivation abnormal binocular or interaction" (Von Noorden 1996). It can occur from 4 months until 8 years of age.² If not treated before the development of central vision, the efficacy of treatment is poor after 8 years of age.^{3,4} Before the age of 8 years, there is a potential to improve vision so it is essential to intervene

timely.^{5,6,7} Amblyopia is commonly a monocular condition, but it can also be binocular.⁸

Amblyopia can impact quality of life because of its effect on patients, ability to perform sports and physical activities, social activities and their career of choice.^{9,10}

It can happen due to variety of factors: strabismic (ocular misalignment), anisometropic (a significant difference in refractive error between fellow eyes), form deprivation (exclusion of all visual information except light due to physical such as corneal/lenticular obstructions opacification or eyelid ptosis), significant uncorrected refractive error (high levels of astigmatism or hypermetropia), or а combination of these features.^{11, 12}

Amblyopia is an important cause of non-correctable (when not treated timely) unilateral visual impairment in industrialised countries.¹³ Early detection of the amblyogenic risk factors and institution of the well tolerated as well as highly effective treatment options^{14,15,16} within the sensitive period of development can result in proper recovery and attainment of the normal visual acuity. The detection of amblyopia and associated risk factors therefore depends on parental self-referral and high degree of suspicion by primary healthcare providers.

Amblyopia often referred to as 'lazy eve' results from anomalous visual experience during the critical period of visual development in the early years of childhood and may affect multiple aspects function.^{8,17,18} Untreated of visual amblyopia does not self-rectify,19 and it impacts reading skills²⁰ and significantly the risk increases of severe visual impairment of both eyes in later life²¹.

The severity and the type of amblyopia will largely govern the kind of treatment modality to be followed. The standard treatment options are glasses to correct refractive errors (near-sightedness or far-sightedness, astigmatism) and eye patching (occlusion therapy) ranging from 1hour (part time) to full time occlusion.^{22, 23}

The sound eye is covered with an eye patch to encourage the weaker eye to work harder to improve visual acuity. The success rate of patching depends mainly and maximally on compliance; the reported rates of compliance range widely from 49% to 87%.^{24, 25} Occlusion can be instituted through drug therapy also, eye drops containing atropine or a similar drug are used to temporally blur vision in the good eye. They relax the muscles in the eye so that the lens will not focus for a few hours.^{26,27}

The amblyopic treatment challenges involve the parents, when the parents are uncertain about the benefits of the treatment, unaware about the process of or cause of amblyopia and are under stress or have relationship pressure.²⁸ So, the parents understanding of amblyopia and its impact on their children's well-being is very much crucial.²⁹⁻³²

The purpose of this study was to report and compare the prevalence and symptoms of persistent refractive amblyopia post-traditional treatment age (8 years).^{19,33,34} and its correlation with Heterophoria as well as NPC in schoolchildren.

MATERIAL & METHODS

This cross-sectional populationbased study was conducted in the Govt. Schools of the Etawah district of Uttar Pradesh, during July to December, 2019. Total 2966 subjects were enrolled by exhaustive-stratified sampling procedure to represent the underlying population. School children were clinically examined and screening in their school premises during school hours and taking their written informed consent.

Examination Protocol followed-

- 1. Distance monocular crowded logMAR unaided and aided (if applicable) visual acuities as well as with and without a pinhole were recorded.
- 2. Ocular alignment was assessed with use of Cover-uncover, Alternate cover test and Prism Bar Cover Test (PBCT) using

an accommodative target with and without spectacle correction (if applicable) at distance (3m) and at near (40cm).

- 3. NPC (Near point of convergence) was recorded with the help of RAF ruler.
- 4. Cycloplegic/ dry Retinoscopy was done followed by subjective refraction to achieve the BCVA.
- 5. Class Teacher/ Parents completed child's detailed history of any eye surgery, occlusion therapy and spectacle wear.
- 6. Follow-up subsequent to the examination, teachers and all parents of the concerned children received a detailed report advising them of clinical findings and the requirement of any further management at higher level.

The responses /data were recorded & statistically evaluated with the Pearson Chisquare test in IBM SPSS version 21, to know the prevalence and the major cause of Amblyopia.

