

1 **Diabetic retinopathy screening using a portable retinal camera in Vanuatu**

2 Juan Caceres^{1a} MD, Yibing Zhang^{1*} MD, Lawrence Boe² MD, Yunshu Zhou³ MS, Cagri Besirli³
3 MD, PhD, Yannis M Paulus^{3,4*} MD, FACS, Julie M. Rosenthal^{3*} MD, MS

4 ¹University of Michigan Medical School, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA

5 ²Penama Provincial Health, Godden Memorial Hospital, Ambae, Vanuatu

6 ³Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI,
7 USA

8 ⁴Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

9

10 ^a Juan Caceres and Yibing Zhang contributed equally as co-first authors.

11

12

13

14 **Corresponding authors:**

15 Julie M. Rosenthal MD, MS

16 University of Michigan, Kellogg Eye Center

17 1000 Wall Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48105

18 email: julieros@med.umich.edu

19

20 Yannis M. Paulus, MD, FACS

21 University of Michigan, Kellogg Eye Center

22 1000 Wall Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48105

23 email: ypaulus@med.umich.edu

24

25

26 **Keywords:** diabetic retinopathy, retinal screening, Vanuatu, portable retinal camera, Pictor

27

28 **ABSTRACT**

29 **Background and Objective:** Proof-of-concept study to test the feasibility of using an all-in-one
30 portable retinal camera for the screening of diabetic retinopathy in the Pacific island of Vanuatu.

31 **Study Design/Materials and Methods:** From February 10, 2020, through February 28, 2020, 49
32 patients with diabetes mellitus from three islands in Vanuatu were recruited to participate in the
33 study. Demographics, basic health data and retinal photography were obtained. A non-mydrriatic,
34 handheld camera was used (Volk Pictor Plus).

35 **Results:** Eleven participants (24%) had referral-warranted diabetic retinopathy. There was
36 moderately high inter-rater reliability for our dependent variables: referral status ($\kappa = 0.62$, 95%
37 CI 0.42-0.83), retinopathy severity ($\kappa = 0.76$, 95% CI 0.55-0.96), and clinically significant
38 macular edema ($\kappa = 0.50$, 95% CI 0.25-0.74)

39 **Conclusions:** Our study confirms that portable handheld cameras can be used to obtain retinal
40 images of sufficient quality for diabetic retinopathy screening even in resource limited
41 environments like Vanuatu. Among this cohort, a relatively high (24%) prevalence of referral-
42 warranted diabetic retinopathy was found in Vanuatu.

43 INTRODUCTION

44 Diabetes mellitus is a leading cause of death and disability worldwide. Among its
45 sequelae, diabetic retinopathy is the most common microvascular complication and affects most
46 patients with a history of diabetes for 15 years or more. Diabetes is a worldwide epidemic and
47 has particularly affected the islands of Vanuatu, where 10.9% of adults carry the diagnosis(1).
48 Diabetic retinopathy is one of the major causes of visual impairment in the South Pacific Islands
49 and the second most common diabetes-related complication in Vanuatu(2,3). Smith et al.
50 reported a prevalence of diabetic retinopathy of 52.9% in diabetic patients studied in 2007 and
51 emphasized the need for a “baseline screening program with ophthalmologic assessment and
52 follow up” in order to enable adequate intervention and treatment(4). Recently, a report on
53 Vanuatu’s non-communicable disease strategic plan, as part of the country’s government-funded
54 healthcare system, listed annual screening for diabetic retinopathy as very cost effective(5).

55 Nevertheless, there is still no screening program for diabetic retinopathy in Vanuatu. Like
56 many Pacific Island nations, Vanuatu has relied heavily on visiting teams of eye doctors to
57 perform screenings, leaving them without a reliable and consistent screening or treatment
58 program. However, in recent years, there has been a drastic improvement in eye care
59 infrastructure, including the construction of a new ophthalmology clinic, the arrival of the
60 country’s first permanent ophthalmologist, and the successful training of eye nurses in high
61 resolution retinal photography. As such, there are now more opportunities to create an effective
62 screening program for diabetic retinopathy. This can be done through teleophthalmology, which
63 is among the most efficient screening strategies for diabetic retinopathy due to the cost-
64 effectiveness and the ability to be used in both rural and urban settings(6,7).

65 There has been an increase in the accessibility of portable, high resolution retinal fundus
66 cameras worldwide, which have been shown to have high-sensitivity for referral-warranted
67 diabetic retinopathy(8–10). Due to their portability, relatively low cost, ease of use, and wide
68 availability, these retinal cameras have the potential to be transported to the most remote islands
69 of Vanuatu to aid in nationwide screening (11).

