#### Diabetic Retinopathy: Knowledge, Staging and Barriers to Early Presentation in a Tertiary Eye

#### Care Centre in Ghana.

Emmanuel Appiagyei <sup>1,2\*</sup>, Yaw Akye Essuman <sup>3¶</sup>, Akwasi Agyeman Ahmed <sup>1\*</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Eye Department, Komfo Anokye Teaching Hospital, Kumasi, Ghana

<sup>2</sup> Department of Optometry and Visual Science, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and

Technology, Kumasi, Ghana

<sup>3</sup> Lions International Eye Centre, Korle Bu Teaching Hospital, Accra, Ghana.

\*Correspondence:

drappiagyei@hotmail.com (EA)

akamedus@yahoo.com (AAA)

<sup>¶</sup>These authors contributed equally to this work

#### 1 Abstract

Background: Diabetic retinopathy is the most common microvascular complication of diabetes
mellitus and a leading cause of new-onset blindness in populations of working age. Late
presentation of patients to eye care facilities has been associated with the development of visionthreatening complications. The study sought to determine the clinical profile, knowledge and
factors influencing late presentation of diabetic retinopathy among diabetics at the Eye Centre
of the Komfo Anokye Teaching Hospital in Ghana.

Methods: This descriptive cross-sectional study was conducted between the periods of February 2022 to April 2022. All diabetic patients referred to the retina clinic were examined for diabetic retinopathy. Both eyes of participants were examined and the eye with the most severe form of diabetic retinopathy was used for the staging. A structured questionnaire was employed to collect patients' socio-economic factors and knowledge on diabetic retinopathy. Data was analysed using the SPSS ver. 23 software. Statistical significance was set at p<0.05.

14 Results: A total of 78 diabetic patients were included in the study. Thirty-six (36, 46.2%) were 15 males and 42 (53.8%) females. Mean age of the study population was 49.9±11.4 years. The mean 16 (+SD) knowledge score of study participants on diabetic retinopathy was 5.3  $(\pm 3.2)$  with a maximum possible score of 12. Majority of the participants (65%) were aware that uncontrolled 17 diabetes mellitus affects the eyes; 7.7% had mild NPDR, 16.7%) had moderate NPDR, 10.3%; 18 severe NPDR, 19.2%; very severe NPDR, 9.0%; high risk PDR and 37.2% showed signs of advanced 19 20 PDR. Fifty-four participants (69.2%) highlighted a lack of knowledge about the condition as the 21 main reason for late presentation.

Conclusion: Most diabetic patients who presented to the eye clinic had advanced PDR stage of
 the condition. The major factor to late presentation of diabetic retinopathy cases was lack of
 knowledge about the condition.

Keywords: Diabetes mellitus, Diabetic retinopathy, ETDRS classification, Visual impairment,
 Ghana.

- 27
- 28

#### 29 Introduction

Diabetic retinopathy (DR) is a major complication of diabetes mellitus (DM), which remains a 30 leading cause of visual loss in working-age populations in developing countries [1,2]. The 31 32 diagnosis of DR is made by clinical manifestations of vascular abnormalities in the retina. The Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study (ETDRS) classification is considered the gold 33 standard in grading diabetic retinopathy [3]. Two main stages: the non-proliferative diabetic 34 retinopathy (NPDR) and the proliferative diabetic retinopathy (PDR) stages, have been 35 considered, with differences based on the presence of microaneurysms, intraretinal 36 haemorrhages and neovascularization [4]. The latter stage may be associated with severe visual 37 38 impairment due to development of complications such as vitreous haemorrhage, tractional retinal detachment and maculopathy [1,5]. 39

