Investigation of the reasons for delayed presentation in proliferative diabetic retinopathy patients
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Abstract

Aim: To investigate reasons for delayed presentation in patients with proliferative diabetic retinopathy (PDR).

Methods: A questionnaire was designed to investigate consecutive PDR patients with delayed presentation who visited our center between January 2021 and December 2021. The questionnaire was divided into four sections: knowledge regarding diabetic retinopathy (DR), attitude toward DR treatment, difficulties adhering to follow-up plans, and medical care. The systemic disease status and severity of DR were recorded. Logistic analysis was undertaken to investigate DR treatment refusal and delay factors.

Results: A total of 157 patients were included in this study, with an average age of 50.0 ± 11.6 years. The overall glycemic control was poor, with a median glycated hemoglobin level (HbA1c) of 7.8% (IQR 2.5%). Among the 157 eyes, most required vitrectomy intervention (144, 91.7%); 17 developed neovascular glaucoma (NVG), while only 13 required additional photocoagulation. Among the 36 patients with undiagnosed DM, the reason for delayed DR presentation was a lack of awareness of DM status among these patients (36 cases, 100.0%). Most of the patients with a known history of DM exhibited inadequate DR knowledge (29, 24.0%), believed their good visual acuity did not require DR screening (98, 81.0%), and had poorly controlled diabetes (113, 93.3%). Factors related to refusing DR treatment were patients with an inability to receive regular diabetes treatment in internal medicine clinics (OR 6.78,
95% CI 1.73-26.59, p=0.006), patients who could not tolerate discomfort during
ophthalmic examination and treatment (OR 15.15, 95% CI 2.70-83.33, p<0.001), and
patients who did not have any retinal abnormalities detected and were not informed
about the need for regular screening (OR 2.05, 95% CI 1.36-3.09, p<0.001).

Conclusions: This study investigated the factors contributing to delayed presentation
among patients with PDR. Many individuals in the delayed population were found to
have undiagnosed DM. Among patients already aware of their DM status, reasons for
delay included insufficient knowledge about DR, negative attitudes toward screening
and treatment, and difficulties seeking medical care in real-life situations.Furthermore,
there needed to be more improvements in the detection, treatment, and follow-up of
DR by internal medicine practitioners and ophthalmologists.
Introduction:

Diabetic retinopathy (DR), one of the complications of diabetes, is also the leading cause of blindness in the working-age population [1]. Early detection and prompt treatment of PDR play a crucial role in reducing the risk of diabetes-related blindness [2, 3]. In countries implementing comprehensive screening programs for diabetic retinopathy, the annual incidence of blindness resulting from diabetic retinopathy has declined [4, 5].

However, despite the availability of national DR screening in some countries, many patients still do not receive timely treatment. This issue is not exclusive to specific regions, as highlighted by a national survey that revealed alarming statistics. A survey found that 70.1% of DR patients identified through retinal photography were unaware of their DR condition, while 23.1% of patients with known diabetes were unaware of their DM status [6]. In China, the lack of a national DR screening program and data on delayed DR presentation further exacerbates the problem. However, the increasing number of cases of DR-related blindness in the country indicates a pressing need for prompt action. Between 1999 and 2019, the annual incidence rate of DR-related blindness in China skyrocketed from 0.06 to 0.23 cases per million population, and the rate of visual impairment rose from 0.3 to 0.86 cases per million population [7].

Examining regional data sheds further light on the extent of the issue. For instance, a survey conducted among elderly residents in Beijing communities discovered that 87% of patients with DR were unaware of their condition. Moreover, only 28% of
diabetic patients had undergone DR screening within the past year [8]. Similarly, an epidemiological survey conducted in rural northern China revealed that 12.1% of known diabetic patients had vision-threatening DR but had not received the necessary treatment [9]. These regional findings emphasize a significant delay in diagnosing and treating PDR within the diabetic population in China.

Various factors contribute to the delay in the diagnosis and treatment of DR. In countries where national DR screening programs have been implemented, research indicates that reasons for the patient delay or nonparticipation in screening include insufficient social support [8], poor patient compliance [8], inadequate awareness of DR [8], lack of DR-related visual symptoms [9], limited opportunities for dilated fundus examination [9], restrictions on seeking medical care due to systemic diseases [10], economic factors [11], racial differences [12] pain during treatment [15], and inability to achieve expected visual outcomes [13, 14].

The prevalence of diabetes among Chinese patients has increased annually, from 10.9% in 2013 to 12.4% in 2018 [18]. Investigating the reason for the delayed presentation of PDR is crucial for preventing DR-related blindness.

Therefore, we planned to study a group of PDR patients who had not received timely treatment by using a questionnaire survey to investigate the reasons for delaying DR diagnosis and treatment and evaluate the control of diabetes, treatment of eye diseases, and severity of eye diseases. Finally, we aimed to analyze the relevant factors and reasons for delaying diagnosis and treatment in these PDR patients.
Material and Methods:

Questionnaire design (Appendix 1):

In this study, a questionnaire survey method was used to investigate patients. The questionnaire gathered information about the patient's medical history, medication usage for systemic diseases, and ocular treatment history. The questionnaire then focused on understanding the reasons for delayed PDR presentation among the patients and was divided into four distinct sections:

a. Knowledge about DR section: This part assessed the patients' understanding of DR-related knowledge before their PDR diagnosis. The assessment utilized a yes/no question format to evaluate the patients' knowledge.

b. Attitude toward DR treatment section: This section aimed to gain insights into the patients' attitudes toward the diagnosis and treatment of DR. It also aimed to identify subjective reasons for treatment delay by providing a list of various reasons for patients to choose from. Additionally, patients were asked whether they had ever refused DR treatment.

c. Difficulties in real-life section: This section investigated the social, economic, and systemic factors that patients believed could impact their willingness to seek DR diagnosis and treatment. It included questions related to insurance coverage, financial income situation, level of family support, and whether the patients were influenced by factors such as work, caregiving responsibilities, or other systemic diseases. Multiple-choice selection was utilized in this section.
d. Medical processes section: This section explored the patients' experiences with different medical processes, explicitly focusing on interactions with internal medicine physicians and ophthalmologists. It included inquiries about whether the internal medicine physicians or ophthalmologists provided DR education and informed their patients about the importance of regular fundus examinations or check-ups.

