TITLE PAGE

Category of manuscript:

Original Article – Laboratory Science.

Title of the paper:

How urgent do intravitreal anti-VEGF injections need to be to justify the risk of transmitting COVID-19? Proof-of-concept calculations to determine the Health Adjusted Life-Year (HALY) trade-off.

Full names and highest degree/qualifications of authors

Matt James Boyd[1] MBChB PhD

Daniel Andrew Richard Scott[2] MBChB

David Michael Squirrell[3] FRCOphth

Graham Ashley Wilson[2] FRANZCO MOphth

Addresses of institutions at which the work was carried out

[1] Adapt Research Ltd, Reefton, New Zealand

[2] Hauora Tairāwhiti, Gisborne Hospital, Gisborne, New Zealand

[3] Auckland District Health Board, Greenlane Hospital, Auckland, New Zealand

Full correspondence about manuscript

Dr Matt Boyd

14 Broadway, Reefton 7830, New Zealand

+64223512350, mattjamesboyd@gmail.com

Short running title

Benefit of anti-VEGF vs risk of COVID-19

Declaration of competing/conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Declaration of funding sources

Self-funded.

ABSTRACT and KEY WORDS

Background: Clinical ophthalmological guidelines encourage the assessment of potential benefits and harms when deciding whether to perform elective ophthalmology procedures during the COVID-19 pandemic, in order to minimize the risk of disease transmission.

Method: We performed probability calculations to estimate COVID-19 infection status and likelihood of disease transmission among neovascular age-related macular degeneration patients and health care workers during anti-VEGF procedures, at various community prevalence levels of COVID-19. We then applied the expected burden of COVID-19 illness and death expressed through health-adjusted life-years (HALYs) lost. We compared these results to the expected disease burden of severe visual impairment if sight protecting anti-VEGF injections were not performed.

Results: Our calculations estimate for a single treatment, where the background rate of COVID-19 in the community is 1000 active cases per million population, and full personal protective equipment (PPE) is available, that the benefits of treatment are greater than the expected harms to the patient and immediate health care team, provided the probability of severe visual impairment without treatment is >0.001%. Without effective PPE, and with a COVID-19 prevalence of 200,000 per million, an 8.5% chance of severe visual impairment could still justify monthly injections for six months.

Conclusion: In most cases analysed, the reduced disease burden from avoiding visual impairment outweighs the expected HALYs lost from COVID-19 transmission. This finding is driven by the fact that HALYs lost when someone suffers severe visual impairment for 5 years are equivalent to nearly 400 moderate cases of infectious disease lasting 2 weeks each.

Key Words: Age-Related Macular Degeneration, anti-VEGF, COVID-19, Health-Adjusted Life-Years, Mathematical Model.

MANUSCRIPT

Introduction

The coronavirus causing COVID-19 disease began circulating in Wuhan, China, in November 2019, quickly becoming a global pandemic with a high unmitigated transmissibility (R_0 approximately 2.4), and high infection fatality risk (perhaps as high as 0.9%).[1] Data from contact tracing in China suggests a risk of infection to close contacts of 1–5%.[2] The risk of community spread, and transmission from patient to health care team, and among members of health care teams, must be mitigated.

The provision of personal protective equipment (PPE) for health care workers is a key concern as the pandemic escalates.[3] Italy's national medical federation reports that 10% of responding health-care workers have been infected with 125 attributed-physician deaths recorded from March 11th to April 17th 2020.[4]

One approach to mitigating the burden of COVID-19 is to defer non-urgent medical care such as elective eye procedures. A review of ophthalmologic guidelines on COVID-19 suggests that the decision to provide intervention during the pandemic should be based on clinical judgment. Furthermore, patients with non-urgent clinical conditions (such as stable glaucoma and amblyopia) and non-urgent surgical conditions (such as cataract or epiretinal membrane) can be scheduled later.[5] For those requiring urgent clinical assessment or procedures, stringent isolation and protection measures

should be integrated into the workflow. However, it is useful to have an approximate quantitative estimate of benefits and harms to guide such decisions.