70 As such, the objective of this proof-of-concept study is to test the feasibility of using an
71 all-in-one portable, handheld retinal camera for the screening of referral-warranted diabetic
72 retinopathy. We also aim to better understand the prevalence of diabetic retinopathy in a cohort
73 of patients with diabetes in three islands of Vanuatu and evaluate the effect of demographic and
74 lifestyle factors on the presence or absence of referral-warranted diabetic retinopathy in these
75 patients with diabetes.

76 **METHODS**

77 This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Michigan
78 (HUM00171292, Diabetic Retinopathy in Vanuatu) and the Ethics Committee at the Vanuatu
79 Ministry of Health. Informed consent was obtained from all individuals participating in the
80 described study.

81 Study participant inclusion criteria included patients aged 18 years or older with Type 1
82 or Type 2 diabetes who had an appointment at the non-communicable disease clinic of the three
83 principal hospitals (Vila Central, Godden Memorial, and Northern Provincial Hospital) on the
84 Vanuatu islands of Efate, Ambae, and Santo, respectively. Patients were recruited and data was
85 obtained from February 10, 2020, through February 28, 2020. Patients were excluded if they
86 were under 18-years old, if they declined participation, or if they could not consent to the study.

87 There were 49 participants included in the study. Additionally, three patients were excluded from
88 retinal image analysis due the lack of gradable images.

89 **Procedures**

90 Survey data was obtained by two medical students (JC and YZ) from the University of
91 Michigan with the aid of a nurse language interpreter. Copies of the survey and consent forms
92 were also provided both in English and Bislama as desired. Participants were asked to complete a
93 survey that included demographic factors (including age and sex), diabetic self-management, and
94 lifestyle factors. Visual acuity, point-of care fasting blood sugar levels (mmol/L), blood pressure,
95 and body mass index (BMI) were also obtained from the participant if available.

96 Retinal photography was taken in a darkened room using a non-mydriatic handheld
97 portable fundus digital imaging camera system, the Volk Pictor Plus (Volk Optical, Mentor,
98 OH), which takes 40 degree field of view fundus images. Tropicamide 1% ophthalmic was used
99 for pupil dilation to facilitate image acquisition if patients consented to do so. Participants were
100 not required to use dilating drops for the study, but when consent was obtained, drops were
101 instilled approximately ten minutes prior to retinal photography. Non-mydriatic retinal images
102 were obtained in ten participants (20.4%) who declined dilating eye drops. Mydriatic retinal
103 images were obtained in the remaining thirty-nine participants (79.6%). Three patients were
104 excluded from the analysis of referral status because gradable retinal images were not obtained.
105 Photographs were taken by medical students (JC and YZ) with about two hours of hands-on
106 practice with the Volk Pictor Plus in addition reviewing the operating manual. The photographer
107 captured three retinal images of the macula, fovea, optic disc, vascular arcades, and adjacent
108 structures to ensure adequate field of view. The gold-standard photographic screening technique
109 for diabetic retinopathy is seven-field, 30 degree mydriatic tabletop retinal photography

110 comprising the posterior 90 degrees of the retina(12). Subsequent studies have demonstrated that
111 three-field, 45 degree nonmydriatic fundus photography was effective in grading DR to
112 determine referral-warranted disease, whereas a single 45 degree photograph was insufficient to
113 accurately grade DR(13–15) . Given that the Pictor Plus field of view is approximately 40
114 degrees, three photos were acquired per eye in this study to determine referral-warranted status.

115 Images were graded for image quality (excellent, acceptable, and not gradable) based on
116 a previously published scale(10). A photograph was considered excellent if it was in focus and
117 the entire posterior pole was visualized. An image was considered acceptable if it was
118 overexposed, underexposed, or out of focus but adequate to determine the presence or absence of
119 pathology. An ungradable photograph was one in which the image was out of focus or obscured
120 without being able to determine pathology. This grading scheme was adapted from the National
121 Health Service (United Kingdom) Diabetic Grading Forms(16–18). Images were stored in the
122 camera’s internal memory and linked with the corresponding survey data using a de-identified
123 number.

124 **Remote Image Interpretation**

125 After data acquisition, images were exported to a HIPAA secure online database and
126 stored as individual JPEG images. Images were grouped by eye (OD, OS). A total of 209 images
127 were taken with the Pictor plus. Images and subfolders were given a random identifier in order to
128 mask the two retina specialists (YMP and JR). Prior to initiation of image grading, there was
129 100% inter-rater agreement for referral-warranted diabetic retinopathy on a sample of 20
130 randomly selected images.