By structuring the questionnaire into these four sections, the study aimed to comprehensively investigate patients' knowledge, attitudes, obstacles, and experiences with medical processes related to DR diagnosis and treatment.

Cross-sectional survey:

The population to be surveyed in this study consisted of consecutive patients diagnosed with PDR during outpatient visits to our hospital between January 2021 and December 2021 who did not receive timely treatment. The study followed the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki and the protocol and was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Beijing Tongren Hospital. Patients were required to sign an informed consent form and written informed consent was obtained from each participant prior to commencing the survey.

Inclusion criteria: 1) patients had to be between 18 and 70 years of age; 2) patients must have been diagnosed with PDR requiring photocoagulation or vitrectomy in at least one eye; 3) patients had to show a delayed PDR presentation, defined as those who were diagnosed with PDR but did not receive treatment during their initial outpatient visit or those who received treatment but did not undergo timely follow-up, failing to
detect disease progression; 4) patients must have completed all laboratory tests (including routine blood, urine, and renal function tests) or have had a precise diagnosis of systemic complications; 5) patients must have completed the questionnaire survey; 6) patients must have agreed to participate in the study.

Exclusion criteria: 1) patients with severe vitreous hemorrhage (VH) for which it could not be determined if PDR was the cause; 2) patients in whom both eyes had undergone vitrectomy due to PDR, making it impossible to determine if PDR was delayed before the surgery; 3) patients who currently did not require laser or PPV surgery but only needed close follow-up observation; 4) patients who were unable to complete the survey questionnaire; 5) patients with comorbidities such as glaucoma, optic nerve disease, or macular detachment, as these conditions may cause irreversible vision loss; 6) patients who were in lockdown during the COVID-19 pandemic in Beijing and were excluded from the study due to the limited availability of appointments for DR patients, which could have resulted in delays in their treatment.

The selected patients underwent a comprehensive ophthalmic examination, including a corrected visual acuity test, intraocular pressure test, and slit-lamp assessment to evaluate the presence of neovascularization of the iris (NVI) and indirect ophthalmoscopy and vitrectomy if needed to determine the severity of PDR. PDR patients were diagnosed as those who required only photocoagulation or required vitrectomy. In addition, the presence of combined NVI or NVG was recorded.

The patients then completed the questionnaire survey. The general condition, overall health status, and history of ocular treatment details were recorded as follows: the
diagnosis of combined hypertension; combined diabetic complications; history of participating in a DR screening program; the time between the last screening and diagnosis if they participated; the refusal of DR screening or PDR treatment recommendations; history of phacoemulsification cataract extraction, intravitreal injection (IV) of anti-vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) agents, or pan-retinal photocoagulation (PRP) treatment; and whether the patients were followed up on time after examinations or treatments. The results of the four-section questionnaire on reasons for delayed presentation of PDR were recorded.

The laboratory examination on HbA1C and questionnaire items on controlling blood glucose were recorded for further analysis of glucose control status. The renal function test result was recorded to determine the presence of chronic kidney disease (CKD) with impaired renal function.

Incomplete laser treatment was defined as adding 500 or more laser spots during outpatient photocoagulation or surgical procedures.

PDR patients with neovascularization elsewhere (NVE) but without high-risk PDR were only treated with PRP.

PDR that required vitrectomy was defined by the presence of any of the following conditions: 1) VH that hinders further examination of the fundus, confirmed as PDR during surgery, 2) fibrovascular membranes involving or threatening the macula or associated with recurrent vitreous hemorrhage, and 3) VH due to PDR combined with NVI or NVG.

In cases where treatment was required for both eyes, the eye with better visual acuity
and a milder disease condition was selected as the study eye.

**Grouping:**

The patient's acceptance of their DR diagnosis and treatment is directly related to their awareness of having DM. Therefore, there are inevitably differences in the reasons for delayed presentation, DR-related knowledge, and DM control between PDR patients with undiagnosed DM and those with a clear history of DM who did not receive timely PDR diagnosis and treatment. The former group has never received diabetes treatment before being diagnosed with PDR, while the latter often faces issues causing delays in PDR diagnosis and treatment during the DM treatment process, despite being diagnosed with diabetes early on. In the subsequent investigation of the population known to have DM, we further classified them based on the following question in the survey questionnaire: "Have you ever refused the doctor's recommendation for DR diagnosis and treatment?" This latter group was divided into a non-compliant group (refusing DR diagnosis and treatment) and a compliant group (accepting DR screening or therapy). The compliant group included patients who underwent screening but were misdiagnosed as not having PDR and patients who received photocoagulation treatment but still had worsening conditions.

