

## **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)

¶These authors contributed equally to this work

## 1 **Abstract**

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

8 Methods: This descriptive cross-sectional study was conducted between the periods of February  
9 2022 to April 2022. All diabetic patients referred to the retina clinic were examined for diabetic  
10 retinopathy. Both eyes of participants were examined and the eye with the most severe form of  
11 diabetic retinopathy was used for the staging. A structured questionnaire was employed to  
12 collect patients' socio-economic factors and knowledge on diabetic retinopathy. Data was  
13 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  $49.9 \pm 11.4$  years. The mean  
16 (+SD) knowledge score of study participants on diabetic retinopathy was 5.3 ( $\pm 3.2$ ) with a  
17 maximum possible score of 12. Majority of the participants (65%) were aware that uncontrolled  
18 diabetes mellitus affects the eyes; 7.7% had mild NPDR, 16.7% had moderate NPDR, 10.3%;  
19 severe NPDR, 19.2%; very severe NPDR, 9.0%; high risk PDR and 37.2% showed signs of advanced  
20 PDR. Fifty-four participants (69.2%) highlighted a lack of knowledge about the condition as the  
21 main reason for late presentation.

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

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

27

28

## 29 Introduction

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

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

42 with nearly 80% of this population being in the middle age or working group [6]. DR is the most  
43 common complication in type I diabetes mellitus and nearly all patients will have some degree of  
44 retinopathy 15–20 years after diagnosis. Similarly, more than 60% of type II diabetes patients will  
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  
47 reported the prevalence of diabetic retinopathy between the ranges of 15.5% to 17% [9,10].

48 Key risk factors leading to the development and progression of DR are long-term DM, inadequate  
49 glycaemic control, hypertension (HTN), dyslipidaemia, nephropathy and gender [7]. Control of  
50 the modifiable risk factors through periodic eye examinations and appropriate interventions has  
51 been shown to impede the advancement of DR [7].

52 Visual impairment as a result of DR has a significant impact on patients' quality of life, and can  
53 compromise their ability to manage their disease successfully, which can in turn have a negative  
54 impact on the incidence of other diabetic complications and overall life expectancy [11]. Several  
55 studies have reported that most patients with diabetes mellitus are aware of the detrimental  
56 effect that the condition may have on their sight but yet they do not routinely seek eye care [12–  
57 14]. Reported barriers to screening and regular ocular examinations include: lack of knowledge  
58 about diabetic retinopathy and non-compliance with screening guidelines by ophthalmologists  
59 due to socioeconomic, cultural, and geographic reasons [15-17].

60

61 **Materials and methods**

62 This hospital based cross-sectional study was conducted from 1<sup>st</sup> February 2022 to 30<sup>th</sup> April 2022  
63 at the Eye Center, Komfo Anokye Teaching Hospital (KATH) – a major eye referral center in Ghana.  
64 Patients aged 18 years and above, with confirmed cases of diabetes mellitus, were considered  
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  
67 excluded. A purposive sampling method was employed to recruit 78 diabetic retinopathy patients  
68 (156 eyes) at the study site. All study participants had their visual acuity measured with the  
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  
71 used to examine the anterior segment of the eye and pupillary reaction test. Intraocular pressure  
72 was measured using a Goldmann Applanation Tonometer (Haag-Streit AG, Koeniz, Switzerland).  
73 The pupils of all participants were dilated with 1% tropicamide and a detailed posterior segment  
74 examination as much as the media clarity allowed was performed by a retina specialist (AAA). A  
75 stereoscopic examination of the disc and macula with a slit lamp and 78D Volk lens (Volk Optical,  
76 USA); as well as indirect ophthalmoscopy with a 20D lens (Volk Optical, USA) was used for  
77 posterior segment examination; clinical staging of DR was done. Findings were recorded on the  
78 data collection sheet. Information on duration of diabetes mellitus diagnosis, and the presence  
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  
81 Board of the Komfo Anokye Teaching Hospital (KATH IRB/AP/028/22). A written Informed  
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 ( $\geq 5.32$ ) 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**

95 A total of 78 patients were included in the study. The mean age of the study population was  
96  $49.9 \pm 11.4$  years with the minimum age of 32 years and maximum age of 79 years. Almost all the  
97 study participants were enrolled on the National health insurance scheme (83.3%) and served as  
98 the only means of accessing healthcare. Almost 90% of the study population had at least primary  
99 education. Details pertaining to the socioeconomic characteristics of participants can be found  
100 in Table 1.

