

1 **Classification of Primary Angle Closure Disease by Hierarchical Cluster Analysis of Ocular**
2 **Biometrics in the Dark and Light**

3

4 **AUTHORS**

5 Austin Cho, BA¹; Juan Pablo Lewinger, PhD^{1,3}; Anmol A. Pardeshi, MS²; Galo Apolo Aroca, MS²; Mina
6 Torres, PhD⁴; Monisha Nongpiur, MBBS, MD, PhD⁵; Xuejuan Jiang, PhD²; Roberta McKean-Cowdin^{1,3},
7 PhD; Rohit Varma, MD, MPH⁴; Benjamin Y. Xu, MD, PhD²

8

9 **AFFILIATIONS**

- 10 1. Keck School of Medicine of the University of California, Los Angeles, CA
11 2. Roski Eye Institute, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA
12 3. Department of Population and Public Health Science, Keck School of Medicine at the University of
13 Southern California, Los Angeles, CA
14 4. Southern California Eye Institute, CHA Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA
15 5. Singapore Eye Research Institute and Singapore National Eye Center, Singapore, Republic of
16 Singapore

17

18 **Short Title:** Clustering of Ocular Biometrics in Angle Closure Disease

19

20 **Corresponding Author:** Benjamin Xu, Department of Ophthalmology, Keck School of Medicine at the
21 University of Southern California, 1450 San Pablo Street, 4th Floor, Suite 4700, Los Angeles, CA 90033
22 Phone number: 323-442-6780; Fax number: 323-442-6412

23 E-mail: benjamin.xu@med.usc.edu

24

25

26

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

ABSTRACT

Purpose: To investigate the classification of eyes with primary angle closure disease (PACD) based on hierarchical cluster analysis of ocular biometrics measured in the dark and light using anterior segment OCT (AS-OCT).

Methods: Participants of the Chinese American Study received complete eye exams, including gonioscopy and AS-OCT imaging, to identify primary angle closure suspects (PACS) and primary angle closure without/with glaucoma (PAC/G). Biometric parameters analyzed included angle opening distance (AOD750) and trabecular iris space area (TISA750), iris area (IA), iris thickness (IT750), iris curvature (IC), lens vault (LV), anterior chamber width (ACW) and anterior chamber depth (ACD). Hierarchical cluster analysis was performed using Ward’s method and Euclidean distance.

Results: Analysis of 159 eyes with PACS or PAC/G produced 2 clusters in both dark and light. In both analyses, the primary cluster (N=132 in the dark, N=126 in the light) was characterized by smaller AOD750 and TISA750, greater IC, and greater LV ($p < 0.001$). The proportion of PACS to PAC/PACG eyes was significantly different between clusters in the light ($p = 0.02$) but not the dark cluster analysis ($p = 0.08$). On multivariable logistic regression analysis, smaller TISA750 (OR=0.84 per $0.01\mu\text{m}^2$) and AOD750 (OR=0.93 per 0.01mm) in the light and smaller TISA750 (OR=0.86 per $0.01\mu\text{m}^2$) in the dark were significantly associated ($p \leq 0.02$) with higher odds of PAC/G.

Conclusion: Cluster analysis of ocular biometrics can classify PACD eyes by disease severity. Ocular biometrics appear equally if not more strongly predictive of disease severity when measured in the light than dark. Clustering of biometric measurements obtained in the light could provide a novel method to risk-stratify patients for more severe PACD.

53

54 **Introduction**

55 Primary angle closure glaucoma (PACG) is a leading cause of blindness worldwide.^{1,2} Primary angle
56 closure disease (PACD) is a spectrum of disease characterized by appositional or synechial closure of the
57 anterior chamber angle.³ Angle closure in the form of iridotrabecular contact can impede aqueous flow
58 through the trabecular meshwork, progressing to higher intraocular pressure (IOP) and, in severe cases,
59 PACG.⁴ Angle closure eyes are typically categorized as primary angle closure suspects (PACS), primary
60 angle closure (PAC), and primary angle closure glaucoma (PACG) across this spectrum of disease
61 severity.⁵

62 Ocular biometric parameters measured using anterior segment OCT (AS-OCT) are well-
63 established risk factors in PACD.⁶⁻¹⁰ These parameters can also provide information about underlying
64 anatomical mechanisms of angle closure, such as pupillary block, plateau iris configuration, exaggerated
65 lens vault, or thick peripheral iris.^{7, 11-13} For example, greater iris curvature is believed to reflect increased
66 pupillary block as aqueous humor collects posterior to the iris, and iris thickness, which can be directly
67 measured in AS-OCT images, directly contributes to higher risk of angle closure.^{14,15} Hierarchical cluster
68 analysis, an unsupervised analysis method, also identifies patterns among ocular biometric measurements
69 that appear to conform to these broad categories of angle closure mechanisms.¹⁶⁻¹⁹

70 Clinical assessments of angle closure risk and underlying anatomical mechanisms are by
71 convention conducted in the dark as angle width tends to be narrower in the dark than in the light.²⁰
72 However, despite strong associations between ocular biometric measurements and presence of PACD,
73 static measurements under dark lighting conditions appear only moderately predictive of disease severity
74 and progression.^{21,22} This raises the question whether biometric data obtained under different lighting
75 conditions might provide additional information about PACG risk, especially since the majority of
76 waking hours are typically spent in lit environments. While more recent studies have begun to assess
77 anatomical differences between the dark and light, the impact of these differences on anatomical
78 mechanisms and disease severity remains unclear.^{20,23}