1. **PDR patients with undiagnosed DM:** Defined as patients who sought ophthalmic care due to ocular symptoms, where retinal abnormalities were discovered, leading to a diagnosis of DR, but who had not previously undergone DM screening or treatment were unaware of having DM during initial ophthalmic consultation.
2. PDR patients with a clear history of DM at the time of PDR diagnosis: This group of patients was further divided into two subgroups:

2.1. Patients who were able to complete DR screening and treatment as required:

   Defined as patients who have previously undergone DR screening and treatment as instructed by their doctor before the current visit, including one of the three following conditions:

   2.1.1. Patients with underdiagnosed PDR: Defined as patients with a confirmed history of DM who underwent eye DR screening within the last six months as required but had negative findings and were diagnosed with PDR during the current visit.

   2.1.2. Patients with PDR progression despite previous PRP treatment: Defined as patients with a confirmed history of DM and DR who had previously undergone PRP treatment as required but whose condition progressed to the extent that extra photocoagulation or surgical treatment was needed.

2.2 Patients who refused to participate in DR screening and treatment: Defined as patients previously advised to undergo DR screening or treatment but refused.

**Statistical analysis:**

Statistical analysis was performed using R version 3.20 (http://www.R-project.org). Patient characteristics were retrieved from their medical charts and recorded in Epidata Entry Clientversion2.0.3.15 (http://epidata.dk). The mean and standard deviation (SD) were calculated for continuous variables with a normal distribution. The median with quartiles was calculated for continuous variables with nonnormal distribution. The t-test
or Mann–Whitney U test was carried out for continuous variables. The chi-square or Fisher's exact test was carried out for discrete data.

To investigate the factors related to patients refusing to undergo DR screening or treatment, two independent-sample comparisons were carried out on characteristics between patients who could complete DR screening and treatment as required and patients who refused to participate in DR screening and treatment. Variables with a p-value less than 0.3 were further enrolled in a binary backward stepwise logistic regression model. Each time, one variable was included or excluded from the model by comparing the Akaike information criterion (AIC) value; the model with the lowest AIC was chosen.

**Results:**

**General Characteristics :**

A total of 157 patients, with a mean age of 50.0 ± 11.6 years and including 84 male patients (53.5%), were included in this study. The overall glycemic control was poor, with a median HbA1c of 7.8% (IQR 2.5%).

Most 157 eyes (144, 91.7%) required vitrectomy intervention; 17 developed NVG, while only 13 required additional PRP.

PDR was confirmed in most contralateral eyes (154, 98.1%), with 3 cases of blindness due to trauma. Most of these eyes did not receive timely and effective treatment, resulting in 18 cases of blindness due to PDR, five patients treated with vitrectomy, 42
cases treated with PRP, and 10 cases treated with intravitreal injection (IV) of anti-vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) agents (details in Table 1).

**Table 1 Characteristics of Diabetic patients in different groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patients with a history of DM (121)</th>
<th>Patients who refused to participate in DR screening and treatment (75)</th>
<th>Patients who were able to underdiagnosed PDR (30)</th>
<th>Progressed after PRP (16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patients</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.3±11.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.6±11.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.5±11.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age (y, mean±SD)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54.9±13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM duration (y, median, IQR)</td>
<td>0.6, 1.1</td>
<td>13.0, 6.5</td>
<td>15.7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(y, median, IQR)</td>
<td>13.0, 6.5</td>
<td>15.7, 8</td>
<td>20, 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HbA1c (%, IQR)</td>
<td>7.2, 2.5</td>
<td>7.6, 2.6</td>
<td>8.6, 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
without other medicati on (n)  
HTN (n) 25 35 18 9  
CKD (n) 11 17 20 5  
coronary heart disease (n) 9 10 9 4  
stroke (n) 3 6 5 3  
Ocular symptom (m, median, IQR) 3.5, 9.3 3.0, 7.0 4.0, 4.0 4.5, 10  
Cataract extraction n without 6 1 1 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DR screening (n)</th>
<th>IV-anti</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VEGF (n)</td>
<td>incomplet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP (n)</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP (n)</td>
<td>required</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP (n)</td>
<td>required</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP (n)</td>
<td>required</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Patient-related reasons for delayed presentation:

Patients with undiagnosed DM at the diagnosis of PDR:

We identified 36 patients who were unaware of their DM diagnosis at the time of PDR diagnosis. The primary reason for delayed DR presentation was that these patients were unaware they had DM (36 cases, 100.0%). Additionally, some patients believed that ophthalmic examination was only necessary when visual acuity significantly declined or had a noticeable impact on their daily lives (14 cases, 38.9%). Furthermore, a few patients believed traditional Chinese herbal therapy could cure DM and did not undergo systematic evaluation even after receiving suggestions to rule out DM (4 cases, 11.2%). Notably, 14 (38.9%) did not have medical insurance, seven (19.4%) had economic difficulties, six (16.7%) had caregiving responsibilities, five (13.9%) had trouble taking time off from work, and 5 (13.9%) had concurrent management of other systemic diseases. These factors were identified as contributing to delayed medical
attention. None of the patients had undergone a physical examination in the past year.

Due to patients' lack of awareness of their DM diagnosis, we did not investigate their compliance with blood glucose control and knowledge of DR.

Patients with a clear history of DM at the diagnosis of PDR:

We surveyed 121 PDR patients with a known history of diabetes to explore the reasons and personal factors contributing to their delay in DR treatment. The survey included patients' acknowledgment of DR, compliance with DM management, and attitudes toward DR diagnosis and treatment. Some patients were not opposed to DR treatment but had other issues, while others directly resisted DR treatment. We conducted separate investigations for these two groups.

First, we identified common issues among patients with a known history of DM who experienced delays in PDR diagnosis and treatment:

In terms of DR awareness, the patients generally exhibited inadequate knowledge. Only 29 (24.0%) individuals knew that diabetic patients require regular DR screening, and only 33 (27.3%) knew that untreated DR could lead to blindness.