131 Images were graded based on image quality, the presence or absence of diabetic
132 retinopathy, and the severity level of the retinopathy by two masked retina specialists (YMP and
133 JR). Grading was based on the international clinical diabetic retinopathy and diabetic macular
134 edema disease severity scales(19). Clinically significant macular edema was defined as retinal
135 thickening or hard exudates approaching the center of the macula or involving the center of the
136 macula (within 500 microns)(20). Moreover, image quality was graded based on gradeability
137 (see above). Retinopathy severity level was evaluated as ungradable, no retinopathy, mild non-
138 proliferative diabetic retinopathy (NPDR), moderate NPDR, severe NPDR, and proliferative
139 diabetic retinopathy (PDR). Clinically significant macular edema (CSME) was also graded as
140 present, absent, or ungradable. Any patient with CSME or with a retinopathy severity level
141 greater than mild NPDR was considered referral-warranted (Figure 1). If CSME or retinopathy
142 was ungradable, the image was considered ungradable. Discrepancies (gradable vs. ungradable)
143 in grades between readers remained de-identified and were reviewed a second time. Any further
144 discrepancies were adjudicated by a third retina specialist grader (CB).

145 **Statistical Analysis**

146 Survey data, visual acuity, fasting blood sugar levels (mmol/L), blood pressure, and BMI
147 were summarized both by location and by referral status. For referral status, only gradable
148 images were used. Participants were included in the analysis if there was at least one eye that
149 was gradable. Descriptive statistics were performed on retinal images based on grading. Either t-
150 test or Wilcoxon rank sum test for continuous variables were used depending on the distribution
151 of the data; and either chi-square test or Fisher's exact tests were used for categorical variables
152 depending on the distribution of the data. These tests were performed using SAS version 9.4
153 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA). Inter-observer reliability was assessed for quality of retinal

154 images, retinopathy severity, CSME, and referral status using Cohen's kappa statistic(21). Kappa
155 statistic was performed using the Graphpad Quickcalcs website
156 (www.graphpad.com/quickcalcs/kappa1, San Diego, CA).

157 **RESULTS**

158 Forty-nine patients representing the islands of Efate, Santo, and Ambae were included in the
159 study. Study participants were divided equally by sex and had a mean (\pm standard deviation) age
160 of 57 ± 10 . Body mass index (BMI, $27\pm 4\text{kg/m}^2$), systolic blood pressure (138 ± 22 mmHg), and
161 blood glucose levels (14 ± 5.8 mmol/L) were also similar between islands. Most participants
162 received their diabetes diagnoses during routine screening (86%) and reported adherence to their
163 diabetes medication regimen (84%). About half of study participants reported a dilated eye exam
164 in the past (Table 1). More than half of participants reported having vision (65%) or foot (63%)
165 complications as a result of their diabetes. There were 11 participants (24%) with referral-
166 warranted diabetic retinopathy versus 35 participants (76%) who did not have referral-warranted
167 diabetic retinopathy (Table 2). There were no significant differences in age or sex between
168 referral and non-referral-warranted patients. BMI (27.7 vs 27.2 kg/m^2), systolic blood pressure
169 (138.3 vs 138.0 mm Hg), blood glucose levels (12.8 vs 13.9 mmol/L), and visual acuity were
170 also similar between referral and non-referral-warranted groups (all $p > 0.05$). Most patients in
171 both groups (81.8% vs 82.8%) reported adequate adherence to their diabetic medication regimen.

172 Out of the 95 eyes imaged, there was 100% agreement of ungradable images between
173 graders and these images were excluded. For referral status, a third grader was required to reach
174 a consensus in 11 eyes. There were 15 eyes (16%) that were considered to have referral-
175 warranted diabetic retinopathy versus 69 eyes (73%) that did not require referral (Table 3). There

176 was full agreement ($\kappa = 1$) on whether an image was of adequate quality for analysis. There was
177 moderately high inter-rater reliability for referral status ($\kappa = 0.62$, 95% CI 0.42-0.83),
178 retinopathy severity ($\kappa = 0.76$, 95% CI 0.55-0.96), and CSME ($\kappa = 0.50$, 95% CI 0.25-0.74;
179 Table 4).

180 **DISCUSSION**

181 We performed a proof-of-concept study evaluating the use of a portable, handheld retinal
182 fundus camera to screen for diabetic retinopathy in patients with diabetes in Vanuatu. We found
183 that 24% of our cohort had referral-warranted diabetic retinopathy (DR), which was consistent
184 with the 23.5% of participants with sight-threatening DR among diabetic patients in Vanuatu
185 reported by Smith et al. in 2007(4). This high prevalence is problematic, especially due to the
186 insufficient screening for DR in Vanuatu. Based on our data, only about half of the study
187 population reported a prior dilated retinal exam, compared to almost 80% of U.S patients with
188 diabetes who reported a dilated retinal exam over 24 months(22). This puts many of these
189 patients at risk of vision loss and blindness due to inadequate early detection and intervention.
190 The impact of pupil dilation was unclear, as most of our participants were dilated, although our
191 main methodological goal was to obtain an adequate view of the fundus. The study did not
192 evaluate the lens status. Nevertheless, there were multiple patients with cataracts that did limit
193 the evaluation of the fundus. Furthermore, the elevated mean systolic blood pressure and blood
194 sugar in this study indicate that these patients are at higher risk of developing DR(23). As such,
195 an effective screening method for DR in Vanuatu is imperative.