Definitions of Persistent amblyopia:

1. Multiethnic paediatric eye disease study (MEPEDS) definition: Unilateral amblyopia; ≥ 2 line interocular difference in visual acuity, measured through a pinhole, with BCVA of 0.2 logMAR (6/9.5 Snellen, 20/32) or poorer in the worse eye in the presence of a unilateral amblyogenic factor consistent with the affected eve. Amblyogenic factors included strabismus at a distance and near fixation with/without spectacle correction, a history of strabismus surgery, anisometropia (≥1.00D difference in hyperopia, $\geq 3.00D$ difference in myopia, \geq 1.50D difference in astigmatism in any amblyopia: meridian).Bilateral BCVA poorer than 0.3logMAR (Snellen, 20/40) in both eyes in the presence of a bilateral amblyogenic factor.³

2. Refractive error study in children (*RESC*) definition: Amblyopia was defined as BCVA (measured through a pinhole) $\geq 0.3\log$ MAR ($\leq 20/40$ Snellen) in at least one eye associated with one or more of the following potential causes: 1. esotropia,

exotropia or vertical tropia at 4m fixation, or esotropia or vertical tropia at 0.5m (strabismic amblyopia); 2. Anisometropia of \geq 2D spherical equivalent refractive error (SER) (Anisometropic amblyopia); or 3. Hyperopia of \geq 6D SER. Unilateral amblyopia: If only one eye met the criteria. Bilateral amblyopia: If both eyes met the criteria separately.³⁶

Children with history of amblyopia treatment were not categorised as having persistent amblyopia unless they met definition-1 or definition-2. To examine the magnitude of amblyopic visual acuity deficits, based on the BCVA in the amblyopic eye, severe amblyopia was defined as BCVA >0.6logMAR.³⁷

RESULTS

subjects Out of total 2966 (Males=1594 & Females=1372), 36 subjects, 1.21% (males-13, 36.2%; females-23, 63.8%) were found to have Amblyopia and remaining 2930 (98.79%) were nonamblyopic. The common symptoms including headache, watery eyes, itching, and redness of eyes were observed. The age group of 9-22 years were having the most number of amblyopes. Most commonly experienced amblyogenic factors in female (23) than the male (13), had a significantly amblyopia prevalence (p<0.05). Commonly experienced symptoms (statistically significant with the Pearson Chi-square test in IBM SPSS version 21) amongst amblyopes (in order of prevalence) were Headache (100%, p<0.05), Watery eyes (83.3%, p<0.05), Itching (41.6%, p<0.05), Redness (5.5%, p<0.05). It was evaluated amongst vision impaired amblyopic children using criteria of pinhole acuity 0.2logMAR (6/9.5 Snellen) plus an amblyogenic factor. Statistically, highly significant (p<0.05) correlation was found between amblyopia & Heterophoria as well as NPC with the BCVA.



Figure- 1 Amblyopia Frequency and Symptoms

DISCUSSION



Present Study	Study by-Harrington S at al ³⁸	Study by-Zbu H ot al ⁴⁰
1 Cross sectional study (Etawah July December	Cross sectional study (Iraland IIV	Cohort study (South west Ching June
1. Closs-sectional study (Elawan, July-December	Closs-sectional study (lieland, UK	Conort-study (South-west China, June-
2019).	January-April 2019).	July 2018).
2. Total 2966 subjects.	Total 1621 subjects.	Total 3050 subjects.
(36-Amblyopic)	(47-Amblyopic)	(25-Amblyopic)
3. Observed symptoms were Headache (10%),	These aspects were not considered,	These aspects were not considered.
Watery eyes (83.3%), Itching (41.6%), Redness	Only type of Amblyopia was studied.	Only type of Amblyopia was studied.
(5.5%).		
4. Those suffered from weak NPC as well as phoria	The aspects such as NPC and phoria not	The aspects such as NPC and phoria
were mainly present.	included.	not included.
5. Data analysis was performed using SPSS version	Analysis was performed using SPSS	Data analysis was done using statistical
21.	version 24.0.	tools SPSS statistics version 13.

Quite similar results of prevalence of amblyopia were observed in all these studies regardless of the area and place of study. The minor differences resulted probably due to different definitions of the amblyopia and cut off criteria employed in all these studies. The present study was very specific in nature where the comparison was done of the visual deficit with the heterophoria and NPC.

Limitations:

- 1. Amblyopic patient was defined only on the basis of pinhole criteria by MEPEDS and RESC definition.
- 2. Not possible to show all the amblyogenic factors and true prevalence of amblyopia as the exhaustive sampling was confined to a very small area.
- 3. Time frame has limited the sample size as it is not the true representation of the geographical area (Need to do the sampling from all area of the district). Also, not all students were exactly residing in the same place where school is located.