In terms of behavior, patients attributed the primary reason for the delay to their excellent visual acuity, leading them to believe that DR screening was unnecessary. Ninety-eight (81.0%) patients thought their good visual acuity was the main reason for delaying DR diagnosis and treatment.

Regarding compliance with DM management, most patients (113/121, 93.3%) reported regular use of diabetic medication, but their glycemic control was poor. Among
them, 22 patients (18.2%) had an HbA1c level above 6.5% at their visit.

Furthermore, we revealed the characteristics of patients who refused DR screening or treatment and the reasons for the refusal.

The two groups of patients showed similar levels of DR awareness in the survey regarding reasons for delay (p=0.41, p=0.83), and there were no significant differences in social support (p=0.98) or insurance coverage (p=0.99).

Compared to diabetic patients who did not refuse the recommended DR screening and treatment, those who refused exhibited the following characteristics: a lower proportion of regular visits to internal medicine clinics (43/75, 42/46, p<0.001), a shorter duration of diabetes (13, 16, p=0.005), a higher proportion of patients with no abnormalities detected during screening but no regular follow-up recommended (49/75, 14/46, p<0.001), and a lower proportion of patients able to tolerate discomfort during DR examination or treatment (17/75, 3/46, p=0.02). Furthermore, logistic regression analysis revealed three factors associated with the refusal of DR diagnosis and treatment:

A. Inability to receive regular diabetes treatment in internal medicine clinics (OR 6.78, 95% CI 1.73-26.59, p=0.006),

B. Inability to tolerate the discomfort during ophthalmic examination and treatment (OR 15.15, 95% CI 2.70-83.33, p<0.001),

C. Patients who did not detect any retinal abnormalities and were not informed about the need for regular screening (OR 2.05, 95% CI 1.36-3.09, p<0.001) (AIC=118.88, AUC=0.861).
Patient-perceived reasons for delayed presentation related to medical, family, and social aspects:

After investigating the reasons for the delay as perceived by themselves, we further examined the difficulties that could lead to delays, including financial problems, work distractions, family caregiving responsibilities, inability to seek medical attention independently, and the need to treat other systemic diseases. The ranking of these reasons varied among different patient groups (Figure 1).

1. For individuals who were unaware of their DM diagnosis at the time of PDR diagnosis, the factors influencing their DR treatment were as follows: financial difficulties (16.7%), being occupied by work (16.7%), family caregiving responsibilities (14.9%), and the need for treatment of other systemic diseases (11.9%).

2. For the PDR patients who refused DR treatment suggestion, the factors influencing their participation in DR screening were as follows: the need for treatment of other systemic diseases (16.0%), being occupied by work (12.0%), lack of accompanying during medical visits (8.0%), and financial difficulties (5.3%).

3. For the PDR patients with underdiagnosed DR, the factors influencing their situation were as follows: the need for treatment of other systemic diseases (26.7%), being occupied by work (13.3%), financial difficulties (10.0%), and lack of accompanying during medical visits (2.9%).

4. For the PDR patient experiencing disease progression after PRP treatment, the
factors influencing their situation were as follows: the need for treatment of other systemic diseases (31.3%), lack of accompanying during medical visits (25%), financial difficulties (25%) and being occupied by work (30%).

Figure 1 The radar chat for the patient-perceived reasons for delayed presentation among different groups.

Deficiencies in the healthcare services in response to the delayed presentation:

In addition to the patients and their support system, we identified deficiencies in DM screening, the management of diabetic patients by internal medicine physicians, and the treatment for DR provided by ophthalmologists, all contributing to delays in DR management.

Inadequate DM screening among the general population:

Our study identified 36 patients diagnosed with DM only when PDR was detected in the ophthalmology clinic. These patients had not undergone DM screening previously. For them, the main issue contributing to treatment delay is why DM was not detected promptly.

Issues with internal medicine physicians in DR management:

After being diagnosed with DM, patients most frequently interact with internal
medicine physicians. Among patients with a known history of DM but who
experienced treatment delays, we identified problems related to guidance on regular
visit, education on DR, and the sensitivity of DR screening by internal medicine
physicians.

Internal medicine physicians did not emphasize the importance of regular follow-up
visits for DM patients. Our study found that among individuals with known history of
DM, 36 patients (29.75%) did not have regular visits to internal medicine physicians.
Furthermore, the proportion of patients who did not have regular visits and underwent
DR screening was lower. This was evident in the following aspects: 1) a lower
proportion of patients who received information from internal medicine physicians
about the potential blindness caused by DR, compared to those with regular visits
(4/36, 29/85, p=0.01); 2) a lower proportion of patients with irregular visits who
underwent DR screening, compared to those with regular visits (11/36, 67/85, p=0.01).

We found a lack of DR education among internal medicine physicians. Among the
121 patients known to have DM, only 18 individuals (14.9%) received DR education
from internal medicine physicians, which was significantly lower than the proportion
of patients receiving DR education from ophthalmologists (18/121 vs 62/121,
p<0.001). Even among the 85 patients with regular visits, only 25 individuals were
aware of the importance of regular fundus examinations. The majority of patients
obtained knowledge about DR through ophthalmic DR screening, and those who
underwent DR screening had better awareness of DR compared to those who did not
undergo screening (DR screening necessary: 40/66 vs 81/91, p<0.001; DR can cause
blindness: 46/66 vs 80/91, p=0.008).

During the initial visit for DM, internal medicine physicians did not sufficiently emphasize the potential for blindness due to DR and the importance of regular asymptomatic DR examinations. Among the 55 patients who refused retinal screening, 87.3% believed that good vision meant they did not need screening, which was the primary reason for their refusal. Additionally, we found that 14.5% of patients delayed DR screening out of fear of detecting retinal abnormalities.