196 The ideal screening modality in a low resource, rural setting must be cost-effective,
197 portable, non-invasive, and reliable regardless of training level(6). We used the Volk Pictor Plus,

198 a commercially available, handheld, non-mydratic retinal camera. Accessible camera-based
199 telemedicine screening programs have been shown to lead to saved sight-years(24). Although
200 this camera costs approximately US \$4,000-\$10,000, this pales in comparison to the healthcare
201 costs associated with blindness(25,26).

202 Due to the portability of the Pictor Plus, our team was able to travel across three different
203 islands in Vanuatu without requiring extensive equipment. As for quality, only 12% of the retinal
204 images taken were ungradable, despite the limited training of the photographers. This number of
205 ungradable images is consistent with and sometimes less than prior studies screening for
206 retinopathy in low-resource settings(27). We also found that about 16% of eyes (and 24% of
207 participants) imaged had referral-warranted diabetic retinopathy, which is also consistent with
208 the 17% of referral-warranted DR in a primary care study by Toy et al(28).

209 Furthermore, there was moderately high agreement between the two retina specialists in
210 terms of referral status ($\kappa = 0.62$), retinopathy severity ($\kappa = 0.76$), and the presence of CSME (κ
211 $= 0.50$). There was also full agreement ($\kappa = 1$) on whether an image was of adequate quality for
212 analysis. For diabetic retinopathy screening purposes, images should be of adequate quality to be
213 analyzed, which is why our analysis only differentiated between ungradable versus gradable
214 images for quality. The images taken by our portable retinal camera were of enough quality to
215 provide a reliable screening diagnosis of referral-warranted DR. While we did not evaluate the
216 performance of the Volk Pictor Plus in this study, it has been shown to be 64-88% sensitive and
217 71-90% specific using a photographer with similar training(8). Although there is some
218 controversy and variability in the literature about the quality of images taken with handheld non-
219 mydratic cameras, retinal photography can be obtained with high quality images with limited
220 training(16,29,30). While most participants were dilated prior to image acquisition in this study,

221 Sengupta et al. showed that there was only minimal improvement in sensitivity in patients with
222 vision-threatening diabetic retinopathy when using a non-mydratic camera without dilation. This
223 would further facilitate image acquisition by photographers with limited experience(17).

224 The majority of the participants in the study (86%) were diagnosed with diabetes through
225 screening held by the Ministry of Health in Vanuatu. These patients are subsequently followed at
226 the non-communicable disease (NCD) clinic with routine BMI, blood pressure, and blood sugar
227 measurements. Visual acuity measurement has also been implemented but is not regularly
228 performed. While these variables are practical for assessing a patient's disease progression, our
229 study did not find them useful for predicting referral-warranted retinal disease, as there were no
230 differences between patients with referral and non-referral-warranted disease. Nevertheless, if
231 non-mydratic portable retinal cameras are integrated in the NCD clinic workflow, they could be
232 effectively used for screening in the primary care setting. Furthermore, local eye nurses could be
233 effectively trained in the photographic detection of DR and identification of referral warranted
234 DR as described by Boucher et al(31). Andonegui et al. similarly demonstrated that general
235 practitioners can be trained to achieve high sensitivity and specificity in the detection of DR(32)
236 with retinal photographs. By developing a tele-ophthalmology program, these retinal images can
237 be stored and sent to the eye team in Port Vila and Santo for further analysis. This would allow
238 for more frequent follow up for patients with severe DR, which should be done at least every 1-2
239 years in low-resource settings based on global guidelines(33). Artificial intelligence (AI) could
240 also be used to perform image evaluation for detection of DR(34).

241 This proof-of-concept study was limited by multiple factors, although it does provide us
242 with evidence that a portable retinal camera can be used for screening of diabetic retinopathy.
243 The study's small sample size could have led to a Type 2 error in the data analysis. In a larger,

244 second-stage feasibility study, we may find a significant difference between groups. There was
245 also a disparate representation of patients between the different islands studied, which could have
246 biased the results. Given that participants were recruited to participate after their NCD clinic
247 appointment, selection bias could have been introduced. However, this was the most efficient
248 way to determine the prevalence of diabetic retinopathy in the diabetic population of Vanuatu in
249 our proof-of-concept study. Retinal image quality was also limited for the purpose of prevalence
250 analysis for numerous reasons. Photographers were not ophthalmic photographers and received
251 limited initial training. However, this mimics the real-world limited training of photographers in
252 many of these screening photography programs. Image quality could have also been
253 compromised due to the language barrier between the photographers and the study participants.
254 We were also unable to compare our images from images obtained from other imaging
255 techniques, given the limited availability of imaging in Vanuatu. Nevertheless, our retina
256 specialists used validated, consistent grading criteria and non-gradable images were not used in
257 our analysis. The Pictor Plus has also been validated as a retinal camera in the studies mentioned
258 above.