Loss of vision is a long-term complications of diabetes mellitus. Globally, the total number of
people with diabetes mellitus is estimated to rise from 366 million in 2011 to 552 million by 2030

with nearly 80% of this population being in the middle age or working group [6]. DR is the most 42 43 common complication in type I diabetes mellitus and nearly all patients will have some degree of retinopathy 15–20 years after diagnosis. Similarly, more than 60% of type II diabetes patients will 44 45 have evidence of DR during this period [7]. A meta-analysis of the overall global prevalence of 46 diabetic retinopathy (DR) was reported to be 34.6% [8]. Studies done in Ghana and Nigeria have reported the prevalence of diabetic retinopathy between the ranges of 15.5% to 17% [9,10]. 47 Key risk factors leading to the development and progression of DR are long-term DM, inadequate 48 49 glycaemic control, hypertension (HTN), dyslipidaemia, nephropathy and gender [7]. Control of 50 the modifiable risk factors through periodic eve examinations and appropriate interventions has 51 been shown to impede the advancement of DR [7]. Visual impairment as a result of DR has a significant impact on patients' quality of life, and can 52 53 compromise their ability to manage their disease successfully, which can in turn have a negative impact on the incidence of other diabetic complications and overall life expectancy [11]. Several 54 studies have reported that most patients with diabetes mellitus are aware of the detrimental 55 effect that the condition may have on their sight but yet they do not routinely seek eye care [12-56 57 14]. Reported barriers to screening and regular ocular examinations include: lack of knowledge about diabetic retinopathy and non-compliance with screening guidelines by ophthalmologists 58 due to socioeconomic, cultural, and geographic reasons [15-17]. 59

60

#### 61 Materials and methods

This hospital based cross-sectional study was conducted from 1<sup>st</sup> February 2022 to 30<sup>th</sup> April 2022 62 63 at the Eye Center, Komfo Anokye Teaching Hospital (KATH) – a major eye referral center in Ghana. Patients aged 18 years and above, with confirmed cases of diabetes mellitus, were considered 64 65 eligible for this study whereas diabetic retinopathy patients with other retinal vascular 66 pathologies such as: sickle cell retinopathy, hypertensive retinopathy, retinal vasculitis, were excluded. A purposive sampling method was employed to recruit 78 diabetic retinopathy patients 67 (156 eyes) at the study site. All study participants had their visual acuity measured with the 68 69 LogMAR Chart. Objective and subjective refraction was performed for all participants and best 70 corrected visual acuity (BCVA) was recorded. A slit lamp biomicroscope (Inami & Co, Japan) was used to examine the anterior segment of the eye and pupillary reaction test. Intraocular pressure 71 72 was measured using a Goldmann Applanation Tonometer (Haag-Streit AG, Koeniz, Switzerland). The pupils of all participants were dilated with 1% tropicamide and a detailed posterior segment 73 74 examination as much as the media clarity allowed was performed by a retina specialist (AAA). A stereoscopic examination of the disc and macula with a slit lamp and 78D Volk lens (Volk Optical, 75 USA); as well as indirect ophthalmoscopy with a 20D lens (Volk Optical, USA) was used for 76 posterior segment examination; clinical staging of DR was done. Findings were recorded on the 77 data collection sheet. Information on duration of diabetes mellitus diagnosis, and the presence 78 79 of comorbidities such as hypertension was assessed from the history. This study adhered strictly 80 to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Komfo Anokye Teaching Hospital (KATH IRB/AP/028/22). A written Informed 81 82 consent was obtained from all participants.

83

#### 84 Data Analysis

85	Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS Version 23.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY). Descriptive
86	analysis was performed using frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations.
87	Participant's knowledge of DR was assessed by 17 questions with a maximum score of 12 points.
88	A numerical value of 1 for correct response and 0 for incorrect response was given. Participants
89	who scored greater than or equal to the mean (≥5.32) of knowledge questions were considered
90	to have good knowledge and those who scored below the mean were considered as having poor
91	knowledge. The Chi-square test was used to determine statistical significance between
92	categorical variables. Statistical significance was set at p<0.05.

93

#### 94 Results

A total of 78 patients were included in the study. The mean age of the study population was 49.9±11.4 years with the minimum age of 32 years and maximum age of 79 years. Almost all the study participants were enrolled on the National health insurance scheme (83.3%) and served as the only means of accessing healthcare. Almost 90% of the study population had at least primary education. Details pertaining to the socioeconomic characteristics of participants can be found in Table 1.