We observed a low sensitivity of DR screening initiated by internal medicine physicians. This could lead patients to mistakenly believe that their fundus are normal and overlook the importance of regular follow-up examinations. Our study identified 30 patients who underwent DR screening within the past six months without detecting any retinal abnormalities. However, within the subsequent six months, 29 patients developed PDR retinal lesions requiring surgical intervention, including two individuals who developed NVG. Among them, 20 patients had undergone DR screening initiated by internal medicine physicians, while ten had undergone screening initiated by ophthalmologists. The rate of missed diagnosis in DR screening initiated by internal medicine physicians was 20/21, significantly higher than that of ophthalmologists, which was 10/45 (p<0.001).

Internal medicine physicians did not adequately emphasize the need for regular DR screening when DR was not detected. Our findings demonstrated that among patients who underwent initial screening without detecting DR, those who were not informed about the importance of regular follow-up had fewer opportunities for PDR treatment.
compared to those who were notified. Among the 30 patients with negative retinal findings during the initial screening, 14 individuals were not informed about the need for follow-up, and 12 were not informed by internal medicine physicians. These patients did not receive PDR treatment during the subsequent six months. On the other hand, 16 patients were informed about the need for regular follow-up. During the subsequent examinations, they were diagnosed, with two individuals receiving the opportunity for complete PRP treatment and five individuals completing partial PRP treatment before the onset of vitreous hemorrhage (0/14, 7/16, p=0.007).

Our investigation revealed that 28 patients experienced delays in DR treatment due to hospitalization for systemic diseases. These patients did not receive ophthalmic consultations or treatment during their hospital stay, nor did they receive any educational information about DR from internal medicine physicians.

We identified 8 PDR patients who regularly sought treatment from traditional Chinese medicine (TCM) practitioners. These patients were of working age, ranging from 33 to 62 years old, with a median age of 59 (standard deviation 7.75 years). However, these patients relied solely on TCM instead of receiving systematic glucose-controlling medicine (6/8), resulting in poor blood glucose control (elevated glycated hemoglobin levels, with an average of 7.1±1.1) and severe systemic complications (8/8). Prior to their diagnosis of PDR, these patients lacked awareness of DR, unaware of its potential to cause blindness and the need for regular examinations (8/8). Furthermore, none underwent ophthalmic DR screening (8/8), leading to the development of PDR complications requiring surgical intervention.
Insufficiencies in the Diagnosis, Treatment of DR by Ophthalmologists:

Ophthalmologists are responsible for treating DR, particularly in emphasizing the importance of regular follow-up for early-stage DR that does not affect vision. However, we found that DR patient education inadequately emphasizes this importance. Only 62 out of 121 patients received DR education from ophthalmologists. Additionally, a considerable proportion of patients who received DR treatment falsely believed that having good VA meant they did not require ophthalmic care and postponed seeking medical attention. This behavior was similar to that of patients who did not comply with the recommended DR treatment (39/46, 59/75, p=0.55).

Ophthalmologists have shown insufficient efforts in educating and encouraging patients who exhibit resistance and pain-related concerns during DR treatment. Alternatively, the understanding of patients may have needed to be improved despite information from ophthalmologists. We discovered that discomfort experienced during fundus examinations and PRP therapy became the primary reasons for delayed presentation of DR. When investigating the reasons behind delayed medical intervention among different patient groups, we found that 65% of patients who refused PDR treatment did so out of fear of pain associated with PRP therapy. Similarly, among patients who experienced disease progression after PRP treatment declined and refused to complete the treatment due to pain related to PRP therapy. Furthermore, four individuals who refused fundus examination within the group declined PRP treatment.
due to discomfort. In the group where improper PRP treatment resulted in DR progression, three patients declined subsequent follow-ups due to discomfort during eye examinations post-PRP treatment. These patients exhibited insufficient awareness regarding the risk of blindness associated with DR and the necessity of regular follow-up examinations (10 patients, 50%, among those who refused treatment, and four patients, 66.7%, among those who completed treatment but did not undergo follow-up examinations). As a result, they lacked the necessary determination to overcome discomfort and complete the required examinations and treatment.

We found that ophthalmologists needed to adequately emphasize the possibility of disease progression and the importance of regular follow-up examinations after PRP treatment, as demonstrated by the patient's lack of knowledge. Among the 16 patients who completed PRP therapy, 11 were unaware of the need for regular follow-up examinations after treatment. Despite relatively stable vision in these patients (11/16), factors such as being occupied by work, systemic illnesses, family responsibilities, financial difficulties, and discomfort with examinations and PRP treatment contributed to their failure to attend follow-up appointments. As a result, ten patients experienced disease progression to a stage requiring vitrectomy.

Furthermore, we found that some ophthalmologists performed PRP treatment with inadequate coverage, leading to delays in disease management. Six patients were informed of completing PRP treatment, and their condition progressed to PDR requiring vitrectomy. However, during the surgery, it was discovered that the PRP coverage was insufficient. These patients did not attend follow-up examinations promptly after
completing PRP treatment.

Some ophthalmologists overlooked DR screening when performing cataract extraction surgery on diabetic patients. Among the ten patients who underwent cataract extraction surgery before receiving DR treatment, seven individuals with improved vision underwent no retinal screening. In comparison, only one out of the three patients whose vision did not improve underwent DR screening, leading to a missed diagnosis. The improvement in visual acuity following cataract extraction surgery may have contributed to the delay in the diagnosis and treatment of DR.