Intravitreal injections have become the most common procedure in both ophthalmology and medicine.[6] Injection of anti-vascular endothelial growth factor (anti-VEGF) for treatment of neovascular age-related macular degeneration (nAMD) is the most common indication. Since their introduction to New Zealand there has been a significant reduction to the nAMD-associated blindness. The expected cost per quality adjusted life-year for sight improvement/maintenance from this treatment is estimated at NZ$2,900. In the New Zealand health setting, most nAMD treatments are delivered by our public health service, with less than 10% of volume performed in private.[7]

COVID-19 imposes a high burden of morbidity and mortality upon communities through illness and death. However, severe vision impairment and blindness due to untreated eye conditions such as AMD also imposes quality of life losses. The clinical judgment equation must determine whether to treat or defer after balancing these competing impacts on health. The difference in disease burden expressed as annualised disability weight (DW) for a shift from moderate distance vision impairment to severe distance vision impairment is 0.153, whereas the DW for a ‘moderate infectious disease’ is 0.051, which only applies for the duration of illness.[8] COVID-19 can be a severe and deadly disease, nevertheless the burden of vision loss is significant and ongoing.

In this paper, we balance the burden of disease due to severe vision impairment against the possible burden due to COVID-19 transmission among nAMD patients and the healthcare team at various community levels of infection prevalence. We aimed to estimate the probability of severe vision impairment in the New Zealand setting that might justify nAMD treatment rather than deferral for individual cases in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Method

We developed a simple, coarse grained model of COVID-19 transmission and illness impacts, which accounted for the level of background COVID-19 disease in the community, the probability that health care workers or the patient (drawn randomly from the community) are currently infected, the probability of transmission among these individuals at the time of treatment, the health impact, in terms of disability weight (DW), due to vision impairment, COVID-19 infection, and the life years lost due to death from COVID-19. Life years were health adjusted, meaning that any loss of life years was already adjusted for morbidity such as the expected level of pre-existing illness by age group. The parameters used in the model are displayed in Table 1.

For simplicity we assumed a healthcare team of 3 members for a standard ophthalmologic procedure such as anti-VEGF injection for nAMD (injector, nurse, and additional assistant/clinic staff). This means the patient experiences three possible exposures to COVID-19 and each healthcare team member is exposed to two other staff and the patient. When calculating the impact of vision loss we assumed the patient

already had moderate distance vision loss (best eye), with visual impairment: <6/18 to 6/60, (DW 0.031) and was at risk of progressing to severe distance vision loss, <6/60 to 3/60, or blindness, <3/60, (DW 0.184 and 0.187 respectively) which were treated as equivalently bad outcomes for simplicity.

Given the age-distribution of COVID-19 illness and death we assumed an average healthcare worker age in New Zealand of approximately 50 years.[9] We analysed a number of scenarios including where a patient of mean age for AMD treatment in New Zealand receives monthly anti-VEGFs across six months, also a scenario where a patient of younger age (65-69 years) receives a single treatment. We also evaluated scenarios assuming the transmission probability reported for 'close contacts' was reduced by 95% due to the impact of full PPE used by all staff (gloves, goggles, face shields, water resistant gowns, and respiratory protective equipment). Finally, we analysed scenarios where we assumed either the patient or one health care worker is currently infected with COVID-19. The expected gain/loss in terms of health adjusted life-years (HALYs) for a single average patient was scaled up by the number of patients expected to receive anti-VEGF injections in a 6-month period to determine total potential HALY gain/loss in the New Zealand context.

Our coarse-grained model assumed a new health care team at each treatment occasion as a simplifying assumption in order to avoid the complication of tracking those who had been infected and recovered. Population prevalence of COVID-19 was assumed to be static across time for repeat procedures.

Table 1: Parameters used in the proof-of-concept model to estimate expected health-adjusted life-year gains/losses for preventing severe visual impairment in the context of COVID-19 pandemic.