CONCLUSION

persisting Amblyopia prevalence beyond traditional treatment ages was significantly higher schoolamongst Uncorrected children. refractive error. compliance with spectacle wear and socioeconomic disadvantage were important contributing factors of Amblyopia. Children without obvious visible eye defects were less likely to access eye care, resulting in missed opportunities for intervention where necessary. So, the early detection of the cases of amblyopia by the eye screening at the time of admission in the school with the help of optometrists/ Eye care professionals will certainly prevent the bad consequences of this disorder.

This study is the first to report amblyopia prevalence in District of Etawah, Uttar Pradesh. Further research is needed to explore the possible causes of amblyopia and to create awareness about the amblyopia as well as about the protection and prevention of eyes from such types of visual deficit amongst the students, teachers and parents.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are thankful to the management of the Govt aided schools of the Etawah (Uttar Pradesh) which were included in this study for cooperating us during the conduction of this valuable study.

REFERENCES

- 1. Ali M. Alsaqr et al. The awareness of amblyopia among parents in Saudi Arabia: Ther Adv. Ophthalmol, (2019), vol. 11:1-7, doi: 10.1177/2515841419868103.
- Bardisi WM and BinSadiq BM. Vision screening of preschool children in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. Saudi Med F 2002; 23: 445-449.
- 3. De Zarate BR and Tejedor J. Current concepts in the management of amblyopia. Clin Ophthalmol, 2007; 1: 403-414.
- Ehrlich MI, Reinecke RD and Simons K. Pre-school vision screening for amblyopia and strabismus: programs, methods, guidelines, 1983. Surv Ophthalmol 1983; 28: 145-163.
- 5. Fronius M, Cirina L et al. Efficiency of electronically monitored amblyopia treatment between 5 and 16 years of age: new insight into declining susceptibility of the visual system. Vision Res 2014; 103: 11-19.
- 6. Holmes JM. Levi DM. Treatment of amblyopia as a function of age. Vis Neurosci 2018; 35: E015.
- Koo EB. Gilbert AL. VanderVeen DK. Treatment of amblyopia and amblyopia risk factors based on current evidence. Semin Ophthalmol 2017; 32: 1-7.
- 8. Webber AL and Wood J. Amblyopia: prevalence, natural history, functional effects and treatment. Clin Exp Optom 2005; 88: 365-375.
- Aljohani M, Alorabi S, et al. Awareness, attitudes and practices regarding common eye diseases among general population in Saudi Arabia. Ann Int Med Den Res 2018; 4: ME01-ME4.
- Webber AL. The functional impact of amblyopia. Clin Exp Optomet 2018; 101: 443-450.
- 11. Holmes JM, Clarke MP, Amblyopia CMP. Amblyopia. The Lancet 2006; 367: 1343-51.
- 12. Barrett BT. Bradley A, Candy TR, The relationship between anisometropia and

amblyopia. Prog Retin Eye Res 2013; 36: 120-58.

- Foran S, Wang JJ et al. Causes of visual impairment in two, older population crosssections: the Blue Mountains Eye Study. Ophthalmic Epidemiol 2003; 10: 215-225.
- 14. Hrisos S, Clarke MP, et al. The emotional impact of amblyopia treatment pre-school children: randomized controlled trial. Ophthalmol 2004; 111: 1550-1556.
- 15. Choong YF et al. Childhood amblyopia treatment psychosocial implications for patients and primary carers. Eye 2004; 18: 369-375.
- 16. Pediatric Eye Disease Investigator Group. A randomized trial of atropine vs. patching for treatment of moderate amblyopia in children. Arch Ophthalmol 2002; 120: 268-278.
- Meler K, Giaschi D. Unilateral amblyopia affects two eyes: fellow eye deficits in amblyopia. Invest. Ophthalmol. Vis. Sci. 2017; 58.
- Chua B, Mitchell P. Consequences of amblyopia on education, occupation, and long term vision loss. Br J Ophthalmol 2004; 88: 1119-1121.
- Holmes JM. Lazar EL et al. Effect of age on response to amblyopia treatment in children. Arch Ophthalmol 2011; 129: 1451.
- Kelly KR. Jost RM. Et al. Amblyopic children read more slowly than controls under natural, binocular reading conditions. J Aapos 2015; 19: 515-520.
- 21. Rahi JS, Logan S, Timms C et al. Risk, causes and outcomes of visual impairment of loss of vision in the non-amblyopic eye: a population based study. The Lancet 2002; 360: 597-602.
- 22. Alzahrani N. Alhibshi N, et al. Awareness, perceptions and knowledge of amblyopia among paediatrics and ophthalmology clinics attendees in King Abdul Aziz University Hospital, Jeddah. Int F of Adv. Res 2018; 6: 1506-1517.
- 23. Olson RJ and Scott WE. A practical approach to occlusion therapy for amblyopia. Semi Ophthalmol 1997; 12: 161-165.
- 24. Al-Zuhaibi S, Al- Harthi et al. Compliance of amblyopic patients with occlusion therapy: a pilot study. Oman F Ophthalmol 2009; 2: 67-72.
- 25. Moseley MJ, Fielder AR, et al. Effectiveness of occlusion therapy in