101 **Table 1**: Sociodemographic characteristics and mean knowledge score of study participants

	Fraguanay	Mean	
Characteristics	Frequency	knowledge	P-value
	(%)	score (SD)	
Total	78 (100.0)	5.3 (3.2)	
Age group, years			0.212
<40	19 (24.4)	5.47 (3.66)	
40-49	19 (24.4)	4.58 (2.89)	
50-59	30 (38.4)	5.23 (3.10)	
60-69	5 (6.4)	8.40 (1.95)	
≥70	5 (6.4)	4.80 (3.35)	
Gender			0.506
Male	36 (46.2)	5.58 (3.43)	
Female	42 (53.8)	5.10 (3.01)	
Occupation			0.163
Trader	26 (33.3)	4.81 (2.87)	
Artisan	13 (16.7)	5.08 (3.30)	
Farmer	5 (6.4)	4.60 (2.30)	
Professional	14 (17.9)	7.43 (2.68)	
Unemployed	7 (9)	4.29 (3.04)	
Other	13 (16.7)	5.15 (4.10)	
Marital status			0.952
Single	11 (14.1)	5.64 (3.72)	

Married	50 (64.1)	5.16 (3.31)	
Divorced	7 (9)	5.57 (3.51)	
Widowed	10 (12.8)	5.60 (2.01)	
Health insurance			0.063
NHIS	65 (83.3)	5.22 (3.11)	
Private insurance schemes	6 (7.7)	8.00 (1.79)	
None	7 (9)	4.00 (4.00)	
Educational level			0.594
Primary	10 (12.8)	4.90 (3.21)	
JHS	23 (29.5)	5.17 (3.28)	
SHS	12 (15.4)	5.33 (3.08)	
Tertiary	25 (32.1)	6.04 (3.49)	
None	8 (10.3)	4.00 (2.14)	
Housing type			0.314
Single room	5 (6.4)	4.00 (1.87)	
Chamber and hall	24 (30.8)	4.63 (3.23)	
Self-contained house	38 (48.7)	5.97 (3.05)	
Apartment/Flat	11 (14.1)	5.18 (3.20)	

# 102 NHIS=National Health Insurance Scheme, JHS=Junior High School, SD=Standard Deviation, SHS=Senior High School 103 The mean (+SD) knowledge score of study participants about DR was 5.3 (±3.2) with a maximum

104 possible score of 12. There was no statistically significant association between the mean scale

105 scores of knowledge of diabetic retinopathy and sociodemographic characteristics of

106 participants.

- 107 Participants' level of knowledge in the various sections of diabetic retinopathy is represented in
- 108 Table 2.

109 **Table 2**: Knowledge of study participants on diabetic retinopathy (N=78).

Knowledge	Responses				
Knowledge	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't' Know (%)		
Knowledge on how to control diabetes mellitus.					
Medication	77 (98.7)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.3)		
Dieting	62 (79.5)	3 (3.8)	13 (16.7)		
Exercising regularly	34 (43.6)	4 (5.1)	40 (51.3)		
Weight reduction	35 (44.9)	3 (3.8)	40 (51.3)		
Going for regular checkup	43 (55.1)	1 (1.3)	34 (43.6)		
Knowledge on how often a patients with diabetes					
should have an eye examination.					
Every month	15 (19.2)	10 (12.8)	53 (67.9)		
Every 2 months	11 (14.1)	15 (19.2)	52(66.7)		
Every 3 months	17 (21.8)	18 (23.1)	43 (55.1)		
> 3 months	24 (30.8)	11 (14.1)	43 (55.1)		

#### Knowledge of the ocular effects of diabetes mellitus.

Are you aware diabetes affects the eye?	51 (65.4)	17 (21.8)	10 (12.8)
Have you heard of diabetic retinopathy?	30 (38.5)	39 (50.0)	9 (11.4)
Diabetic retinopathy could cause blindness.	25 (32.1)	15 (19.2)	38 (48.7)
Knowledge on the management of Diabetic			
Retinopathy.			
Eye drops	24 (30.8)	8 (10.3)	46 (58.9)
Injections (Eye)	16 (20.5)	9 (11.5)	53 (67.9)
Surgery	14 (17.9)	6 (7.7)	58 (74.4)
Spectacles	9 (11.4)	12 (15.4)	57 (73.1)
Laser treatment	13 (16.7)	5 (6.4)	60 (76.9)