79 In this study, we perform unsupervised hierarchical cluster analysis of biometric data from the
80 Chinese American Eye Study (CHES) to classify eyes with mild (PACS) and severe (PAC and PACG)
81 PACD. The CHES data comprises the full spectrum of PACD severity in contrast to prior cluster analysis
82 studies of angle closure eyes.^{16–18} In addition, we analyze biometric data obtained in the dark and light to
83 identify differences in clustering patterns of ocular biometric parameters and PACD severity. While there
84 is limited knowledge about the clinical significance of biometric measurements obtained in the light, we
85 hypothesize that clustering patterns may differ under the two lighting conditions, which could provide
86 novel insights into disease mechanisms and severity.

87

88 **Methods**

89 The Chinese American Study (CHES) was approved by the Ethics Committee from the University of
90 Southern California Medical Center Institutional Review Board. All procedures followed the
91 recommendations of the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants gave informed consent at the time of
92 enrollment. CHES study participants were recruited as part of a population-based study on ocular disease
93 in Chinese American individuals aged ≥ 50 years living in Monterey Park, California.²⁰ Patients with
94 any history of eye procedures, including laser peripheral iridotomy and cataract surgery, that could affect
95 the anterior segment structures were excluded from this study.

96

97 ***Clinical Examination***

98 Each participant received a complete eye examination by a trained ophthalmologist, including manual
99 gonioscopy and AS-OCT imaging (CASIA SS-1000; Tomey Corporation) in the upright seated position.
100 Gonioscopy was performed under dark ambient lighting ($0.1 \text{ candela [cd]/m}^2$) with a 1-mm light beam
101 and a Posner-typer 4-mirror lens (Model ODPSG; Ocular Instruments, Inc) by a trained ophthalmologist
102 (D.W.). The angle in each quadrant was graded according to the modified Shaffer classification system:
103 grade 0, no structures visible; grade 1, nonpigmented TM visible; grade 2; pigmented TM visible; grade
104 3, scleral spur visible; and grade 4, ciliary body visible. PACD was defined as an eye with ≥ 3 quadrants

105 gonioscopic angle closure (grade 0 or 1) in the absence of potential causes of secondary angle closure
106 such as inflammation or neovascularization.

107 Primary angle closure suspect (PACS) was defined as narrow angles with IOP \leq 21mmHg
108 without peripheral anterior synechiae (PAS). Primary angle closure (PAC) was defined as PACS with
109 IOP > 21 mmHg or PAS without evidence of glaucomatous optic neuropathy (GON). PACG was defined
110 as PAC with evidence of GON. PAC and PACG were grouped together as PAC/G in this study due to the
111 relatively small number of PACG cases in the CHES cohort.

112

113 *Anterior Segment Optical Coherence Tomography*

114 AS-OCT imaging of both eyes was performed under dark (0.1 cd/m²) and light (27 cd/m²) ambient
115 lighting conditions before pupillary dilation. The SS OCT viewer software (V.3.0) was used to
116 automatically segment structures and measure anterior segment biometric parameters after an experienced
117 grader (A.P.) manually identified the scleral spur (SS) in each image. The grader was masked to the
118 identities and other exam findings of the participants. One eye per participant was selected at random for
119 analysis using MATLAB software (MathWorks, Natick, MA). Four of 128 two-dimensional radial cross-
120 sectional images were analyzed per eye, measuring up to 8 different sectors. Sectoral measurements were
121 then averaged, and the average measurement value was used for this study. Eyes missing measurements
122 in 4 or more sectors were excluded from the analysis.

123 Two biometric parameters describing angle width were measured: angle opening distance (AOD)
124 and trabecular iris space area (TISA).²⁴ AOD750 was defined as the perpendicular distance from the TM
125 at 750 μ m anterior to the scleral spur to the anterior iris surface. TISA750 was defined as the area
126 bounded anteriorly by AOD750; posteriorly by a line drawn from the scleral spur perpendicular to the
127 plane of the inner scleral wall to the opposing iris; superiorly by the inner corneoscleral wall; and
128 inferiorly by the iris surface. Iris area (IA), anterior chamber depth (ACD), iris curvature (IC), lens vault
129 (LV), and anterior chamber width (ACW) were also measured.^{24,25} IA was defined as the cross-sectional
130 area of the full length of the iris. ACD was defined as the distance from the apex of the anterior lens

131 surface to the apex of the corneal endothelium. IC was defined as the distance from the apex of the iris
132 convexity to a line extending from the peripheral to central iris pigment epithelium. ACW was defined as
133 the distance between scleral spurs. Pupil diameter (PD) was defined as the shortest distance between the
134 edges of the pupil. Intra-grader measurement repeatability was previously assessed and reported to be
135 excellent for all parameters, with intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) ranging from 0.89 to 0.98.²⁰

