

1 **Original Research Article**

2 **Demographic profiles of contact lens wearers and their association**
3 **with lens wear characteristics in Trinidad and Tobago: A**
4 **retrospective study**

5
6 Ezinne E Ngozika^{1,3p}; Bhattarai Dipesh^{2†}; Ekemiri K Kingsley^{1,3}; Harbajan N Gabrielle^{1†}; Crooks
7 C Anesha^{1†}; Mashige P Khathutshelo^{3†}; Alex A Ilechie^{4†}; Ferial M Zereid^{5†}; Osuagwu L
8 Uchechukwu^{6*p}

9 **Affiliations:**

10 ¹Optometry Unit, Department of Clinical Surgical Sciences, Faculty of Medical Sciences,
11 University of the West Indies, St Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago; ezinne.ngozi@gmail.com;
12 doctorkingsley1981@gmail.com;

13 ²School of Medicine, Faculty of Health, Deakin University, Victoria Australia.

14 dipeshbhattarai@hotmail.com.

15 ³African Vision Research Institute (AVRI), Discipline of Optometry, School of Health Sciences,
16 University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa. Mashigek@ukzn.ac.za

17 ⁴Department of Optometry and Vision Science, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana

18 Email address: alexilechie@gmail.com

19 ⁵Department of Optometry & Vision Sciences College of Applied Medical Sciences, King Saud
20 University, Ilesha, Saudi Arabia; drferyal@KSU.EDU.SA

21 ^{6*}Translational Health Research Institute (THRI), School of Medicine, Western Sydney
22 University, Campbelltown, Australia. L.Osuagwu@westernsydney.edu.au

23 *Corresponding Author:

24 Uchechukwu L Osuagwu

25 Translational Health Research Institute (THRI),

26 School of Medicine, Western Sydney University, Campbelltown, NSW 2560

27 Email: L.Osuagwu@westernsydney.edu.au;

28 Number of Tables: 1

29 Number of Figures: 4

30 [‡] These authors contributed equally to this work

31 [†] These authors also contributed equally to this work

32

33 **Acknowledgments:** None to acknowledge

34

35 **Abstract**

36 Purpose: Contact lenses (CL) remain a popular mode of refractive error correction globally and in
37 the Caribbean, mostly among young people. However, no data on the characteristics of the CL

38 population wearers in the Caribbean is available. This study reported on the characteristics of CL
39 wearers and the associated factors in Trinidad and Tobago (T&T).

40 Methods: Clinical records of 243 CL wearers attending the University of the West Indies (UWI)
41 optometry clinic between 2017 and 2018 were reviewed. Data on their demographic profiles, CL
42 wearing characteristics including lens type, material, purpose of wear, replacement schedule and
43 care systems were extracted and analyzed. The associations between the demographic
44 characteristics and CL wearing characteristics were also determined.

45 Results: About half of the respondents wear CL wearers and used them for various purposes such
46 as fashion (more among those aged 18 to 30 years, 61.0%), therapeutic (more among those <18
47 years, 43.8%, $P = 0.001$) and refractive error correction purposes (more in those >40 years, P
48 =0.001). Females were more likely to use CLs for fashion compared with males (67.0% versus
49 40.7%). Age ($P<0.0005$) and gender ($P=0.030$) were associated with the lens materials. Those
50 aged 18-30 years were more likely use hydrogels compared with the younger ones (64.1% versus
51 25.0%). Rigid gas permeable (RGP) CL use was more common in males than females (21.8%
52 versus 10.9%, $P = 0.031$). Daily disposables were predominantly used by younger respondents
53 (18-30 year-olds, 31.3%, $P < 0.001$) and more in females than males (66.7% vs 49.4%, $P = 0.040$).

54 Conclusions: Contact lens use appears be more common among younger females for fashion and older
55 males for refractive correction. Age, gender and employment status were the main determinants of
56 lens wear among respondents attending the university clinic in T&T.