# 110

Hundred and fifty six eyes (78 right eyes and 78 left eyes) were examined. When both eyes showed different stages of DR, a diagnosis was made based on the eye showing the most advanced stage of the condition. All participants (78, 100%) had at least one form of DR in one or both eyes. Among the 78 participants that were examined, 6 (7.7%) showed signs of mild NPDR, 13 (16.7%) showed signs of moderate NPDR, 8 (10.3%), severe NPDR; 15 (19.2%), very severe NPDR; 7 (9.0%), high risk PDR and 29 (37.2%) showed signs of advanced PDR. (Table 3).

**Table 3**: Stages of Diabetic Retinopathy among study participants.

			Diabetic F	Retinopathy	stages		
				Very	High		
	Mild	Moderate	Severe	Severe	Risk	Advanced	P-
Characteristics	NPDR	NPDR (%)	NPDR (%)	NPDR	PDR	PDR (%)	value
	(%)			(%)	(%)		
Total	6 (7.7)	13 (16.7)	8 (10.3)	15 (19.2)	7 (9.0)	29 (37.2)	
Age groups, years							0.967
< 40	2 (2.6)	4 (5.1)	2 (2.6)	4 (5.1)	2 (2.6)	5 (6.4)	
40-49	1 (1.3)	4 (5.1)	3 (3.8)	2 (2.6)	1 (1.3)	8 (10.3)	
50-59	2 (2.6)	4 (5.1)	3 (3.8)	6 (7.7)	4 (5.1)	11 (14.1)	
60-69	0 (0.0)	1 (1.3)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.6)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.6)	
≥70	1 (1.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.3)	0 (0.0)	3 (3.8)	
Gender							0.136
Male	5 (6.4)	4 (5.1)	2 (2.6)	8 (10.3)	5 (6.4)	12 (15.4)	
Female	1 (1.3)	9 (11.5)	6 (7.7)	7 (9.0)	2 (2.6)	17 (21.8)	
Occupation							0.512
Trader	1 (1.3)	4 (5.1)	3 (3.8)	2 (2.6)	2 (2.6)	14 (18.0)	
Artisan	1 (1.3)	2 (2.6)	2 (2.6)	2 (2.6)	2 (2.6)	4 (5.1)	
Farmer	1 (1.3)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)	
Professional	2 (2.6)	2 (2.6)	1 (1.3)	7 (9.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.6)	
Unemployed	0 (0.0)	2 (2.6)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.6)	1 (1.3)	2 (2.6)	
Other	1 (1.3)	3 (3.8)	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)	6 (7.7)	

Marital Status							0.167
Single	2 (2.6)	1 (1.3)	2 (2.6)	2 (2.6)	2 (2.6)	2 (2.6)	
Married	3 (3.8)	8 (10.3)	2 (2.6)	11 (14.1)	3 (3.8)	23 (29.5)	
Divorced	0 (0.0)	2 (2.6)	2 (2.6)	1 (1.3)	2 (2.6)	0 (0.0)	
Widowed	1 (1.3)	2 (2.6)	2 (2.6)	1 (1.3)	0 (0.0)	4 (5.1)	
Health Insurance							0.324
NHIS	6 (7.7)	12 (15.4)	7 (9.0)	12 (15.4)	5 (6.4)	23 (29.5)	
PIS	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (3.8)	0 (0.0)	3 (3.8)	
None	0 (0.0)	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.6)	3 (3.8)	
Level of education							0.656
Primary	0 (0.0)	3 (3.8)	2 (2.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.3)	4 (5.1)	
JHS	1 (1.3)	2 (2.6)	3 (3.8)	4 (5.1)	2 (2.6)	11 (14.1)	
SHS	2 (2.6)	3 (3.8)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.3)	2 (2.6)	4 (5.1)	
Tertiary	2 (2.6)	5 (6.4)	2 (2.6)	8 (10.3)	1 (1.3)	7 (9.0)	
None	1 (1.3)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.3)	2 (2.6)	1 (1.3)	3 (3.8)	
Duration of Diabetes							0.306
<5 years	1 (1.3)	8 (10.3)	4 (5.1)	5 (6.4)	4 (5.1)	14 (17.9)	
5-10 years	3 (3.8)	5 (6.4)	3 (3.8)	4 (5.1)	1 (1.3)	11 (14.1)	
>10 years	2 (2.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.3)	6 (7.7)	2 (2.6)	4 (5.1)	
Housing Type							0.802
Single Room	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.6)	1 (1.3)	2 (2.6)	
Chamber and Hall	3 (3.8)	2 (2.6)	4 (5.1)	5 (6.4)	2 (2.6)	8 (10.3)	