136

137 *Statistical Analysis*

138 Continuous and categorical variables were summarized as mean \pm standard deviation (SD) and
139 proportions, respectively. Distributions of continuous variables were compared using the two-sample t-
140 test or Wilcoxon signed rank test depending on the result of normality testing using the Shapiro-Wilk test.
141 Proportions of categorical variables were compared using the Chi-squared test. Hierarchical cluster
142 analysis was used to classify PACD eyes. Measurements of each parameter were standardized (values
143 subtracted by mean and then divided by standard deviation) prior to analysis so as not to affect squared
144 Euclidean distances. Agglomerative cluster analysis was performed using Euclidean distance as the
145 similarity measure and Ward's method as the clustering algorithm. Each case started with each cluster as
146 a separate cluster; clusters were then combined until only one cluster remained. Cluster analysis was
147 applied used squared Euclidean distances as a similarity measure and Ward's method as the clustering
148 algorithm. The Duda-Hart (DH) index and pseudo t^2 statistics (PST2) were used to determine the optimal
149 number of clusters. The DH index utilizes the ratio of the two within sum of squares to decide if a cluster
150 can be divided into separate clusters. PST2 is derived from the DH index and accounts for the total
151 number of cases. The optimal number of clusters was chosen by selecting the number of clusters
152 corresponding to peaks in the PST2 value and a low DH index value. Univariable logistic regression
153 analysis was performed with dark and light AS-OCT parameters as independent variables and disease
154 severity (PACS or PAC/PACG) as the dichotomous outcome variable. Multivariable logistic regression
155 analysis included age, sex, and all parameters with p-value < 0.2 on univariable analysis; AOD750 and
156 TISA750 were not included in the same model due to collinearity. Area under the receiver operating

157 curve (AUC) metrics were calculated to assess predictive performance of regression models. All analyses
158 were performing using the R software version 4.2.1 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna,
159 Austria). Statistical Analysis were conducted using a significance level of 0.05.

160

161 **Results**

162 AS-OCT data was available on 169 eyes of 169 participants with PACS or PAC/G. After excluding 10
163 patients with history of intraocular surgery or LPI, 159 eyes were eligible for analysis, all of which had
164 biometric data from 5 or more sectors. 120 eyes had PACS and 39 participants had PAC/G. Mean age
165 was 61.7 ± 7.79 , mean IOP was 16.2 ± 3.49 , and 122 (76.7%) of the participants were female. The
166 optimal number of clusters was 2 for both dark and light measurements based on DH index and PST2.

167 In the dark analysis, there were 132 eyes in Cluster 1 and 27 eyes in Cluster 2 (**Table 1, Figure**
168 **1**). Cluster 1 was significantly ($p = 0.03$) older than Cluster 2 (62.3 ± 7.9 and 58.8 ± 6.8 years,
169 respectively). Clusters 1 and 2 had similar IOP (16.34 ± 3.6 and 15.3 ± 2.7 mmHg, respectively; $p =$
170 0.14) and proportion of females overall (75.8% and 81.4%, respectively; $p = 0.52$). Cluster 1 had smaller
171 AOD750 and TISA750 and greater IC and LV ($p < 0.001$) (**Table 1**). Cluster 2 had greater ACD and PD
172 ($p < 0.001$). There was no significant difference ($p = 0.12$) in the proportion of PAC/G between Clusters 1
173 (36 out of 132; 27.3%) and 2 (3 out of 27; 11.1%) in the dark analysis.

174 In the light analysis, cluster 1 had 126 eyes and cluster 2 had 33 eyes (**Table 1, Figure 1**). No
175 significant difference was found ($p = 0.66$) in age between Cluster 1 and Cluster 2 (62.1 ± 8.3 and $60.5 \pm$
176 5.6 years, respectively). Clusters 1 and 2 had similar IOP (16.3 ± 3.6 and 15.7 ± 3.2 , respectively; $p =$
177 0.36) and proportion of females overall (77.8% and 72.7%; $p = 0.54$). Cluster 1 had smaller AOD750 and
178 TISA ($p < 0.001$), smaller ACW ($p = 0.01$), and greater IC and LV ($p < 0.001$) (**Table 1**). Cluster 2 had
179 greater ACD ($p < 0.001$). There was a significantly greater ($p = 0.04$) proportion of PAC/G in Cluster 1
180 (36 out of 126; 28.6%) compared to Cluster 2 (3 out 33; 9.1%) in the light analysis.

181 In an analysis of change in cluster between dark and light, cluster identity was mostly conserved
182 across lighting conditions (**Table 2**). 13 eyes (8.2% of total; 11 PACS, 2 PAC/G) changed from Cluster 1

183 in the dark analysis to Cluster 2 in the light analysis. 7 eyes (4.4% of total; 5 PACS, 2 PAC/G) changed
184 from Cluster 2 in the dark analysis to Cluster 1 in the light analysis.

185 A sensitivity analysis conducted with 3 instead of 2 clusters produced similar results, except
186 Cluster 1 was sub-divided into 2 clusters, Clusters 1A and 1B (**Supplementary Table 1, Supplementary**
187 **Figure 1**). In the dark analysis, Cluster 1A (71) was characterized by smaller AOD750 and TISA750;
188 Cluster 1B (61) was characterized by greater IC and LV; Cluster 2 (27) was characterized by greater
189 ACD, IT, and PD. In the light analysis, Cluster 1A (110) was characterized by greater IC; Cluster 1B (16)
190 was characterized by smaller AOD750 and TISA750, ACW, and PD; Cluster 2 (33) was characterized by
191 greater ACD. Similar to the 2-cluster analysis, there was a significant inter-cluster difference in
192 proportion of PAC/G in the light analysis ($p = 0.01$), but not in the dark analysis ($p = 0.07$).