57 **Keywords:** Contact lens; refractive error; silicone hydrogel; rigid gas permeable; demographic
58 profile

59

60 **Introduction**

61 Contact lenses (CL) are used for the correction of refractive errors as well as fashion and
62 therapeutic purposes [1]. It is estimated that there are over 140 million CL wearers globally [2].
63 However, over the past decade, the CL industry has experienced advancements in terms of lens
64 designs and materials which has influenced the choice of wear [3-5]. The use of CL has been in
65 existence for the past two decades, with ongoing evaluation of different types of CL worn around
66 the world, to better understand and identify some of the common factors which influence choice
67 of wear. Global trends indicate that soft CL for daily wear are more popular, and majority of
68 wearers were females [6-9]. In addition, an increase in silicone hydrogel CL for daily wear has
69 been reported globally [1, 10, 11]. Rigid CL lens fitting has been shown to represent a small
70 percentage of the market, particularly in developing countries [7, 12]. The common factors
71 reported to affect CL wear are demographic profiles of the population, income, purpose of wear,
72 prevailing eye condition in that area, the range of CL available, level of education of the
73 optometrist and socio-cultural issues [8, 10, 13].

74 Trinidad and Tobago (T&T) is a small twin Island republic state in the Caribbean [14] with
75 a population of 1.4 million people and is regarded as the power house of the English speaking
76 Caribbean due to its large natural oil and gas reserves [15]. It has only one optometry school which
77 is located at the University of the West Indies, Saint Augustine campus and started in 2011. Prior
78 to 2009, most optometrists in T&T were foreign trained (UK, USA, Nigeria, and South Africa)
79 because there was no optometry training institution in the country and across the Caribbean region.
80 To meet the growing demand for eye care services by increasing the number of optometrists in the

81 region, the first Bachelor of Science programme in Optometry was started in T&T at the University
82 of the West Indies and this training brought a lot of changes in optometry profession across the
83 Caribbean [16].

84 CL practice in T&T has evolved over the last decades following the emergence of the
85 optometry programme and together with some other countries in the Caribbean including
86 Barbados, Guyana, Saint Lucia and Jamaica, the country has benefitted enormously from this
87 Programme [16] with increase in the optometry manpower. The increase in the number of
88 optometry graduate from the University of West Indies led to the expansion of optometry practice
89 with many of the optometrists embarking on different areas of interests including CL practice. This
90 is possibly due to a high demand for CL wear in private practices as a result of the improvement
91 in the socio-economic condition of many in the country.

92 Contact lens practice in Trinidad and Tobago is regulated by the Trinidad and Tobago
93 Optometrists Association (TTOA) [17]. Optometrists and Ophthalmologists are the only
94 professionals permitted to prescribe CL for the management of refractive error, keratoconus and
95 anisometropia in Trinidad and Tobago. The use of fashion CL is not regulated as individuals are
96 free to purchase them from beauty parlor, over-the-counter pharmacy shops, online and even
97 supermarkets. Most of the big CL companies such as Johnson and Johnson, Acuvue, Bausch and
98 Lomb have their representatives in the country making various CLs readily available.

99 CL are gaining popularity worldwide as an alternative to spectacles for the correction
100 of refractive errors and across different countries, their usage vary with various demographic
101 characteristics [5, 6, 8, 9]. Approximately 7.2%, 12.0%, 14.6% and 14.7% adult CL usage rates
102 were reported in the UK, Norway, Japan and the USA respectively [11]. Unlike the neighboring
103 countries like the United states, there is a paucity of published data on CL use across the Caribbean

104 and the characteristics of lens wearers in T&T remain unknown. Considering the growing
105 popularity of CL use and the fact that demographic profile of lens wearers and associated factors
106 might vary between countries due to the variations in socioeconomic factors, more studies are
107 needed to provide an insight into CL wear in different countries including T&T. The information
108 will aid eye care practitioners and lens manufacturers in T&T to understand the local CL market
109 to assess demand, growth in relation to other countries. The aim of this study was to determine the
110 demographic characteristic of CL wearers and associated factors among respondents who attended
111 a university optometry clinic in T&T. This will provide data for comparison with the global
112 findings.

113

114 **Materials and Methods**

115 *Study setting*

116 This study was carried out at the University of the West Indies (UWI) optometry clinic
117 situated in Couva, an urban town (48,858 in 2011 census) in west-central Trinidad, south of Port
118 of Spain and Chaguanas [18]. It is the capital and main urban centre of Couva–Tabaquite–Talparo
119 located directly adjacent to the Venezuelan state of Monagas [18]. It is the fourth least populated
120 city in Trinidad and has very few optometry clinics. Most (80%) of the optometry practices in
121 Trinidad are situated in Port of Spain, which is the nation capital, and it can be assumed that most
122 contact lens wearers live there.