Self-contained house	2 (2.6)	9 (11.5)	3 (3.8)	5 (6.4)	4 (5.1)	15 (19.2)
Apartment/ Flat	1 (1.3)	2 (2.6)	1 (1.3)	3 (3.8)	0 (0.0)	4 (5.1)

118 NHIS=National Health Insurance Scheme, PIS=Private Insurance Scheme, JHS=Junior High School, SHS=Senior High
119 School.

120 When the eyes of participants were analyzed separately, it was found that, out of the 156 eyes,

121 138 (88.5%) had DR and 18 (11.5%) had no DR. In the analysis of only the right eye (OD) of

participants, 65 (83.3%) had DR and 13 (16.7%) did not have DR, whereas in the left eye (OS) of

study participants, 73 (93.6%) had DR and 5 (6.4%) did not have DR. (Figure 1).

- 124 Factors elucidated for late presentation among study participants include: lack of knowledge
- about diabetic retinopathy (54, 69.2%), lack of access to eye care (15, 22.1%), cost/insurance (17,

126 21.8%), fear of discovery (25, 32.1%), transportation difficulties (3, 3.8%) and others (7, 9.0%).

127

#### 128 Discussion

The mean age of our study population; patients with diabetes (50 years) was similar to other hospital-based studies conducted by in Jordan [18] and Turkey [19], but unlike other developing countries [20,21], where patients were much younger. This may be due to late detection of diabetes or late presentation for eye examination among our study population.

133 More females than males were seen during the study period, this was similar to the study in 134 Turkey which reported a preponderance of female participants (51.8%) among their study 135 population [19]. This was contrary to findings seen in studies in Jordan where male prevalences

of 50.4%, and 54.9%, were recorded [22]. The higher percentage of females found in this study 136 137 could be attributed to the recent upward trends in the prevalence of diabetes among women [6]. 138 Majority of the study population were traders (33.3%) followed by professionals (17.9%). 139 Regarding level of education, majority of the study population had attained tertiary education, and most of the study population occupied either a chamber/hall (30.8%) or self-contained house 140 (48.7%). These socio-demographic characteristics reflects on the fraction of population that have 141 higher prevalence of diabetes as reported in prevalence studies (diabetes) in the country [9]. A 142 study in an adult Ghanaian diabetic population found that diabetes is prevalent among adults 143 144 aged 50 years and above, females, higher level of education, wealth households and 145 professionals [23]. These findings reflect in the sociodemographic characteristics of our study population in this study. 146

147 On assessment of the knowledge of participants on diabetic retinopathy, we found that 65.4% of participants were aware that diabetes had ocular effects. Only 38.5% of them had heard about 148 diabetic retinopathy and 32.1% knew DR could result in blindness. Contrary to our findings, 149 another study found that 98.3% of the study participants knew that diabetes could affect eyes 150 151 with 99.1% believing that it could lead to blindness, while 50.4% of them were aware of diabetic retinopathy [22]. A study carried out in Jordanese population also revealed that 88.2% of study 152 153 participants were aware of the effects of diabetes on the eye with 81.9% stating that diabetes 154 could lead to blindness [18]. These findings were also seen in Turkey, where a study also reported 155 higher levels of knowledge among participants where 88.1% of the study participants being aware of the effects of diabetes on the eyes [19]. The disparities in the level of knowledge as 156 reported in this study and other studies could be attributed to a lower educational level among 157

our study populations. Also, there is an established national eye health care program and referral guidelines regarding DM and DR management for primary care in Jordan which positively influence knowledge about the conditions. Patients are referred for an eye examination at the same time as their diagnosis of DM. This may explain the high level of awareness of DR found in their study. The lower levels of knowledge regarding the awareness of diabetic retinopathy accounts for the lower mean scale score of (5.32) that was found in the study.