**Discussion:**

Early detection and intervention can prevent blindness caused by DR \(^4,^5\), so delayed treatment may result in severe and regrettable consequences. In China, the incidence of blindness caused by DR is rapidly increasing, becoming an essential factor in the rise of the blindness rate \(^7\). The factors leading to the delayed presentation of DR in Chinese diabetic patients are complex and diverse; however, there are currently no reports on the reasons for it. Investigating the reasons for the delayed presentation of DR in diabetic patients is significant for preventing and treating blindness caused by DR.

**The specific DM population that the ophthalmologist should pay more attention to:**

1. Patients with poor diabetes control:
Our investigation revealed that this group of diabetic patients commonly exhibited poor blood glucose control, which may lead to rapid DR progression. Specifically, we observed that patients had elevated HbA1c (with a median of 7.8%), and only 18.2% had their HbA1c controlled below 6.5% at their visit. It is established that poor blood glucose control is associated with microvascular complications in diabetic patients \[15\]. Studies have shown that individuals with HbA1c between 6.5 and 6.9 have a 2.35 times higher risk of developing DR within three years than those with HbA1c between 5 and 5.4 \[16\]. Therefore, based on our inference, poor blood glucose control is an essential factor contributing to the rapid progression of DR in the population with the delayed presentation in our study. Ophthalmologists should pay special attention to and provide education specifically for this population.

2. Patients with a high possibility of refusing DR treatment:

We compared patients who refused DR treatment suggestions with those who accepted them to investigate the factors associated with refusal. Ophthalmologists should be attentive to patients with the following characteristics, as they are more likely to be less engaged in DR treatment. Targeted education and follow-up should be provided to these patients to slow the progression of DR. Patient information leaflets, or website education may also allow patients to review and revise the issues.

A. Patients who do not visit internal medicine regularly are more prone to refuse DR treatment. Compared to patients who do not visit internal medicine regularly, those who have regular visits have a 6.78 times higher chance of receiving timely DR treatment. This could be attributed to regular patients receiving more DR education...
B. Patients who exhibit intolerance to pain and discomfort during examinations and treatment are more likely to refuse DR treatment. The likelihood of refusing DR treatment increased by 15.15 times for patients who strongly resisted pain and discomfort compared to those who were less resistant. This resistance is particularly evident among patients who refuse DR treatment (13/20), whereas factors related to delays in PRP treatment due to hospitalization for systemic diseases accounted for only 5/20 cases. Furthermore, previous studies have shown that fear of discomfort during ophthalmic examinations is a primary reason patients refuse DR screening [10,24]. Surveys regarding satisfaction with PRP treatment indicate that insufficient knowledge about laser treatment [17], discomfort caused by pupillary dilation [17], pain during laser treatment [17] [18], and failure to achieve expected visual acuity [13, 14] may lead to patient reluctance towards PRP treatment, thereby affecting compliance with laser treatment and subsequent follow-up examinations. The results of our study align with previous research.

C. Patients unaware of the need for regular follow-up after DR screening and with no positive DR finding were more likely to refuse visits for DR screening. Compared to patients advised of timely treatment and had DR detected during screening, those who did not receive regular follow-up advice and had no evidence of DR during screening were 2.05 times more likely to refuse DR screening or treatment. Guidelines recommend annual retinal examinations for diabetic patients without DR [3]. In our study, a group of patients (30/121) had no DR detected during their initial
screening but progressed to PDR within the following six months. Most of these patients' DR screenings were conducted by internal medicine doctors (20/30), indicating the possibility of missed diagnoses. However, these patients shared the common characteristics of long time of poor blood glucose control, with a median HbA1c of 8.6 and a median duration of DM of 15 years. It was suggested that individuals with a long duration of DM and poor blood glucose control might experience rapid progression of DR, even if abnormalities are not initially detected. Annual follow-up examinations may delay the diagnosis, indicating the need to shorten the interval for DR screenings.

Reducing delays requires joint efforts from society and healthcare professionals:

Practical difficulties:

After investigating the self-perceived factors contributing to delays in our study, we referred to common reasons reported in previous studies, such as economic difficulties [11], lack of nearby medical facilities, other commitments, and hospitalization [8, 10], to examine the barriers identified by patients that hindered their adherence to regular DR treatment.

We identified several social factors that can influence the timely receipt of DR treatment among diabetic patients. These factors should receive greater attention and improvement in receiving similar diabetic patients in the future to provide timely DR treatment for diabetic patients.

Some low-income or uninsured patients did not have the opportunity to undergo
diabetes screening. Among patients unaware of their diabetes diagnosis when diagnosed with PDR, a considerable portion consisted of low-income individuals without health insurance. These patients are typically younger, with 14 (38.9%) lacking health insurance and 7 (19.4%) stating they could not seek medical care due to economic difficulties. Many patients missed medical visits due to obligations such as caring for family members or work, and these patients had not undergone regular health check-ups in the past year. Therefore, efforts should be made to enhance diabetes screening for individuals without health insurance or facing economic difficulties to identify individuals with diabetes at an early stage and facilitate subsequent DR screenings for these patients.

The absence of a companion may pose a barrier for diabetic patients to attend DR treatment. Patients consider the lack of a companion during medical visits a primary challenge in receiving DR treatment. This situation is particularly prominent among patients who refuse DR treatment (6/20) and those who have completed PRP treatment but have no regular follow-up examinations (4/16). PDR can impact patients' independent living abilities \[19\], causing inconvenience in their daily lives. Therefore, for diabetic patients with visual impairments, family members are encouraged to accompany them during medical visits to help provide them with more opportunities to receive DR treatment.