Parameter	Value	Source
Mean 5-year age group of those undergoing anti-VEGF for AMD	75-79 years 65-69 years	Ernst & Young (2017) report the mean age of those undergoing anti-VEGF is 79 years.[7] 65-69 year age group was included for the 'younger patient, single treatment' scenario
Average age of health care workers	50	Approximate (in New Zealand average nurse age is reported to be 46, and 40% of doctors are older than 50).[9]
Health adjusted life expectancy (HALE) in New Zealand by age group	Varies by age, eg 9.1 years for those aged 70–79	Kvizhinadze et al (2015).[10]
Excess disability weight for severe visual impairment over moderate visual impairment (annualised)	0.153	Difference between 0.031 and 0.184, Salomon (2015).[8]
Probability of COVID transmission from 'close contact'	5%	WHO-China Joint COVID-19 Report reports that 1–5% of close contacts became infected. The conservative value of 5% is used in model.[2]
Disease burden from infectious disease (DW, annualised) - mild - moderate - severe	 0.006 0.051 0.133	Salomon (2015), applied to proportion of the year that the individual is ill.[8]
Duration of COVID-19 illness (to apply annualised DW)	22.6 days (hospitalised cases)	Verity et al. (2020).[11] (we therefore assumed 14 days duration for moderate cases, and 7 days for mild cases).
Probability of severe COVID-19 illness	Varies by age (eg 70-79 years = 24.3%)	Ferguson et al. (2020).[1]
Probability of death from COVID-19	Varies by age (eg 70-79 years = 5.1%)	Ferguson et al. (2020).[1]
Number of procedures required in 6 months	Scenario analyses: 6 (eg monthly anti-VEGF injections) 1 (eg single procedure)	Authors' estimates.
Effective number of health care staff per 'procedure'	3	Authors' estimate: includes ophthalmologist, nurse, clinic assistant
Parameters varied in the model		
Probability of progression from moderate to severe visual impairment without treatment	Varied in model	Varied to establish 'break-even' point where expected HALYs gained = 0.
Population prevalence of COVID-19	Varied in model	Varied from 200 per million to 200,000 per million.

AMD: age-related macular degeneration, DW: disability weight, HALY: health-adjusted life-year, VEGF: vascular endothelial growth factor

Results

Key results are summarized in Table 2 and are expressed as the percentage chance of progression from moderate vision impairment to severe vision impairment without treatment that would justify the procedure on the basis of aggregate HALYs gained for preventing blindness minus those lost for spreading COVID-19.

In the base case (before the probability of infection reduction due to PPE is applied), our results suggest that the expected aggregate HALY loss/gain for close contact among one patient aged 65–69 years, and three health care workers aged 50 years, when performing a single procedure that averts progression from moderate vision impairment to severe vision impairment (in a patient who had 5% likelihood of progression untreated), but exposes all involved to the background risk of COVID-19 (and age-attributable morbidity and mortality), is a gain of 0.12 HALYs when the population prevalence of COVID-19 is only 200 per million. This is made up of an expected gain of 0.12 HALY due to prevention of vision loss, and a negligible HALY loss due to the spread of infection. This changes to an expected HALY loss of 0.04 (due to COVID-19 infection) if the probability of severe visual impairment by deferring treatment for 6 months is only 0.5% and the prevalence of COVID-19 is very much higher at 200,000 per million.

Evaluating the scenario where monthly treatments are required across six months, and the patient is 75–79 years of age, with a 5% probability of severe visual loss, then we find the expected HALY benefit is 0.07 at a COVID-19 prevalence of 200 per million,

but an expected loss of 1.11 HALYs if 200,000 per million of the population are infected.

Applying the assumption that correct use of good quality PPE reduces the likelihood of transmission by 95%, we find HALY benefits in all scenarios where the probability of progression to severe visual impairment without treatment is 5%. The HALY benefit is 0.01 even at 200,000 per million COVID-19 prevalence.