259 In summary, our study confirms the high prevalence of referral-warranted DR in
260 Vanuatu. Our results suggest that handheld portable retinal cameras like the Volk Pictor Plus can
261 be used to obtain retinal images of sufficient quality for effective diabetic retinopathy screening
262 due to their portability, non-mydratic capabilities, relatively limited training required for use,
263 and cost-effectiveness. Moving forward, a validation study consisting of image acquisition by
264 trained local nurses and image analysis by the Port Vila ophthalmology team could be performed
265 to further evaluate the infrastructure capabilities for a telemedicine program in Vanuatu. A

- 266 teleophthalmology screening program could assist with the prevention of blindness due to
- 267 diabetic retinopathy in Vanuatu and other Pacific Islands.

268 REFERENCES

- 269 1. International Diabetes Federation. Vanuatu Country Report [Internet]. IDF Diabetes Atlas,
270 8th Edition. 2017 [cited 2020 Jan 1]. Available from:
271 <https://diabetesatlas.org/resources/2017-atlas.html>
- 272 2. Keeffe JE, Konyama K, Taylor HR. Vision impairment in the Pacific region. *Br J*
273 *Ophthalmol.* 2002 Jun;86(6):605–10.
- 274 3. Win Tin ST, Kenilorea G, Gadabu E, Tasserei J, Colagiuri R. The prevalence of diabetes
275 complications and associated risk factors in Pacific Islands countries. *Diabetes Research*
276 *and Clinical Practice.* 2014 Jan;103(1):114–8.
- 277 4. Smith TST, Szetu J, Bourne RRA. The prevalence and severity of diabetic retinopathy,
278 associated risk factors and vision loss in patients registered with type 2 diabetes in
279 Luganville, Vanuatu. *Br J Ophthalmol.* 2006/10/31 ed. 2007 Apr;91(4):415–9.
- 280 5. Vanuatu Ministry of Health. Vanuatu Non-Communicable Disease Policy and Strategic
281 Plan [Internet]. Government of Vanuatu. 2016 [cited 2020 Jan 1]. Available from:
282 [https://www.iccp-](https://www.iccp-portal.org/system/files/plans/VUT_B3_Vanuatu%20NCD%20Policy%20and%20Strategic%20Plan%202016-2020.pdf)
283 [portal.org/system/files/plans/VUT_B3_Vanuatu%20NCD%20Policy%20and%20Strategic](https://www.iccp-portal.org/system/files/plans/VUT_B3_Vanuatu%20NCD%20Policy%20and%20Strategic%20Plan%202016-2020.pdf)
284 [%20Plan%202016-2020.pdf](https://www.iccp-portal.org/system/files/plans/VUT_B3_Vanuatu%20NCD%20Policy%20and%20Strategic%20Plan%202016-2020.pdf)
- 285 6. Pasquel FJ, Hendrick AM, Ryan M, Cason E, Ali MK, Narayan KMV. Cost-effectiveness
286 of Different Diabetic Retinopathy Screening Modalities. *J Diabetes Sci Technol.* 2015 Dec
287 29;10(2):301–7.
- 288 7. Kalogeropoulos D, Kalogeropoulos C, Stefanidou M, Neofytou M. The role of tele-
289 ophthalmology in diabetic retinopathy screening. *J Optom.* 2020 Dec;13(4):262–8.
- 290 8. Zhang W, Nicholas P, Schuman SG, Allingham MJ, Faridi A, Suthar T, et al. Screening for
291 Diabetic Retinopathy Using a Portable, Noncontact, Nonmydriatic Handheld Retinal
292 Camera. *J Diabetes Sci Technol.* 2017 Jan;11(1):128–34.
- 293 9. Kim TN, Myers F, Reber C, Loury PJ, Loumou P, Webster D, et al. A Smartphone-Based
294 Tool for Rapid, Portable, and Automated Wide-Field Retinal Imaging. *Transl Vis Sci*
295 *Technol.* 2018 Oct 1;7(5):21–21.
- 296 10. Patel TP, Kim TN, Yu G, Dedania VS, Lieu P, Qian CX, et al. Smartphone-Based, Rapid,
297 Wide-Field Fundus Photography for Diagnosis of Pediatric Retinal Diseases. *Transl Vis Sci*
298 *Technol.* 2019 May 30;8(3):29–29.
- 299 11. Micheletti JM, Hendrick AM, Khan FN, Ziemer DC, Pasquel FJ. Current and Next
300 Generation Portable Screening Devices for Diabetic Retinopathy. *J Diabetes Sci Technol.*
301 2016 Feb 16;10(2):295–300.