193 Post hoc analysis was performed to identify factors contributing to the difference in proportion of
194 PAC/G between clusters. On univariable logistic regression analysis, only greater TISA750 in the dark
195 ($OR = 0.86$ per $0.01\mu m^2$) and light ($OR = 0.84$ per $0.01\mu m^2$) and greater AOD750 in the light ($OR = 0.93$
196 per $0.01\mu m$) were significantly associated ($p = 0.02$) with lower odds of PAC/G (**Table 3**). On
197 multivariable logistic regression analysis of eligible parameters measured in the light, greater
198 TISA750 ($OR = 0.85$ per $0.01\mu m^2$) was significantly associated ($p = 0.007$) with lower odds of PAC/G
199 after adjusting for age and sex (area under the receiver operating characteristic curve [AUC] = 0.681, 95%
200 CI: 0.573-0.788). Greater AOD750 ($OR = 0.93$ per $0.01\mu m$) in the light was also significantly associated
201 ($p = 0.04$) with lower odds of PAC/G in a separate multivariable model with similar covariates (AUC =
202 0.641, 95% CI: 0.538 – 0.744). TISA750 was the only parameter measured in the dark eligible for
203 multivariable logistic regression analysis; greater TISA750 ($OR = 0.85$ per $0.01\mu m^2$) remained associated
204 ($p = 0.01$) with lower odds of progression after adjusting for age and sex (AUC = 0.628, 95% CI: 0.525 –
205 0.782).

206

207 **Discussion**

208 In this study, hierarchical cluster analysis of biometric measurements from Chinese American eyes with
209 PACD revealed two clusters under both light and dark conditions. Clusters in dark and light analyses both
210 appeared to segregate based primarily on established biometric risk factors for PACD. While Cluster 1
211 had a significantly higher proportion of severe PACD (PAC/G) than Cluster 2 in the light, inter-cluster
212 difference in proportions was not significantly different in the dark. Post hoc logistic regression analysis
213 showed that smaller TISA750 and AOD750 in the light and TISA750 in the dark were significantly
214 associated with disease severity. These findings based on unsupervised analysis of PACD eyes provide
215 potential insights into disease mechanisms and the role of biometric measurements obtained in the light
216 for risk stratifying patients for more severe PACD.

217 Our cluster analysis produced 2 clusters in both the light and dark analyses, similar to cluster
218 analyses of PACD eyes conducted by Baek et al. and Nongpiur et al.^{16,18} Similar to in those studies,
219 clusters in our study did not appear cleanly grouped by angle closure subtype (e.g. pupillary block,
220 plateau iris configuration, thick peripheral iris roll). Instead, biometric factors that are associated with
221 more severe PACD were generally grouped together.^{16,18} Cluster 1 in both dark and light analyses were
222 characterized by narrower angles, greater IC and LV, and smaller ACD, which are well-established
223 biometric risk factors for PACD.^{6,7,9} It is tempting to further sub-categorize the clusters into angle closure
224 subtypes; increased IC has been previously reported as an indicator of pupillary block, and flatter IC and
225 deeper ACD are associated with plateau iris configuration.^{26,27,28} However, this type of sub-classification
226 should be performed cautiously as angle closure subtypes cannot be confirmed with existing CHES data
227 (e.g. UBM was not performed to confirm plateau iris configuration), and it is difficult to ascertain why the
228 unsupervised cluster analysis grouped eyes together in the way it did. Therefore, we believe it is only
229 appropriate to conclude that cluster analysis appears to segregate PACD eyes in CHES by factors that are
230 known to increase risk of angle closure.

231 Cluster analysis of biometric measurements in CHES appeared to identify a sub-population of
232 eyes with a higher proportion of severe PACD (Cluster 1). This finding highlights a key difference
233 between our study, which includes PACS and PAC/G eyes, and studies by Baek et al., which only

234 included PAC/G patients, and Nongpiur et al., which only included either PACS or PAC/G eyes in two
235 separate cluster analyses.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ Specifically, when eyes that span the entire spectrum of PACD are clustered
236 together, classification appears to occur by disease severity. Our cohort also differs from that of Moghimi
237 et al., which included a substantial proportion (nearly half) of APAC and fellow APAC eyes.¹⁹ This
238 difference may explain why their analysis produced 3 clusters, with one cluster comprised almost entirely
239 of APAC and fellow APAC eyes. These differences in results between studies suggest that this type of
240 clustering analysis, and by extension inferences about its results, may be specific to the study cohort.