The inability to take time off from work may hinder diabetic patients from attending DR treatment. According to our research, 10.9% of patients who refuse DR screening stated that the inability to take time off work was the reason for not being able to undergo
timely screening. Similarly, 13% of patients with missed DR diagnoses and 18.7% of patients who completed PRP treatment believed that the inability to take time off work was the reason for not being able to attend scheduled DR follow-ups. It is crucial to identify their concerns about needing help to take leave during the initial consultation and provide individualized guidance and support. It is essential to be cognizant that patients with end-stage DM disease, such as PDR, are likely to have numerous medical appointments, and the impact on their work can be extensive. Physicians or ophthalmologists should provide adequate patient education to enhance treatment compliance.

**Medical care:**

Our investigation found that the reasons for treatment delay among patients are attributed to the patients and the factors related to the treating physicians. The treatment process for DM involves a complete chain of care, starting from the initial diagnosis of DM to DM follow-ups, to DR screening, and finally, the diagnosis and treatment of DR. However, if any link in this chain encounters issues, it can delay patient treatment. Therefore, physicians and ophthalmologists need to strengthen their attention and management at each stage of the treatment chain to ensure that patients receive timely care.

a. There are deficiencies in the DM patient education provided by physicians and ophthalmologists, primarily regarding dispelling the misconception that regular DR screening is unnecessary as long as their vision is not deteriorating. Our research
revealed that 81.0% of delayed patients believed that good vision meant they did not need medical attention. This misconception was prevalent among patients receiving regular internal medicine care (60/85) and those undergoing ophthalmic DR treatment (59/75). It reflects a need for more emphasis on the importance of early DR screening by the physicians and ophthalmologists attending to these patients. Studies have shown that patients' understanding of the potential blindness caused by the delayed detection of DR directly influences their adherence to DR treatment [9]. Insufficient awareness of the need for DR screening and the misconception that good vision eliminates the need for ocular examinations are associated with the severity of proliferative diabetic retinopathy (PDR) when diabetic patients seek ophthalmic care [20]. Therefore, patient education for diabetic patients should focus on the importance of regular follow-ups for early DR detection, irrespective of visual symptoms. During consultations with diabetic patients, every opportunity should be seized to emphasize that early-stage DR may not affect vision, the need for regular DR screening, and the significance of early detection and treatment.

b. Some errors made by the physicians:

When diagnosing and treating systemic diseases, internal medicine physicians should also pay attention to diagnosing and treating DR. We found that 28 patients had delayed DR presentation due to treating their systemic conditions. Previous studies have indicated that hospitalization in internal medicine is a major factor contributing to delays in PRP treatment [10], which aligns with our research findings.
Therefore, while treating systemic diseases, internal medicine physicians should promptly seek ophthalmic consultations when feasible to ensure timely diagnosis and treatment of DR.

During internal medicine follow-ups for DM, attention should be given to patients with psychological issues. In this study, 14.5% of patients refused DR screening due to concerns about discovering retinal abnormalities. This reason was not mentioned in previous research. The majority of these patients do not actively seek ophthalmic screenings, even though they have some understanding of DR and its screening. They experience excessive anxiety about potential positive test results. The prevalence of depression (25%) and anxiety (13.5%) is relatively high among DR patients in our country, and social support can alleviate anxiety and depression in these patients [21]. Internal medicine physicians should promptly identify patients with abnormal psychological emotions and provide positive guidance, such as informing them that having DR does not inevitably lead to blindness and that timely treatment can slow down disease progression and stabilize vision. It is also essential to seek the cooperation and support of family members and encourage patients to undergo DR diagnosis and treatment.

The sensitivity of DR screenings initiated by physicians needs to be improved. In this study, physicians' missed DR diagnosis rate was 20/21, which is relatively high. Previous research has shown that the sensitivity of non-mydriatic single-field fundus photography and DR interpretation initiated by internal medicine physicians is 86.6% with a specificity of 78.6% [22], indicating their potential role in DR screenings.
However, our study's sensitivity of DR screenings was much lower than the above data, meaning there is still room for improvement among our physicians. Recent studies have demonstrated that fundus photography initiated by physicians and remote image reading can enhance the accuracy of DR screening \[23\]. Therefore, improving the sensitivity of DR screening by physicians or implementing reliable remote network image reading guidance may play a crucial role in the timely detection of DR in DM patients who do not seek ophthalmic care. Alternatively, trained nonphysician graders have been demonstrated to be highly successful. In the UK, this has reduced the impact of diabetic eye disease-related blindness \[24\].

Additionally, we found that among the 20 PDR patients with missed diagnoses in DR screenings initiated by physicians, 14 needed to be made aware of the need for regular follow-up visits. These patients did not pursue further ophthalmic care due to their excellent vision. It suggests that physicians and other health care professionals involved in their care needs must further strengthen patient education and urge patients to undergo ophthalmic follow-up visits.

There are also issues with TCM regarding DR screenings and patient education. We identified eight patients receiving treatment in TCM internal medicine who opted for traditional Chinese medicine instead of glycose-controlled medicine. This resulted in poor blood sugar control (HbA1c 7.1 \[1.1\]), no DR screenings, and delayed treatment until severe PDR developed. Additionally, they had uncontrolled systemic complications (high rates of HTN (6/8), CKD (4/8), and a high proportion of CAD (3/8) that were not addressed by internal medicine treatment. These patients,
aged between 32 and 62, belong to the working-age population. Once life-threatening and vision-threatening complications occur, they will burden society significantly. Previous studies have shown that traditional Chinese medicine (TCM), as a benefit as an adjunct to conventional treatment for DM, including medication, exercise, and dietary control, may affect controlling HbA1c levels and improving vision [25, 26]. Therefore, it is essential to enhance the understanding of TCM physicians regarding DR screenings. When diagnosing DM, patients should be informed about the importance of medication, diet, exercise, blood sugar control, and glycose-control medicine treatments. Simultaneously, patients should be encouraged to undergo DR screenings to minimize treatment delays caused by solely focusing on vision changes.