- 302 12. Grading diabetic retinopathy from stereoscopic color fundus photographs--an extension of
303 the modified Airlie House classification. ETDRS report number 10. Early Treatment
304 Diabetic Retinopathy Study Research Group. *Ophthalmology*. 1991 May;98(5 Suppl):786–
305 806.
- 306 13. Vujosevic S, Benetti E, Massignan F, Pilotto E, Varano M, Cavarzeran F, et al. Screening
307 for diabetic retinopathy: 1 and 3 nonmydriatic 45-degree digital fundus photographs vs 7
308 standard early treatment diabetic retinopathy study fields. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2009
309 Jul;148(1):111–8.
- 310 14. Aptel F, Denis P, Rouberol F, Thivolet C. Screening of diabetic retinopathy: effect of field
311 number and mydriasis on sensitivity and specificity of digital fundus photography. *Diabetes*
312 *Metab*. 2008 Jun;34(3):290–3.
- 313 15. Murgatroyd H, Ellingford A, Cox A, Binnie M, Ellis JD, MacEwen CJ, et al. Effect of
314 mydriasis and different field strategies on digital image screening of diabetic eye disease.
315 *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2004 Jul;88(7):920–4.
- 316 16. Davila JR, Sengupta SS, Niziol LM, Sindal MD, Besirli CG, Upadhyaya S, et al. Predictors
317 of Photographic Quality with a Handheld Nonmydriatic Fundus Camera Used for Screening
318 of Vision-Threatening Diabetic Retinopathy. *Ophthalmologica*. 2017;238(1–2):89–99.
- 319 17. Sengupta S, Sindal MD, Besirli CG, Upadhyaya S, Venkatesh R, Niziol LM, et al.
320 Screening for vision-threatening diabetic retinopathy in South India: comparing portable
321 non-mydrriatic and standard fundus cameras and clinical exam. *Eye (Lond)*. 2018
322 Feb;32(2):375–83.
- 323 18. Woodward MA, Bavinger JC, Amin S, Blachley TS, Musch DC, Lee PP, et al.
324 Telemedicine for ophthalmic consultation services: use of a portable device and layering
325 information for graders. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2017 Feb;23(2):365–70.
- 326 19. Wilkinson CP, Ferris FL, Klein RE, Lee PP, Agardh CD, Davis M, et al. Proposed
327 international clinical diabetic retinopathy and diabetic macular edema disease severity
328 scales. *Ophthalmology*. 2003 Sep;110(9):1677–82.
- 329 20. Photocoagulation for Diabetic Macular Edema: Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy
330 Study Report Number 1 Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study Research Group.
331 *Arch Ophthalmol*. 1985 Dec 1;103(12):1796.
- 332 21. McHugh ML. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochem Med (Zagreb)*.
333 2012;22(3):276–82.
- 334 22. Eppley SE, Mansberger SL, Ramanathan S, Lowry EA. Characteristics Associated with
335 Adherence to Annual Dilated Eye Examinations among US Patients with Diagnosed
336 Diabetes. *Ophthalmology*. 2019 Nov;126(11):1492–9.