In the scenario of monthly treatments without availability of effective PPE, the break-even point for HALYs is at 85% chance of severe visual impairment, and 0.1% with the PPE reduction applied. This break-even point is well below 0.01% chance of blindness when prevalence is only 200 per million.

If a health care worker or the patient are COVID-19 positive then the break-even point without PPE is 2.7–4.7% chance of progression to severe visual impairment depending on population prevalence for a one-time procedure, but 0.1% or less in every scenario if PPE reduces transmission by 95%.

Table 2: Results expressed as the probability of progression to severe visual impairment, which would justify treatment given the prevalence of COVID-19 and availability or not of full personal protective equipment (PPE).

Community Prevalence of COVID-19	Six monthly treatments, involving 3x 50-year old health care workers, for a patient aged 75–79 years	Single treatment, involving 3x 50 year old health care workers, for a younger patient aged 65–69 years
PPE is available and 95% effective (eg gown, gloves, N95 mask, face shield, cap)		
0.0002 (200 per million)	<0.01%	<0.001%
0.002	0.04%	<0.001%
0.02	0.43%	0.01%
0.2	4.25%	0.1%
PPE is not available (eg just gloves, surgical mask)		
0.0002	0.09%	0.002%
0.002	0.85%	0.022%
0.02	8.5%	0.22%
0.2	85%	2.22%

Percentages indicate the probability of progression to severe visual impairment without treatment; for example with PPE available and community prevalence of 0.0002, then a one-time treatment is justified for a very low (<0.001%) probability of progression, however, with no PPE and prevalence of 0.2 then a monthly treatment is only justified if the patient will almost certainly (85%) progress to severe visual impairment.

Discussion

Advice in recent ophthalmologic guidelines suggests that a clinical evaluation of the benefits and harms of performing eye procedures during the COVID-19 pandemic should determine whether to proceed or defer interventions.[5] This means that clinicians should be weighing the probability of serious progression of eye disease against the probability that COVID-19 might spread to patients or health care staff. Our simple calculations suggest that with appropriate PPE the threshold for carrying out interventions is likely to be low, with a 1% chance of severe visual impairment justifying interventions in all scenarios we analysed except for those involving repeated treatments in the context of very high population prevalence of disease.

The risk of COVID-19 spread can be further mitigated by appropriate health facility processes, including staff rotation, physical distancing, handwashing and disinfection, alert signs, no touch payments and many other measures.[5] Patients and staff could be tested for COVID-19 and could remain in self-quarantine following contact. Effective PPE makes a dramatic difference to the calculus. A study of 30 confirmed and suspected COVID-19 patients undergoing caesarean section reported no infection of healthcare workers.[12] Furthermore, pertaining to ophthalmology, the virus causing COVID-19 has been identified in the conjunctival sac, however at least one study indicates that transmission via the conjunctival sac has not been supported.[13] The additional cost of PPE could be factored in to determine whether the HALY benefits are cost-effective compared to usual practice.

The risks of stopping or delaying treatments for nAMD are significant. A delay in providing treatment is known to increase the risk of disease reactivation and visual loss.[14] As a lifelong chronic disease, even with good disease control, continued anti-VEGF injections are recommended to reduce the risk of reactivation.[15] We know from an observational study of 434 eyes where treatment was suspended, that 41% experienced disease reactivation within the first year.[16] In a large cohort study from the United Kingdom, just 6.9% of nAMD patients became legally blind following 2 years of anti-VEGF, compared to a predicted figure of 15.7% for untreated patients.[17]

The expected HALY gains per procedure that we estimate can be scaled up by applying case volumes. For example, in New Zealand, there are more than 75,000 anti-VEGF injections annually. Assuming monthly injections, this means there are potentially 6000 patients getting treatment in a six-month period. If even 1% of nAMD patients are at risk of progressing to severe visual impairment, then there are more than 87 net HALYs to be gained by continuing injections while the prevalence of COVID-19 in New Zealand is below 200 per million. There were only 454 active COVID-19 cases in New Zealand (and falling) as at 20th April 2020, which is approximately 94 cases per million.[18]