The stages of diabetic retinopathy were graded according to the ETDRS classifications. In the 164 165 current study, 37.2% of the study population showed signs of advanced PDR, while 9.0% had high 166 risk PDR and 19.2% had very severe NPDR. Several findings have been reported in other studies, 167 including in Blantyre, Malawi, where 19.7% of type 2 DM cases were found to have STDR which 168 was defined as pre-proliferative, proliferative and or the presence of macular edema, while a 169 further 8.5% had PDR. They also found an STDR prevalence of 18.8% and PDR prevalence of 12.5% 170 in type 1 diabetic participants [24]. A study in a Chinese population [25], found an STDR prevalence of 12.6% among 16305 participants, while another study [26] in Hangzhou, China, 171 found that 80% of participants had STDR, including 67% of first-time attendees at the study site. 172 Even though the method of classification in the other studies were different from this study, it 173 was observed that the percentage of the study population at the stages of advanced PDR and 174 175 high risk PDR was high (46.2%) as compared to the studies in Malawi and China [24,25]. The 176 higher percentages recorded in our study could be attributed to the late presentation of diabetic patients to the eye clinic for examination, resulting in more of them presenting with advanced 177 178 PDR stages.

Study subjects reported several factors that led to the late presentation of diabetic retinopathy 179 180 cases. Lack of knowledge about diabetic retinopathy was the most reported factor (69.2%) followed by fear of discovery (32.1%), lack of access (22.1%), high costs (21.8) and transportation 181 182 difficulties (3.8). These findings were similar to those seen in Owo, Nigeria, where lack of 183 knowledge about DR was cited by 62.8% of participants [27]. Davalgi et al. (2018) also reported lack of knowledge about DR as the number one barrier to timely eye examination by diabetic 184 patients [28]. Another study reported that cost of service delivery also hindered timely eye 185 186 examination by diabetic patients [29]. Lack of access to eye examination as reported by some 187 study participants may be due to an inadequate number of ophthalmologists in the country and the unequal distribution of eye care services in the country [30]. Most eye care centers are in the 188 189 urban regions of the country which deprives diabetic patients in the remote areas from seeking 190 eye care and even those that decide to make efforts to seek eye care are faced with transport 191 difficulties.

This study had some limitations. It was a hospital-based study with a small sample size as compared to other studies and as such findings of the study may not be an exact representation of diabetic patients and diabetic retinopathy in the country. The study however, provides muchneeded insight into factors influencing late presentation among diabetic retinopathy patients and should thus, serve as a foundation for future research and public health interventions on the subject.

198

199 Conclusions

The study identified majority of diabetic patients having poor knowledge about diabetic retinopathy. Most diabetic patients were found to present to the eye clinic advanced PDR stages with many citing a lack of knowledge about the condition as the major factor for their late presentation. There is the need for compulsory ocular examination for all diabetic patients at their hospitals as well as wide scale education on diabetes mellitus and its ocular complications in remote areas.

206

#### 207 List of abbreviations

208	DM	Diabetes mellitus
209	DR	Diabetic retinopathy
210	ETDRS	Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy study
211	КАТН	Komfo Anokye Teaching Hospital
212	NPDR	Non proliferative diabetic retinopathy
213	OD	Oculus dexter
214	OS	Oculus sinister
215	PDR	Proliferative diabetic retinopathy
216	STDR	Sight threatening diabetic retinopathy
217		

218 **Declarations** 

#### 219 Ethics approval and consent to participate

- 220 This study adhered strictly to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by
- the Institutional Review Board of the Komfo Anokye Teaching Hospital (KATH IRB/AP/028/22). A
- 222 written Informed consent was obtained from all participants.
- 223
- 224 Consent for publication
- 225 Not applicable.