- 337 23. Ting DSW, Cheung GCM, Wong TY. Diabetic retinopathy: global prevalence, major risk
338 factors, screening practices and public health challenges: a review: Global burden of
339 diabetic eye diseases. *Clinical & Experimental Ophthalmology*. 2016 May;44(4):260–77.
- 340 24. Maberley D, Walker H, Koushik A, Cruess A. Screening for diabetic retinopathy in James
341 Bay, Ontario: a cost-effectiveness analysis. *CMAJ*. 2003 Jan 21;168(2):160–4.
- 342 25. Frick KD, Foster A. The magnitude and cost of global blindness: an increasing problem that
343 can be alleviated. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2003 Apr;135(4):471–6.
- 344 26. Köberlein J, Beifus K, Schaffert C, Finger RP. The economic burden of visual impairment
345 and blindness: a systematic review. *BMJ Open*. 2013 Nov 7;3(11):e003471.
- 346 27. Lin S, Ramulu P, Lamoureux EL, Sabanayagam C. Addressing risk factors, screening, and
347 preventative treatment for diabetic retinopathy in developing countries: a review: Diabetic
348 retinopathy prevention in developing countries. *Clinical & Experimental Ophthalmology*.
349 2016 May;44(4):300–20.
- 350 28. Toy BC, Aguinaldo T, Eliason J, Egbert J. Non-Mydriatic Fundus Camera Screening for
351 Referral-Warranted Diabetic Retinopathy in a Northern California Safety-Net Setting.
352 *Ophthalmic Surg Lasers Imaging Retina*. 2016 Jul 1;47(7):636–42.
- 353 29. Yogesan K, Constable IJ, Barry CJ, Eikelboom RH, McAllister IL, Tay-Kearney M-L.
354 Telemedicine Screening of Diabetic Retinopathy Using a Hand-Held Fundus Camera.
355 *Telemedicine Journal*. 2000 Jun;6(2):219–23.
- 356 30. Li P, Paulus Y, Davila J, Gosbee J, Margolis T, Fletcher D, et al. Usability testing of a
357 smartphone-based retinal camera among first-time users in the primary care setting. *BMJ
358 Innov*. 2019 Oct;5(4):120–6.
- 359 31. Boucher MC, Nguyen MTD, Qian J. Assessment of Training Outcomes of Nurse Readers
360 for Diabetic Retinopathy Telescreening: Validation Study. *JMIR Diabetes*. 2020 Apr
361 7;5(2):e17309.
- 362 32. Andonegui J, Serrano L, Eguzkiza A, Berástegui L, Jiménez-Lasanta L, Aliseda D, et al.
363 Diabetic retinopathy screening using tele-ophthalmology in a primary care setting. *J
364 Telemed Telecare*. 2010 Dec;16(8):429–32.
- 365 33. Wong TY, Sun J, Kawasaki R, Ruamviboonsuk P, Gupta N, Lansingh VC, et al. Guidelines
366 on Diabetic Eye Care. *Ophthalmology*. 2018 Oct;125(10):1608–22.
- 367 34. Kim TN, Aaberg MT, Li P, Davila JR, Bhaskaranand M, Bhat S, et al. Comparison of
368 automated and expert human grading of diabetic retinopathy using smartphone-based
369 retinal photography. *Eye*. 2021 Jan;35(1):334–42.

370

372 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS STATEMENT**

373 Drs. Caceres, Zhang, Boe, Paulus, and Rosenthal made substantial contributions for the
374 conception and design of the work. Drs. Caceres and Zhang made substantial contributions to the
375 acquisition of the data. Drs. Caceres, Zhang, Besirli, Paulus, Rosenthal and Ms. Zhou made
376 significant contributions to the analysis and interpretation of the data. All authors revised the
377 work and approved the final submitted version. All authors also have agreed both to be
378 personally accountable for the author's own contributions and ensure that any questions related
379 to the accuracy or integrity of the work are appropriately addressed.

380 **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

381 **Disclosures:** None of the authors has a conflict of interest relevant to this paper.

382 **Acknowledgments:** This work was sponsored by a grant from the National Eye Institute
383 (1K08EY027458, PI YMP), Alcon Research Institute Young Investigator Grant (PI YMP),
384 unrestricted departmental support from Research to Prevent Blindness, and the University of
385 Michigan Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences. We would like to thank the
386 physicians, nurses, and staff at Godden Memorial Hospital, Northern Provincial Hospital, and
387 Vila Central Hospital for all the support. We would also like to thank Alexis Cullen for helping
388 us with the conception, design, and logistics of the trip. We finally thank Dr. David Musch for
389 statistical guidance for the project.

390

391

Table 1. Demographics and diabetes management by island in Vanuatu

Variable	Total (n = 49)	Port Vila (n = 23)	Santo (n = 19)	Ambae (n = 7)
Age (years; mean, SD)	57 (10)	57 (10)	56 (10)	59 (13)
Sex (male, %)	23 (47)	7 (30)	14 (74)	2 (29)
BMI (mean, SD)	27 (4.0)	29 (2.9)	26 (3.9)	25 (5.1)
Blood Pressure (mmHg)				
Systolic (mean, SD)	138 (22)	138 (23)	139 (26)	139 (9.3)
Diastolic (mean, SD)	83 (13)	80 (11)	86 (14)	83 (11)
Blood glucose ^a (mmol/L; mean, SD)	14 (5.8)	14 (4.8)	13 (6.9)	12 (5.7)
Visual Acuity				
LogMAR (mean, SD)				
OD	0.23 (0.24)	0.25 (0.24)	0.17 (0.27)	0.32 (0.19)
OS	0.23 (0.23)	0.26 (0.24)	0.19 (0.26)	0.24 (0.11)
Snellen Equivalent (mean, SD)				
OD	20/34 (35)	20/36 (35)	20/30 (37)	20/42 (31)
OS	20/34 (34)	20/36 (35)	20/31 (36)	20/35 (26)
Location of Diabetes Diagnosis (%)				
During routine screening	42 (86)	20 (87)	16 (84)	6 (86)
During hospitalization	7 (14)	3 (13)	3 (16)	1 (14)
Prior dilated eye exam (%)	27 (55)	12 (52)	10 (53)	5 (71)
Reported adherence to diabetic medication regimen (%)				
Somewhat	5 (10)	3 (13)	2 (11)	0 (0)
Very much	41 (84)	19 (83)	15 (79)	7 (100)
Unknown	3 (6.1)	1 (4.3)	2 (11)	0 (0)