The current triage guidelines released by The Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Ophthalmologists (RANZCO) recommend continuing clinic appointments for nAMD patients with a high urgency.[19] The American Macular Degeneration Foundation shares a similar position, stating that 'anti-VEGF injections are essential for those who require them'.[20]

If there was a rapid escalation of COVID-19 cases, the 'break even' point at which HALYs lost rather than gained from providing care will change. We find that if one in five members of the population carries active virus, and PPE is in short supply, then the expected harms from COVID-19 outweigh the benefits of anti-VEGF treatments unless the chance of blindness is 85% or more. COVID-19 prevalence has demonstrated exponential growth in many countries worldwide, and so models can swing away from a position of benefit in a short time period.

During this unique period of a global pandemic, the equation for continuing to provide care becomes more complicated. For Ophthalmologists, there is a mindset change from patient-centered (preventing vision loss) to a community-centered (preventing spread of infectious disease and death) perspective. The personal health risks that the ophthalmology team and our patients take must be carefully considered. Most nAMD patients are higher risk for the development of severe disease and death given their average age and the fact that age is one of the most important risk factors for severe COVID-19 illness.[21] Likewise, Ophthalmologists are currently overrepresented in physician deaths attributed to COVID-19 (4% of all physicians) possibly reflecting their close contact with patients. Dr. Li Wenliang, the Ophthalmologist and whistleblower who informed the world of COVID-19, died of the disease.[22] Our calculations show that with appropriate PPE (sufficient to reduce transmission probability by 95%), the transmission risks are almost zero, even with high COVID-19 prevalence, however the limiting factor will be the availability of this equipment.

A number of other factors need to be considered beyond our simple model. Firstly, we encourage the development of more sophisticated and accurate epidemiological models of the likelihood of COVID-19 transmission in healthcare settings, given a range of contextual factors. We also encourage estimates of the probability of severe visual impairment if conditions are untreated. This would allow models to output the expected HALYs gained and lost, rather than the probability of progression at which the intervention 'breaks even' in terms of HALYs.

Secondly, given the high number of undetected COVID-19 cases in the community then ideally the true prevalence is established by random testing. In Austria, as at early April 2020, such studies revealed an active case prevalence of 0.33%.[23] Early random community testing in New Zealand has indicated zero community prevalence as at 20 April, 2020.[24]

Thirdly, our evaluation considers individual cases and assumes that the healthcare team is different each time for repeated procedures. This means that cumulative risk to individual health care workers who may perform many procedures, is not evaluated. The risk to individuals who are likely to be repeatedly exposed ought to be considered when weighing benefits and harms. That said, even without effective PPE, and with a COVID-19 population prevalence of 200,000 per million the expected HALY loss to health care workers due to COVID-19 infection appears to be approximately 0.0001 per person per procedure. The reason is that for the vast majority of people COVID-19 is a mild infectious illness for a week or two. In the model this is weighed against severe visual impairment for the remainder of the patient's life.

Finally, local COVID-19 mitigation strategies should be considered. In contexts where mitigation of disease impact or suppression of the number of cases is the goal, then the arguments above will apply. However, if the aim is elimination of COVID-19 then extra consideration might be given to avoiding all personal contact, including ophthalmologic procedures. However, if patients recover at home in quarantine, and it is possible to keep health care teams in small 'bubbles', then the risks could be managed.

Without continuing elective anti-VEGF injections where feasible, there is a risk of post-pandemic surge in demand. Health authorities need to plan ahead in order to avoid a mismanaged flow, and minimize staff burnout.[25] We are mindful that the reasoning described in this paper will apply to a number of other procedures where untreated conditions are likely to result in a high burden of disease. The benefits and harms of performing procedures for these conditions should also be quantified.