226

### 227 Availability of data and materials

228 All relevant data are within the manuscript and its Supporting Information files.

# 229 Competing interests

230 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

231

- 232 Funding
- 233 This research received no external funding.

234

235 Authors' contributions

236	All	authors contributed to the conceptualization and design of the study, collection and
237	mar	agement of data, analysis and interpretation and drafting and revision of manuscript.
238		
239	Refe	erences
240	1.	Romero-Aroca P, Baget-Bernaldiz M, Pareja-Rios A, Lopez-Galvez M, Navarro-Gil R, Verges
241		R. Diabetic macular edema pathophysiology: Vasogenic versus inflammatory. J Diabetes
242		Res. 2016;2016:1–17.
243	2.	Congdon NG. Important causes of visual impairment in the world today. JAMA.
244		2003;290(15):2057.
245	3.	Yang Z, Tan TE, Shao Y, Wong TY, Li X. Classification of diabetic retinopathy: Past, present
246		and future. Front Endocrinol. 2022;13:1079217.
247	4.	Wang W, Lo ACY. Diabetic retinopathy: Pathophysiology and treatments. Int J Mol Sci.
248		2018;19(6):1816.
249	5.	Ghanchi F, Bailey C, Chakravarthy U, Cohen S, Dodson P, Gibson J, et al. The Royal College
250		of Ophthalmologists Diabetic Retinopathy Guidelines [Internet]. The Royal College of
251		Ophthalmologists; 2012. Available from: www.rcophth.ac.uk.
252	6.	Godfrey R, Julien M. Urbanisation and health. Clin Med. 2005;5(2):137–41.

253	7.	Klein R. The Wisconsin Epidemiologic Study of Diabetic Retinopathy: II. Prevalence and risk
254		of diabetic retinopathy when age at diagnosis is less than 30 years. Arch Ophthalmol.
255		1984;102(4):520.
256	8.	Yau JWY, Rogers SL, Kawasaki R, Lamoureux EL, Kowalski JW, Bek T, et al. Global
257		prevalence and major risk factors of diabetic retinopathy. Diabetes Care. 2012;35(3):556-
258		64.
259	9.	Rotimi C, Daniel H, Zhou J, Obisesan A, Chen G, Chen Y, et al. Prevalence and determinants
260		of diabetic retinopathy and cataracts in West African type 2 diabetes patients. Ethn Dis.
261		2003;13(2 Suppl 2):S110-117.
262	10.	Magulike N, Chuka-Okosa C, Oli J. Diabetic eye disease in Enugu South-Eastern Nigeria – A
263		preliminary report. Niger J Ophthalmol. 2003;11(1):30–3.
264	11.	Brown MM, Brown GC, Sharma S, Shah G. Utility values and diabetic retinopathy. Am J
265		Ophthalmol. 1999;128(3):324–30.
266	12.	Chew YK, Reddy SC, Karina R. Awareness and knowledge of common eye diseases among
267		the academic staff (non-medical faculties) of University of Malaya. Med J Malaysia.
268		2004;59(3):305–11.
269	13.	Rani P, Raman R, Subramani S, Perumal G, Kumaramanickavel G, Sharma T. Knowledge of
270		diabetes and diabetic retinopathy among rural populations in India, and the influence of
271		knowledge of diabetic retinopathy on attitude and practice. Rural Remote Health.
272		2008;8(3):838.