241 The identification of a sub-population of eyes with a higher proportion of severe PACD is
242 clinically significant in the setting of the Zhongshan Angle-Closure Prevention (ZAP) Trial and
243 Singapore Asymptomatic Narrow Angles Laser Iridotomy Study (ANA-LIS), which both reported low
244 risk of progression from PACS to PAC or acute angle closure (AAC).^{29,30} These studies highlight the
245 importance of developing novel methods to risk-stratify PACS eyes for more severe disease and identify
246 eyes that could benefit from prophylactic treatment with laser peripheral iridotomy (LPI). While it is
247 tempting to speculate that PACS eyes in Cluster 2 may be at higher risk of developing PAC/G than in
248 Cluster 1, it is important to point out that our findings are based on cross-sectional data that could be
249 confounded by unobserved factors. Therefore, cluster analysis of data from longitudinal studies like the
250 ZAP Trial and ANA-LIS may help establish the relative prognostic value of clustering biometric
251 measurements for predicting angle closure progression starting from a common baseline.

252 Cluster analysis of biometric measurements from the light but not the dark segregated eyes into
253 groups with significantly higher (Cluster 1; 29% probability) or lower (Cluster 2, 9% probability)
254 proportion of eyes with PAC/G. While the measurements of most biometric parameters differed between
255 Clusters 1 and 2 in the light, it is unclear which parameters contributed to the difference in disease
256 severity based solely on the unsupervised cluster analysis. This led us to perform post hoc logistic
257 regression analysis of biometric measurements as risk factors for PAC/G, which showed that angle width
258 parameters were the only significant predictors of disease severity, consistent with findings by Moghimi
259 et al.³¹ This finding is also consistent with a previous study by Xu et al. that found smaller angle width

260 predicted progression from PACS to PAC or AAC in ZAP Trial participants.⁶ Comparison of biometric
261 measurements from Clusters 1 and 2 in the dark showed some of the same differences as in the light;
262 however, the proportion with PACG (27% and 13%, respectively) was not significantly different;
263 although, this may be an effect of the relatively small sample size of PAC/G eyes in our cohort. In
264 addition, only TISA750 and not AOD750 was associated with disease severity in the dark. Finally, the
265 AUC of TISA750 trended toward being higher in the light than the dark. These findings together suggest
266 that angle width is an important parameter when evaluating eyes for disease severity in both the light and
267 dark. Furthermore, angle parameters are equally if not more strongly predictive of disease severity when
268 measured in the light and support further consideration of evaluating the angle under different lighting
269 conditions.²⁰ While the angle is most narrow in the dark on average, it is intuitive that angle configuration
270 in the light could contribute to PACG risk, especially since most people spend the majority of their
271 waking hours in lit environments.

272 Our study has several limitations. First, we did not separate eyes with PAC and PACG due to the
273 relatively small number of PACG cases in the CHES cohort. Thus, differences in clustering patterns
274 between these two sub-groups are unclear. Second, we analyzed biometric measurements averaged across
275 8 sectors of the eye. While this approach better captures anatomical variations of the angle, it may weaken
276 the effect of specific sectors that are more predictive of disease severity or progression, such as the
277 temporal and nasal sectors.^{32,33} A more thorough investigation of these factors in the future may help
278 elucidate differences between the proportion of PAC/G in the light and dark. Finally, CHES participants
279 all self-identified as Chinese American. Therefore, the study results may not generalize to other
280 populations. However, generalizability may be improved compared to prior community and hospital
281 based studies.¹⁶⁻¹⁹

282 In conclusion, hierarchical cluster analysis appears to classify angle closure eyes by disease
283 severity when applied to biometric measurements that comprise the full spectrum of PACD. In addition,
284 measurements obtained in the light may provide useful information about disease severity even though
285 clinical assessments of the anterior chamber angle are by convention performed in the dark. While

286 clustering of biometric measurements obtained in the light may provide a novel approach to risk-stratify
287 PACD eyes for more severe disease, longitudinal studies using quantitative OCT measurements to predict
288 disease outcomes are needed to elucidate the long-term clinical significance of this approach for
289 identifying patients at higher risk for PACG.