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

Characteristics	Frequency (%)	Mean knowledge score (SD)	P-value
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 ( $\pm$ 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		
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't Know (%)
<b>Knowledge on how to control diabetes mellitus.</b>			
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)
<b>Knowledge on how often a patients with diabetes should have an eye examination.</b>			
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

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

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

Characteristics	Diabetic Retinopathy stages						P-value
	Mild	Moderate	Severe	Very Severe	High Risk	Advanced	
	NPDR	NPDR (%)	NPDR (%)	NPDR (%)	PDR	PDR (%)	
	(%)				(%)	(%)	
<b>Total</b>	6 (7.7)	13 (16.7)	8 (10.3)	15 (19.2)	7 (9.0)	29 (37.2)	
<b>Age groups, years</b>							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)	
<b>Gender</b>							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)	
<b>Occupation</b>							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)	

<b>Marital Status</b>							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)	
<b>Health Insurance</b>							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)	
<b>Level of education</b>							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)	
<b>Duration of Diabetes</b>							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)	
<b>Housing Type</b>							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  
122 participants, 65 (83.3%) had DR and 13 (16.7%) did not have DR, whereas in the left eye (OS) of  
123 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  
125 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

129 The mean age of our study population; patients with diabetes (50 years) was similar to other  
130 hospital-based studies conducted by in Jordan [18] and Turkey [19], but unlike other developing  
131 countries [20,21], where patients were much younger. This may be due to late detection of  
132 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

136 of 50.4%, and 54.9%, were recorded [22]. The higher percentage of females found in this study  
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,  
140 and most of the study population occupied either a chamber/hall (30.8%) or self-contained house  
141 (48.7%). These socio-demographic characteristics reflects on the fraction of population that have  
142 higher prevalence of diabetes as reported in prevalence studies (diabetes) in the country [9]. A  
143 study in an adult Ghanaian diabetic population found that diabetes is prevalent among adults  
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  
146 population in this study.

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

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

164 The stages of diabetic retinopathy were graded according to the ETDRS classifications. In the  
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  
171 prevalence of 12.6% among 16305 participants, while another study [26] in Hangzhou, China,  
172 found that 80% of participants had STDR, including 67% of first-time attendees at the study site.  
173 Even though the method of classification in the other studies were different from this study, it  
174 was observed that the percentage of the study population at the stages of advanced PDR and  
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  
177 patients to the eye clinic for examination, resulting in more of them presenting with advanced  
178 PDR stages.

179 Study subjects reported several factors that led to the late presentation of diabetic retinopathy  
180 cases. Lack of knowledge about diabetic retinopathy was the most reported factor (69.2%)  
181 followed by fear of discovery (32.1%), lack of access (22.1%), high costs (21.8) and transportation  
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  
184 lack of knowledge about DR as the number one barrier to timely eye examination by diabetic  
185 patients [28]. Another study reported that cost of service delivery also hindered timely eye  
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  
188 the unequal distribution of eye care services in the country [30]. Most eye care centers are in the  
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.

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

198

199 **Conclusions**



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

206

### 207 **List of abbreviations**

208	DM	Diabetes mellitus
209	DR	Diabetic retinopathy
210	ETDRS	Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy study
211	KATH	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  
221 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 management of data, analysis and interpretation and drafting and revision of manuscript.

238

## 239 **References**

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](http://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.


- 273 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  
277 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.
- 283 18. Bakkar M, Haddad M, Gammoh Y. Awareness of diabetic retinopathy among patients with  
284 type 2 diabetes mellitus in Jordan. *Diabetes Metab Syndr Obes Targets Ther.* 2017;10:435–  
285 41.
- 286 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 Ophthalmology Vis Sci.* 2005;46(7):2328–33.
- 295 22. El Khatib BA, Al Hawari HH, Al Bdour MD. Assessment of awareness of diabetic retinopathy  
296 among patients with diabetes mellitus attending the endocrine clinic at Jordan University  
297 Hospital. *Madridge J Ophthalmol.* 2017;2(1):17–21.
- 298 23. Gatimu SM, Milimo BW, Sebastian MS. Prevalence and determinants of diabetes among  
299 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.
- 303 25. Zhang G, Chen H, Chen W, Zhang M. Prevalence and risk factors for diabetic retinopathy in  
304 China: a multi-hospital-based cross-sectional study. *Br J Ophthalmol.* 2017;101(12):1591–  
305 5.
- 306 26. Sapkota R, Chen Z, Zheng D, Pardhan S. The profile of sight-threatening diabetic  
307 retinopathy in patients attending a specialist eye clinic in Hangzhou, China. *BMJ Open*  
308 *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

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.01.24318265>; this version posted December 2, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



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