- 14. Livingston PM, Wood CA, McCarty CA, Harper CA, Keeffe JE, Taylor HR. Awareness of
- 274 diabetic retinopathy among people who attended a diabetic retinopathy screening
- 275 program. Med J Aust. 1998;169(2):117.
- 276 15. Summers K, Ryan GJ. The economic impact of diabetic retinopathy and the promise of
- emerging therapies. Princeton, NJ: International Medical Press; 2007.
- 278 16. Will JC, German RR, Schuman E, Michael S, Kurth DM, Deeb L. Patient adherence to
- 279 guidelines for diabetes eye care: results from the diabetic eye disease follow-up study. Am
- 280 J Public Health. 1994;84(10):1669–71.
- 281 17. Stewart MW. Treatment of diabetic retinopathy: Recent advances and unresolved
- 282 challenges. World J Diabetes. 2016;7(16):333–41.
- 18. Bakkar M, Haddad M, Gammoh Y. Awareness of diabetic retinopathy among patients with
- type 2 diabetes mellitus in Jordan. Diabetes Metab Syndr Obes Targets Ther. 2017;10:435–
- 285 41.
- 19. Çetin EN, Zencir M, Fenkçi S, Akın F, Yıldırım C. Assessment of awareness of diabetic
- 287 retinopathy and utilization of eye care services among Turkish diabetic patients. Prim Care
- 288 Diabetes. 2013;7(4):297–302.
- 289 20. Muninarayana C, Balachandra G, Hiremath S, Iyengar K, Anil N. Prevalence and awareness
- 290 regarding diabetes mellitus in rural Tamaka, Kolar. Int J Diabetes Dev Ctries.
- 291 2010;30(1):18–21.

- 292 21. Rema M, Premkumar S, Anitha B, Deepa R, Pradeepa R, Mohan V. Prevalence of diabetic
- 293 retinopathy in urban India: The Chennai Urban Rural Epidemiology Study (CURES) Eye
- 294 Study, I. Investig Opthalmology Vis Sci. 2005;46(7):2328–33.
- 295 22. El Khatib BA, Al Hawari HH, Al Bdour MD. Assessment of awareness of diabetic retinopathy
- among patients with diabetes mellitus attending the endocrine clinic at Jordan University
- Hospital. Madridge J Ophthalmol. 2017;2(1):17–21.
- 298 23. Gatimu SM, Milimo BW, Sebastian MS. Prevalence and determinants of diabetes among
- older adults in Ghana. BMC Public Health. 2016;16(1):1174.
- 300 24. Glover SJ, Burgess PI, Cohen DB, Harding SP, Hofland HWC, Zijlstra EE, et al. Prevalence of
- 301 diabetic retinopathy, cataract and visual impairment in patients with diabetes in sub-
- 302 Saharan Africa. Br J Ophthalmol. 2012;96(2):156–61.
- Zhang G, Chen H, Chen W, Zhang M. Prevalence and risk factors for diabetic retinopathy in
   China: a multi-hospital-based cross-sectional study. Br J Ophthalmol. 2017;101(12):1591–
   5.
- 306 26. Sapkota R, Chen Z, Zheng D, Pardhan S. The profile of sight-threatening diabetic
- retinopathy in patients attending a specialist eye clinic in Hangzhou, China. BMJ Open
   Ophthalmol. 2019;4(1):e000236.
- 309 27. Omolase CO, Olatunde LO, Komolafe OO, Adeleke OE, Akinwalere AK, Omolase BO.
- 310 Perceptions of barriers to the uptake of diabetic eye screening among diabetic eye
- 311 patients in Owo, Nigeria. Int J Ophthalmic Pathol. 2013;02(01).

312	28.	Davalgi S, Manu S, Aithal S, Dilip B. Awareness of diabetic retinopathy and barriers for eye
313		screening among adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus attending tertiary care teaching
314		hospital, Davanagere, Karnataka. Int J Med Sci Public Health. 2018;7(11):686–90.
315	29.	Paksin-Hall A, Dent ML, Dong F, Ablah E. Factors contributing to diabetes patients not
316		receiving annual dilated eye examinations. Ophthalmic Epidemiol. 2013;20(5):281–7.
317	30.	Morny EKA, Boadi-Kusi SB, Ocansey S, Kyei S, Yeboah K, Mmaduagwu MA. Assessing the
318		progress towards achieving "VISION 2020: The Right to Sight" initiative in Ghana. J Environ
319		Public Health. 2019;2019(12):1–10.

320



Figure 1: Stages of diabetic retinopathy in both eyes of study participants (N=78).

# Figure