290

291 **References:**

- 292 1. Quigley H, Broman AT. The number of people with glaucoma worldwide in 2010 and 2020. *Br J*
293 *Ophthalmol.* 2006;90(3):262-267. doi:10.1136/BJO.2005.081224
- 294 2. Tham YC, Li X, Wong TY, Quigley HA, Aung T, Cheng CY. Global Prevalence of Glaucoma and
295 Projections of Glaucoma Burden through 2040: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.
296 *Ophthalmology.* 2014;121(11):2081-2090. doi:10.1016/J.OPHTHA.2014.05.013
- 297 3. Primary Angle-Closure Disease PPP 2020 - American Academy of Ophthalmology. Accessed
298 September 27, 2022. [https://www.aao.org/preferred-practice-pattern/primary-angle-closure-disease-](https://www.aao.org/preferred-practice-pattern/primary-angle-closure-disease-ppp)
299 [ppp](https://www.aao.org/preferred-practice-pattern/primary-angle-closure-disease-ppp)
- 300 4. Weinreb RN, Aung T, Medeiros FA. The Pathophysiology and Treatment of Glaucoma: A Review.
301 *JAMA.* 2014;311(18):1901-1911. doi:10.1001/JAMA.2014.3192
- 302 5. Foster PJ, Buhrmann R, Quigley HA, Johnson GJ. The definition and classification of glaucoma in
303 prevalence surveys. *Br J Ophthalmol.* 2002;86(2):238-242. doi:10.1136/bjo.86.2.238
- 304 6. Xu BY, Friedman DS, Foster PJ, et al. Ocular Biometric Risk Factors for Progression of Primary
305 Angle Closure Disease: The Zhongshan Angle Closure Prevention Trial. *Ophthalmology.*
306 2022;129(3):267-275. doi:10.1016/J.OPHTHA.2021.10.003
- 307 7. Nongpiur ME, He M, Amerasinghe N, et al. Lens vault, thickness, and position in Chinese subjects
308 with angle closure. *Ophthalmology.* 2011;118(3):474-479. doi:10.1016/J.OPHTHA.2010.07.025
- 309 8. Nongpiur ME, Sakata LM, Friedman DS, et al. Novel association of smaller anterior chamber width
310 with angle closure in Singaporeans. *Ophthalmology.* 2010;117(10):1967-1973.
311 doi:10.1016/J.OPHTHA.2010.02.007
- 312 9. Aung T, Nolan WP, Machin D, et al. Anterior Chamber Depth and the Risk of Primary Angle
313 Closure in 2 East Asian Populations. *Arch Ophthalmol.* 2005;123(4):527-532.
314 doi:10.1001/archopht.123.4.527
- 315 10. Shan J, DeBoer C, Xu BY. Anterior Segment Optical Coherence Tomography: Applications for
316 Clinical Care and Scientific Research. *Asia-Pac J Ophthalmol Phila Pa.* Published online April 25,
317 2019;10.22608/APO.201910. doi:10.22608/APO.201910
- 318 11. Shabana N, Aquino MC, See J, et al. Quantitative evaluation of anterior chamber parameters using
319 anterior segment optical coherence tomography in primary angle closure mechanisms. *Clin*
320 *Experiment Ophthalmol.* 2012;40(8):792-801. doi:10.1111/J.1442-9071.2012.02805.X

- 321 12. Wang N, Wu H, Fan Z. Primary angle closure glaucoma in Chinese and Western populations. *Chin*
322 *Med J*. 2002;115(11):1706-1715.
- 323 13. He M, Foster PJ, Johnson GJ, Khaw PT. Angle-closure glaucoma in East Asian and European people.
324 Different diseases? *Eye* 2006 201. 2005;20(1):3-12. doi:10.1038/sj.eye.6701797
- 325 14. Guzman CP, Gong T, Nongpiur ME, et al. Anterior segment optical coherence tomography
326 parameters in subtypes of primary angle closure. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2013;54(8):5281-5286.
327 doi:10.1167/IOVS.13-12285
- 328 15. Wang BS, Narayanaswamy A, Amerasinghe N, et al. Increased iris thickness and association with
329 primary angle closure glaucoma. *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2011;95(1):46-50. doi:10.1136/BJO.2009.178129
- 330 16. Nongpiur ME, Gong T, Lee HK, et al. Subgrouping of primary angle-closure suspects based on
331 anterior segment optical coherence tomography parameters. *Ophthalmology*. 2013;120(12):2525-
332 2531. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2013.05.028
- 333 17. Nongpiur ME, Atalay E, Gong T, et al. Anterior segment imaging-based subdivision of subjects with
334 primary angle-closure glaucoma. *Eye* 2017 314. 2016;31(4):572-577. doi:10.1038/eye.2016.267
- 335 18. Baek S, Sung KR, Sun JH, et al. A hierarchical cluster analysis of primary angle closure
336 classification using anterior segment optical coherence tomography parameters. *Invest Ophthalmol*
337 *Vis Sci*. 2013;54(1):848-853. doi:10.1167/IOVS.12-10391
- 338 19. Moghimi S, Torkashvand A, Mohammadi M, et al. Classification of primary angle closure spectrum
339 with hierarchical cluster analysis. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(7). doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0199157
- 340 20. Lifton J, Burkemper B, Jiang X, et al. Ocular Biometric Determinants of Dark-to-Light Change in
341 Angle Width: The Chinese American Eye Study. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2022;237:183-192.
342 doi:10.1016/J.AJO.2021.10.027
- 343 21. Quigley HA. The iris is a sponge: a cause of angle closure. *Ophthalmology*. 2010;117(1):1-2.
344 doi:10.1016/J.OPHTHA.2009.11.002
- 345 22. Quigley HA. Angle-closure glaucoma-simpler answers to complex mechanisms: LXVI Edward
346 Jackson Memorial Lecture. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2009;148(5). doi:10.1016/J.AJO.2009.08.009
- 347 23. Soh ZD, Thakur S, Majithia S, Nongpiur ME, Cheng CY. Iris and its relevance to angle closure
348 disease: a review. *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2021;105(1):3-8. doi:10.1136/BJOPHTHALMOL-2020-316075
- 349 24. Leung CKS, Weinreb RN. Anterior chamber angle imaging with optical coherence tomography. *Eye*
350 *Lond Engl*. 2011;25(3):261-267. doi:10.1038/eye.2010.201
- 351 25. Mansouri M, Ramezani F, Moghimi S, et al. Anterior segment optical coherence tomography
352 parameters in phacomorphic angle closure and mature cataracts. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*.
353 2014;55(11):7403-7409. doi:10.1167/iavs.14-14748
- 354 26. Moghimi S, Chen R, Hamzeh N, Khatibi N, Lin SC. Qualitative evaluation of anterior segment in
355 angle closure disease using anterior segment optical coherence tomography. *J Curr Ophthalmol*.
356 2016;28(4):170-175. doi:10.1016/J.JOCO.2016.06.005