Limitations

This analysis is only a proof-of-concept using a simple blunt model. We have not accounted for a number of variables including the possible spread of any COVID-19 acquired during procedures to others beyond the patient and healthcare team. For repeat procedures across a six-month pandemic period we have assumed a constant community prevalence of COVID-19, however this would peak and decline. More sophisticated epidemiological models should be developed to account for these variables. Also, our model applies the DW for progression from 'moderate visual impairment' to 'severe

visual impairment/blindness' as an immediate transition, which does not account for slow deterioration and will likely over-estimate HALY losses. We have also assumed just three healthcare staff exposed to each other and each patient, however, real clinical interactions may involve more close contacts than this. We have assumed that high-quality PPE reduces the chance of infection by 95% (ie one in 20 close contacts using PPE are exposed to the risk of infection). Although, this could still be conservative, as we note above, some reports suggest very low or no COVID-19 transmission in surgical settings (zero infections during 30 caesarean deliveries in one study). Our analysis also, does not consider whether health resources might better be spent treating COVID-19 patients. Our analysis was performed in the context of New Zealand's population demographic, including age at treatment and health adjusted life-expectancy and findings may not generalise to other settings. Finally, the COVID-19 pandemic is evolving and so the parameters used in the model are dynamic and subject to change over time as more information and further research becomes available.

Conclusion

Recent clinical guidelines emphasise the need for clinicians to consider the benefits and harms of performing clinical procedures during the COVID-19 pandemic. We estimated the expected HALYs lost due to COVID-19 transmission in the clinical setting, and the expected HALY gains from preventing progression of eye disease from moderate impairment to severe impairment. Our results indicate that for the most plausible community prevalence rates of COVID-19 and with availability of appropriate PPE, then ophthalmic procedures should continue in many cases even when there is a probability of progression to severe visual impairment of 1% or less. The reason for this result is easily illustrated by considering that the HALYs lost when someone suffers severe visual impairment for 5 years are equivalent to nearly 400 moderate cases of infectious disease lasting 2 weeks each.[8]

In an epidemic, the pendulum has to swing from the greater good of the individual patient toward the greater good of all persons. There will be myriad of factors to consider when deciding on whether to continue or suspend anti-VEGF injections (patient and carer factors, governmental health policies, clinician decision making especially whether patient has good vision in one or two eyes, among others) but this modelling provides some evidence to estimate the quantity of HALYs at stake and the risks involved in anti-VEGF intravitreal injections. As always in medicine, the treatment decision needs to be individualised to the best interest of each patient.

REFERENCES

1. Ferguson N, Laydon D, Nedjati-Gilani G *et al*. *Impact assessment of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand.* London: Imperial College COVID-Response Team, 2020. Report No: 9. doi: https://doi.org/10.25561/77482.
2. WHO-China Joint Mission. *Report of the WHO-China Joint Mission on Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19).* World Health Organization;2020.
3. The Lancet. COVID-19: protecting health-care workers. *Lancet.* 2020;**395**:922.
4. Federazione Nazionale degli Ordini dei Medici Chirurghi e degli Odontoiatri. *Elenco dei Medici caduti nel corso dell'epidemia di Covid-19*. Rome: Federazione Nazionale degli Ordini dei Medici Chirurghi e degli Odontoiatri, 2020. Accessed April 2020. Available from: https://portale.fnomceo.it/elenco-dei-medici-caduti-nel-corso-dellepidemia-di-covid-19/.
5. Gharebaghi R, Desuatels J, Moshirfar M, Parvizi M, Daryabari S, Heidary F. COVID-19: Preliminary Clinical Guidelines for Ophthalmology Practices. *Med Hypothesis Discov Innov Ophthalmol.* 2020;**9**:149–158.
6. Lau PE, Jenkins KS, Layton CJ. Current Evidence for the Prevention of Endophthalmitis in Anti-VEGF Intravitreal Injections. *J Ophthalmol.* 2018;**2018**:8567912.
7. Ernst & Young. *Age-related Macular Degeneration Model of care assessment and recommendations.* Ernst & Young;2017.
8. Salomon JA, Haagsma JA, Davis A *et al*. Disability weights for the Global Burden of Disease 2013 study. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2015;**3**:e712-723.