c. The ophthalmologists should make some improvements:

Ophthalmologists’ failure to remind patients who have undergone cataract extraction about the importance of DR-related fundus examination can delay treatment for diabetic patients who experience improved vision post-surgery. Ten patients with a history of cataract extraction were included in this study, of which eight did not undergo DR screening. Among these eight patients, seven reported improved vision after the surgery, and five of them did not receive a fundus examination because they believed their vision was already good. Previous research has indicated that vision improvement following cataract surgery in diabetic patients can potentially mask vision symptoms caused by DR. Additionally, cataract surgery in diabetic patients can contribute to the progression of PDR, necessitating
perioperative intravitreal anti-VEGF agents and vigilant postoperative follow-up \[27, 28\]. Therefore, ophthalmologists should prioritize strengthening DR screening and follow-up for diabetic patients undergoing cataract surgery. This approach is crucial to identify DR promptly and prevent further deterioration of vision due to DR.

Ophthalmologists must prioritize regular follow-ups and effectively communicate to patients undergoing PRP treatment about ongoing examinations' importance. Our study observed that 16 patients with PDR had completed PRP treatment, but their condition continued progressing. Among these patients, 11 were unaware of the necessity for regular post-PRP examinations, and ten believed that their vision had stabilized, leading them to forego further treatment. Unfortunately, this delay in disease detection hindered early intervention. Furthermore, we discovered that six patients needed complete PRP treatment and were frequently required to pay more attention to follow-up examinations. Consequently, their condition progressed, ultimately requiring vitrectomy surgery. Previous research has demonstrated that effective PRP treatment can prevent 50% of PDR progression and mitigate 50% of severe vision damage caused by PDR \[29\]. However, despite PRP treatment, 42% of PDR patients still experience disease progression \[30\]. Patients who initiate PRP treatment after experiencing vitreous hemorrhage and retinal detachment are more likely to encounter DR progression following PRP treatment \[30, 31\]. Therefore, for diabetic patients who have completed PRP treatment, ophthalmologists should strengthen education regarding the effectiveness of PRP treatment and stress the need for regular follow-up examinations. It is crucial to adhere to standardized PRP
treatment protocols meticulously.

Limitations:

This study is a cross-sectional survey that focused on PDR patients who delayed seeking medical treatment. The study specifically excluded patients with well-controlled glucose levels and those compliant with DR treatment, and we could not investigate the delayed presentation in those patients. Notably, this study's proportion of patients receiving intravitreal anti-VEGF agents was relatively low. Furthermore, most patients who received this treatment did so after experiencing vitreous hemorrhage or NVG. Therefore, the reasons for the delayed progression of PDR following intravitreal anti-VEGF agents remain unclear, indicating a need for further research. Additionally, it is worth mentioning that the number of patients who underwent PRP received intravitreal anti-VEGF agents or cataract surgery was relatively small. This may have resulted in a selection bias among the study population. Furthermore, regarding retinopathy assessment, this study did not include the measurement of VA. Instead, the patient's ocular condition was evaluated solely through fundus examination. Consequently, the study failed to demonstrate any visual acuity impairment within this group of patients. Regarding systemic examination, the study exclusively recorded the patient's medical history of coronary artery disease (CAD), cerebral infarction, and other diseases and the results of kidney function tests. However, urine albumin-to-creatinine ratio (ACR) examinations were not conducted, leading to a deviation in evaluating the systemic condition.
Conclusions:

This study investigated the factors contributing to delayed presentation among patients with PDR. A significant proportion of individuals in the delayed population were found to have undiagnosed DM. As a result, it is crucial to enhance DM screening efforts and promote education about the condition. Among patients already aware of their DM status, reasons for delay included insufficient knowledge about DR, negative attitudes towards screening and treatment, and difficulties seeking medical care in real-life situations. Furthermore, there needed to be more improvements in the detection, treatment, and follow-up of DR by both internal medicine practitioners and ophthalmologists. It is imperative to strengthen education regarding the importance of regular DR screening, especially when it still needs to impact vision. Particular attention should be given to patients with irregular visits to internal medicine specialists and those concerned about discomfort during DR treatment. Additionally, patients who undergo cataract surgery, participate in DR screening conducted by physicians, utilize traditional Chinese medicine treatments, complete PRP, and have negative screening findings should also receive regular follow-up examinations. Finally, vigilance to patients' challenges during the diagnosis and treatment process is crucial. Patients should be encouraged to cooperate and receive support from family members throughout their treatment journey.
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Abbreviations:

AIC  Akaike information criterion
CKD  chronic kidney disease
DR   diabetic retinopathy
HbA1c glycated hemoglobin level
HTN  hypertension
IV   intravitreal injection
NVI  neovascularization of the iris
NVG  neovascular glaucoma
PDR  proliferative diabetic retinopathy
PRP  pan-retinal photocoagulation
VEGF vascular endothelial growth factor
VH   vitreous hemorrhage

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to all those who contributed to the successful completion of this study. Their support, guidance, and encouragement have been invaluable throughout the research process.

First and foremost, we extend our heartfelt appreciation to the patients who participated in this study. Their willingness to share their experiences and insights
played a pivotal role in shedding light on the factors contributing to delayed presentation in patients with proliferative diabetic retinopathy.

We are grateful to our colleagues and fellow researchers who provided valuable feedback and suggestions during the course of this study. Their expertise greatly enriched the quality of our research.