- 357 27. Sng CCA, Aquino MCD, Liao J, et al. Pretreatment anterior segment imaging during acute primary
358 angle closure: insights into angle closure mechanisms in the acute phase. *Ophthalmology*.
359 2014;121(1):119-125. doi:10.1016/J.OPHTHA.2013.08.004
- 360 28. Kumar RS, Tantisevi V, Wong MH, et al. Plateau iris in Asian subjects with primary angle closure
361 glaucoma. *Arch Ophthalmol Chic Ill 1960*. 2009;127(10):1269-1272.
362 doi:10.1001/ARCHOPHTHALMOL.2009.241
- 363 29. Baskaran M, Kumar RS, Friedman DS, et al. The Singapore Asymptomatic Narrow Angles Laser
364 Iridotomy Study: Five-Year Results of a Randomized Controlled Trial. *Ophthalmology*.
365 2022;129(2):147-158. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2021.08.017
- 366 30. He M, Jiang Y, Huang S, et al. Laser peripheral iridotomy for the prevention of angle closure: a
367 single-centre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Lond Engl*. 2019;393(10181):1609-1618.
368 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32607-2
- 369 31. Moghimi S, Vahedian Z, Fakhraie G, et al. Ocular Biometry in the Subtypes of Angle Closure: An
370 Anterior Segment Optical Coherence Tomography Study. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2013;155(4):664-
371 673.e1. doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2012.10.014
- 372 32. Xu BY, Israelsen P, Pan BX, Wang D, Jiang X, Varma R. Benefit of Measuring Anterior Segment
373 Structures Using an Increased Number of Optical Coherence Tomography Images: The Chinese
374 American Eye Study. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2016;57(14):6313-6319. doi:10.1167/iovs.16-19755
- 375 33. Shan J, Pardeshi A, Jiang X, et al. Optimal number and orientation of anterior segment OCT images
376 to measure ocular biometric parameters in angle closure eyes: the Chinese American Eye Study. *Br J*
377 *Ophthalmol*. Published online January 21, 2022:bjophthalmol-2021-319275.
378 doi:10.1136/bjophthalmol-2021-319275

379

380 **Table and Figure Captions**

381 **Table 1.** Comparison of demographics and ocular biometric factors between Clusters 1 and 2 from the 2-
382 cluster analysis.

383 **Figure 1:** Clustering of AS-OCT measurements from PACD eyes in the dark (left) and light (left).

384 **Table 2.** Number of eyes that switched clusters between dark and light analyses.

385 **Table 3.** Univariable and multivariable logistic regression analysis of demographic and ocular biometric
386 factors associated with PAC/G.

387 **Supplementary Figure 1:** Dendrogram representation of agglomerative hierarchical cluster analysis of
388 PACD eyes in the dark (left) and light (right).

389 **Supplementary Table 1.** Comparison of demographics and ocular biometric factors between Clusters
390 1A, 1B, and 2 from the 3-cluster sensitivity analysis

391

Table 1. Comparison of demographics and ocular biometric factors between Clusters 1 and 2 from the 2-cluster analysis.

Lighting	Mean Parameters (Mean ± SD)	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	P-value ^a
Dark		N = 132	N = 27	
	Sex (F:M) ^b	100:32	22:5	0.52
	Age (years) ^b	62.3 ± 7.87	58.8 ± 6.78	0.03
	IOP ^b (mmHg)	16.368 ± 3.616	15.321 ± 2.688	0.14
	PAC/G:PACS ^c	36:96	3:24	0.08
	AOD750 (mm)	0.157 ± 0.051	0.225 ± 0.055	< 0.001
	TISA750 (mm ²)	0.088 ± 0.034	0.114 ± 0.024	< 0.001
	IA (mm ²)	1.611 ± 0.213	1.554 ± 0.213	0.24
	IT750 (mm)	0.398 ± 0.080	0.425 ± 0.052	0.02
	IC (mm)	0.297 ± 0.060	0.206 ± 0.060	< 0.001
	ACD (mm)	2.137 ± 0.195	2.420 ± 0.184	< 0.001
	LV (mm)	0.838 ± 0.157	0.573 ± 0.136	< 0.001
	ACW (mm)	11.509 ± 0.195	11.454 ± 0.281	0.49
	PD (mm)	3.670 ± 0.657	4.259 ± 0.880	< 0.001
Light		N = 126	N = 33	
	Sex ^b (F:M)	98:28	24:9	0.54
	Age ^b (years)	62.1 ± 8.26	60.5 ± 5.61	0.66
	IOP ^b (mmHg)	16.306 ± 3.557	15.747 ± 3.236	0.36
	PAC/G:PACS ^c	36:90	3:30	0.02
	AOD750 (mm)	0.218 ± 0.054	0.311 ± 0.047	< 0.001
	TISA750 (mm ²)	0.126 ± 0.034	0.164 ± 0.026	< 0.001
	IA (mm ²)	1.811 ± 0.221	1.888 ± 0.218	0.08
	IT750 (mm)	0.339 ± 0.065	0.332 ± 0.046	0.58
	IC (mm)	0.301 ± 0.072	0.256 ± 0.056	< 0.001
	ACD (mm)	2.101 ± 0.168	2.464 ± 0.142	< 0.001
	LV (mm)	0.867 ± 0.158	0.656 ± 0.124	< 0.001
	ACW (mm)	11.483 ± 0.375	11.685 ± 0.362	0.006
	PD (mm)	2.553 ± 0.592	2.567 ± 0.351	0.32