ametropic amblyopia: a pilot study. Br F Ophthalmol 1997; 81: 956-961.

- 26. Taylor K, Elliott S. Amblyopia in children: Treatment options for amblyopia. Cologne, Germany: Institute for quality and Efficiency in Health care; 2014.
- Ahyia LA. Amblyopia , Manual of squint. 1st ed. New Delhi: Jaypee Brothers Medical Publisher; 2008. P. 177-189.
- 28. Maconachie GDE and Gottlob I. The challenges of amblyopia treatment. Biomed F 2015; 38: 510-516.
- 29. Senthilkumar D, Kumaran SE, et al. Parents awareness and perception of children's eye diseases in Chennai, India. Optom Vis Sci 2013; 90: 1462-1466.
- Singh A, Rana V et al. To assess knowledge and attitude of parents towards children suffering from strabismus in Indian subcontinent. Indian F Ophthalmol 2017; 65: 603-606.
- 31. Ebeigbe JA and Emedike CM. Parents awareness and perception of children's eye diseases in Nigeria. F Optom 2017; 10: 104-110.
- 32. Newsham D. Parental non-concordance with occlusion therapy. Brit F Ophthalmol 2000; 84: 957-962.
- 33. Powell C, Hatt SR. Cochrane eyes and vision group, Vision screening for amblyopia in childhood. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2009; 89.
- Harrington SC, Stack J et al. Refractive error and visual impairment in Ireland schoolchildren. Br J Ophthalmol 2018. Doi:10. 1136/bjophthalmol-2018-312573. [Epub ahead of print: 12 Oct 2018].
- 35. Verma R, Deneen J, et al. The multi-ethnic paediatric eye disease study: design and methods. Ophthalmic Epidemiol 2006; 13: 253-262.

- 36. Xiao O, Morgan IG, et al. Prevalence of amblyopia in school-children and variations of age, gender and ethnicity in a Multi-Country refractive error study. Ophthalmol 2015; 122: 1924-1931.
- Wallace DK, Repka MS, et al. Amblyopia preferred practice pattern. Ophthalmol 2018; 125: p. 105-142.
- Harrington SC, et al. Comparison of amblyopia in school children in Ireland and Northern Ireland: a population-based observational cross-sectional analysis of a treatable childhood visual deficit. BMJ Open 2019; 9:e031066. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031066.
- 39. D Robaei et al, Impact of amblyopia on vision at age 12 years: findings from a population-based study, Eye (2008) 22, 496-502; doi:10.1038/sj.eye.6702668, 23 March 2007.
- Zhu H, et al. Prevalence of amblyopia and strabismus in Hani school children in rural southwest China: a cross sectional study, BMJ Open 2019, 9: e025441. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-025441.
- 41. Harrington SC, et al. Refractive error and visual impairment in Ireland school children, Br J Ophthalmol 2019; 103, 1112-1118. doi: 10.1136/bjophthalmol-2018-312573.
- 42. Suliman IA et al. The effect of amblyopia on contrast sensitivity, colour vision, and stereoacuity. Albasar Int J Ophthalmol 2017; 4: 54-57.

How to cite this article: Pant K, Khan S, Bansal R. Prevalence of persistent refractive amblyopia amongst school-children in North India: a population-based observational study of childhood visual deficit and its correlation with heterophoria & NPC. International Journal of Research and Review. 2020; 7(9): 11-16.