392 ^a Point of care blood glucose (normal 4.0-5.4 mmol/L)

393 Abbreviations: SD, standard deviation; BMI, body mass index; LogMAR, Logarithm of the Minimum

394 Angle of Resolution; OD, right eye; OS, left eye.

395

Table 2. Demographics and diabetes management by diabetic retinopathy referral status ^a

Variable (n = 46)	Referral n = 11	Non-referral n = 35	p-value
Age (years; mean, SD)	55.5 (8.8)	57.4 (10.3)	.2020
Sex (male)	5 (45.5)	18 (51.4)	.7296
BMI (mean, SD)	27.7 (3.6)	27.2 (3.9)	.7189
Blood Pressure (mmHg)			
Systolic (mean, SD)	138.3 (33.6)	138.0 (18.8)	.6317
Diastolic (mean, SD)	84.4 (17.7)	81.4 (10.9)	.8793
^b Blood glucose (mmol/L; mean, SD)	12.8 (5.3)	13.9 (6.0)	.7409
Visual Acuity			
LogMAR (mean, SD)			
OD	0.22 (0.20)	0.21 (0.25)	.6546
OS	0.12 (0.17)	0.24 (0.24)	.1706
Snellen Equivalent (mean, SD)			
OD	20/33 (32)	20/32 (36)	
OS	20/26 (30)	20/35 (35)	
Location of Diabetes Diagnosis (%)			.3328
During routine screening	8 (72.7)	31 (88.6)	
During hospitalization	3 (27.3)	4 (11.4)	
Prior dilated eye exam (%)	8 (72.7)	16 (45.7)	.1177
Reported adherence to diabetic medication regimen (%)			.6395
Somewhat	2 (18.2)	3 (8.6)	
Very much	9 (81.8)	29 (82.8)	
Unknown	0	3 (8.6)	

396 ^a Three participants were excluded due to lack of gradable images.

397 ^b Point of care blood glucose (normal 4.0-5.4 mmol/L)

398 Abbreviations: SD, standard deviation; BMI, body mass index; LogMAR, Logarithm of the Minimum

399 Angle of Resolution; OD, right eye; OS, left eye.

400 Continuous variables are presented with mean and standard deviation. Categorical variables are presented
401 with N (%)

402

Table 3. Referral status by grader based the diagnosis of DR in retinal images (n = 95 eyes)

Variable	Grader 1	Grader 2	Consensus^{a, b}
Referral Status ^c (%)			
Ungradable	11 (12)	11 (12)	11 (12)
Non-referral	73 (86)	63 (66)	69 (73)
Referral	11 (12)	21 (22)	15 (16)

403 ^a The final consensus between graders for referral status.

404 ^b A third grader (n = 11 eyes) was used to provide final consensus for discrepancies between grader 1 and
405 grader 2.

406 ^c Defined as gradable images with CSME present or a retinopathy severity that was at least moderate.

407

Table 4. Inter-rater reliability between graders for image quality, retinopathy severity, the presence of macular edema, and referral status (n= 95 eyes)

Variable		Kappa (95% CI)			
Image quality					
		Grader 2			
		Ungradable	Gradable		
Ungradable	Grader 1	6	0	1 (1,1)	
Gradable		0	89		
Referral status ^a					
		Grader 2			
		No referral	Referral		
No referral	Grader 1	63	10	0.62 (0.42, 0.83)	
Referral		0	11		
Retinopathy severity ^a					
		Grader 2			
		Normal/mild NPDR	Mod/severe NPDR	PDR	
Normal/mild NPDR	Grader 1	75	1	0	
Mod/severe NPDR		4	7	0	
PDR		0	0	2	
					0.76 (0.55,0.96)
CSME ^a					
		Grader 2			
		None	Present		
None	Grader 1	66	10	0.50 (0.25, 0.74)	
Present		1	7		

^a There was 100% agreement for ungradable images in all categories. Ungradable images are excluded in this table.

Abbreviations: CI: confidence interval; Mod: moderate; NPDR: non-proliferative diabetic retinopathy; PDR: proliferative diabetic retinopathy; CSME: clinically significant macular edema.


408

409

410 **Figure 1.** Gradable retinal images taken during the study; (A) no diabetic retinopathy; (B) referral-
411 warranted diabetic retinopathy with clinically-significant macular edema.

412

413



A
OS



B
OS

Figure 1