ACD: Anterior chamber depth; ACW: Anterior chamber width; AOD: Angle opening distance; IA: Iris area; IC: Iris curvature; IOP: Intraocular pressure; IT: Iris thickness; LV: Lens vault; PAC: Primary angle closure; PACS: Primary angle closure suspect; PACG: Primary angle closure glaucoma; PD: Pupillary diameter; TISA: Trabecular iris surface area

^a Statistical significance tested by Wilcoxon t-test or two-sample t-test

^b Post hoc; not included in cluster analysis

^c Statistical Significance tested by Chi-Squared test

Figure 1: Clustering of AS-OCT measurements from PACD eyes in the dark (left) and light (left).




Table 2. Number of eyes that switched clusters between dark and light analyses.

Clusters	PACS	PAC/G	Total #
Cluster 1 only (dark and light)	85	34	119
Cluster 2 only (dark and light)	19	1	20
Cluster 1 (dark) to Cluster 2 (light)	11	2	13
Cluster 2 (dark) to Cluster 1 (light)	5	2	7

PAC: Primary angle closure; PACS: Primary angle closure suspect; PACG: Primary angle closure glaucoma
^a Dark Analysis
^b Light Analysis

Table 3. Univariable and multivariable logistic regression analysis of demographic and ocular biometric factors associated with PAC/G.

Lighting	Parameter	PACS		PAC/G		Univariable Analysis		Multivariable Analysis	
		Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	OR (CI)	P-value	OR (CI)	P-value		
Light	Age	61.2 (7.9)	63.3 (7.3)	1.03 (0.99-1.08)	0.16	1.03 (0.98-1.08)	0.25		
	Sex:								
	Female	96 (78.7)	26 (21.3)	REF		REF			
	Male	24 (64.9)	13 (35.1)	2.00 (0.88-4.43)	0.09	1.82 (0.76-4.24)	0.17		
	AOD750	24.4 (6.3)	21.5 (6.7)	0.93 (0.87-0.98)	0.02				
	TISA750	13.9 (3.3)	11.7 (4.0)	0.84 (0.75-0.93)	0.002	0.85 (0.75-0.95)	0.007		
	IA	18.4 (2.2)	17.8 (2.4)	0.88 (0.74-1.03)	0.12	0.90 (0.72-1.12)	0.36		
	IT750	3.4 (0.6)	3.4 (0.6)	1.00 (0.55-1.78)	0.99				
	IC	2.9 (0.7)	2.9 (0.8)	0.90 (0.55-1.51)	0.69				
	ACD	21.9 (2.2)	21.4 (2.0)	0.91 (0.76-1.07)	0.26				
	LV	8.1 (1.8)	8.6 (1.7)	1.16 (0.94-1.44)	0.16	1.10 (0.88-1.39)	0.42		
	ACW	11.5 (0.4)	11.5 (0.3)	0.77 (0.30-2.00)	0.59				
	PD	2.5 (0.5)	2.7 (0.6)	1.57 (0.83-3.00)	0.16	0.95 (0.39-2.31)	0.91		
	Dark	Age	61.2 (7.9)	63.3 (7.3)	1.03 (0.99-1.08)	0.16	1.04 (0.99-1.10)	0.08	
Sex:									
Female		96 (80.0)	26 (66.7)	REF		REF			
Male		24 (20.0)	13 (33.3)	2.00 (0.88-4.43)	0.90	2.05 (0.88-4.70)	0.091		
AOD750		17.2 (5.7)	15.7 (5.9)	0.95 (0.89-1.02)	0.15				
TISA750		9.6 (3.4)	8.0 (3.3)	0.86 (0.76-0.97)	0.01	0.85 (0.75-0.95)	0.006		
IA		16.1 (2.1)	15.8 (2.3)	0.93 (0.78-1.10)	0.41				
IT750		4.0 (0.8)	4.1 (0.8)	1.08 (0.66-1.71)	0.75				
IC		2.8 (0.7)	2.7 (0.7)	0.77 (0.45-1.31)	0.33				
ACD		22.0 (2.3)	21.5 (1.9)	0.91 (0.76-1.07)	0.27				
LV		7.8 (1.9)	8.2 (1.6)	1.11 (0.91-1.37)	0.30				
ACW		11.5 (0.4)	11.5 (0.3)	0.70 (0.26-1.82)	0.46				
PD		3.8 (0.7)	3.8 (0.7)	1.05 (0.64-1.72)	0.84				

Statistically significant p-values and odds ratios are bolded; OR = odds ratio; CI = Confidence Interval; ACD: Anterior chamber depth; ACW: Anterior chamber width; AOD: Angle opening distance; IA: Iris area; IC: Iris curvature; IOP: Intraocular pressure; IT: Iris thickness; LV: Lens vault; PAC: Primary angle closure; PACS: Primary angle closure suspect; PACG: Primary angle closure glaucoma; PD: Pupillary diameter; TISA: Trabecular iris surface area