9. Immigration New Zealand. *Building and keeping a health workforce*. Wellington: Immigration New Zealand, 2015. Accessed April 2020. Available from: https://www.immigration.govt.nz/about-us/media-centre/newsletters/settlement-actionz/actionz3/building-and-keeping-a-health-workforce.

10. Kvizhinadze G, Wilson N, Nair N, McLeod M, Blakley T. How much can society spend on life-saving interventions at different ages while remaining cost effective? Estimates using New Zealand health system costs, morbidity, and mortality data. *Popul Health Metr.* 2015;**13**. doi: 10.1186/s12963-015-0052-2.

11. Verity R, Okell L, Doriagatti I *et al*. Estimates of the severity of COVID-19 disease. *MedRxiv. 2020.* doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.09.20033357.

12. Yue L, Han L, Li Q *et al*. Anaesthesia and infection control in cesarean section of pregnant women with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *MedRxiv.* 2020. doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.23.20040394.

13. Zhou Y, Zeng Y, Tong Y, Chen C. Ophthalmologic evidence against the interpersonal transmission of 2019 novel coronavirus through conjunctiva. *MedRxiv.* 2020. doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.11.20021956.

14. Ozturk M, Harris ML, Nguyen V, Barthelmes D, Gillies MC, Mehta H. Real-world visual outcomes in patients with neovascular age-related macular degeneration receiving aflibercept at fixed intervals as per UK licence. *Clin Exp Ophthalmol.* 2018;**46**:407-411.

15. Gale RP, Mahmood S, Devonport H *et al*. Action on neovascular age-related macular degeneration (nAMD): recommendations for management and service provision in the UK hospital eye service. *Eye (Lond).* 2019;**33**:1-21.

16. Nguyen V, Vaze A, Fraser-Bell S *et al*. Outcomes of Suspending VEGF Inhibitors for Neovascular Age-Related Macular Degeneration When Lesions Have Been Inactive for 3 Months. *Ophthalmol Retina.* 2019;**3**:623-628.

17. Buckle M, Lee A, Mohamed Q *et al*. Prevalence and incidence of blindness and other degrees of sight impairment in patients treated for neovascular age-related macular degeneration in a well-defined region of the United Kingdom. *Eye (Lond).* 2015;**29**:403-408.

18. Ministry of Health. *COVID-19 - current cases*. Wellington: Ministry of Health, 2020. Accessed April 2020. Available from: https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/diseases-and-conditions/covid-19-novel-coronavirus/covid-19-current-situation/covid-19-current-cases.

19. Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Ophthalmologists (RANZCO). *RANZCO New Zealand Branch Triage Guidelines – COVID-19 Level 4*. Sydney: Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Ophthalmologists. Accessed April 2020. Available from: https://ranzco.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/RANZCO-triage-NZ-modification-level-4.pdf.

20. Seddon J, Khurana R. *Coronavirus and Your Macular Degeneration Care*. Northhampton: American Macular Degeneration Foundation. Accessed April 2020. Available from: https://www.macular.org/2020/03/19/coronavirus-and-your-macular-degeneration-care.

21. Jordan R, Adab P, Cheng K. Covid-19: risk factors for severe disease and death. *BMJ.* 2020;**368**. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1198.

22. Ing E, Xu A, Salimi A, Tourun N. Physician Deaths from Corona Virus Disease (COVID-19). *MedRxiv.* 2020. doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.05.20054494.

23. Ogris G, Hofinger C. *COVID-19 Prevalence: Media information, April 10.* Sora Institut;2020.

24. New Zealand Government. *Transcript of COVID-19 media conference – 20 April*. Wellington: New Zealand Government. Accessed April 2020. Available from: https://covid19.govt.nz/latest-updates/covid-19-media-conference-20-april/transcript-of-covid-19-media-conference-20-april/.

25. Zhang H, Bo L, Lin Y, Li F, Sun S. Response of Chinese Anesthesiologists to the COVID-19 Outbreak. *Anesthesiology.* 2020. doi: 10.1097/ALN.0000000000003300