123 The UWI optometry clinic in Trinidad and Tobago provides optometry training and
124 services to the general public. It is well equipped and has a highly qualified academic staff

125 complement. CL practice including fitting and prescribing CL for keratoconus management is
126 among the eye care services provided.

127 ***Ethical considerations***

128 Approval to conduct the study was obtained from the University of the West Indies, St
129 Augustine campus, Research and Ethics Committee (registration number:
130 CREC.SA.0037/09/2019). Permission to assess patients' case files was obtained from the
131 university optometry unit Coordinator and the study followed the tenets of the Declaration of
132 Helsinki.

133 ***Study design***

134 This was a retrospective study of patients prescribed with contact lens at the UWI
135 optometry clinic from January 2017 to December 2018. The records of all patients prescribed with
136 contact lens were retrieved and reviewed.

137 ***Inclusion and exclusion criteria***

138 All patients prescribed with contact lens at UWI optometry clinic were included. The study
139 included all patients prescribed with contact lens at the clinic from January 2017 to December
140 2018. All patients who wore contact lens prescribed outside UWI optometry clinic and those whose
141 contact lenses prescriptions were obtained outside UWI or could not be verified, were excluded.

142 ***Data collection procedure***

143 Data collection involved the use of a data extraction sheet to obtain information on the
144 demographic profile of each patient fitted and CL wearing history and characteristics. These were

145 based on a review of previous studies [1, 6, 7] and included lens type, purpose of wear (fashion,
146 refractive correction and therapeutic/cosmesis) [9, 13, 19] lens material (hydrogel, silicon hydrogel
147 and rigid gas permeable), habitual lens replacement schedule (daily disposable, weekly disposable,
148 monthly disposable and yearly disposable) [1], lens wear modality (fulltime wear was considered
149 as ≥ 8 hrs per day and seven days a week and part time as < 8 hrs per day) [7], and care systems
150 advised for each patient, over a two-year period.

151 ***Statistical analysis***

152 Data were analysed using the IBM Statistical package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version
153 27 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, USA). Descriptive statistics were computed for all variables after the
154 data had been screened and the assessed for normality of distribution. Continuous and discrete
155 variables were analysed using student *t* test for means and Pearson's Chi-square test for
156 proportions, respectively.

157

158 **Results**

159 ***Demographics of contact lens wearers***

160 Table 1 presents the demographic profiles and CL-related characteristics. Two hundred and
161 forty three patients were prescribed with CL at the UWI optometry clinic from January 2017 to
162 December 2018. Their mean age was 29.7 ± 12.7 years (range 4-73 years), and the majority
163 (59.7%) were in the 18 to 30 years age group. Almost two-thirds (64.2%) were females and 54.4%
164 were from urban areas. About half (51.4%) were unemployed and these were mostly young people
165 (64.8% were aged 18-30 years).

166 **Table 1:** Demographic characteristics of the participants and CL-related variables ($n = 243$ unless
167 *otherwise specified*).

Variables	Number of participants (n)	Percentage (%)
Year		
2017	101	41.6
2018	142	58.4
Demography		
Age category		
<18 years	16	6.6
18 - 30 years	145	59.7
31 - 40 years	38	15.6
>40 years	44	18.1
Gender		
Male	87	35.8
Female	156	64.2
Residency (n = 240)		
Rural	107	44.6
Urban	133	55.4
Occupation		

Employed	118	48.6
Unemployed	125	51.4
Purpose of CL wear (n= 226)		
Fashion	130	57.5
Refractive error	66	29.2
Correction		
Therapeutic	30	13.3
CL types		
Soft spherical	93	38.3
Soft toric	90	37.0
Soft multifocal	24	9.9
CL material		
Hydrogel	129	53.1
Silicon hydrogel	78	32.1
Rigid Gas permeable	36	14.8
Habitual CL replacement schedule		
Daily disposable	147	60.5
Biweekly disposable	22	9.1
Monthly disposable	38	15.6

Yearly disposable	36	14.8
CL care system		
Multipurpose solution	59	24.3
Boston solution	34	14.0
None (not recorded)	150	61.7
CL wear modality (n = 200)		
Part time (<8hrs/day)	80	40
Full time (≥8hrs/day)	120	60

168 CL=contact lens, wear modality

169

170 *Contact lens wear profile*

171 The main reason for CL wear was cosmesis (53.5%) followed by refractive correction
172 (27.2%) (Table 1). More than two-thirds (38.3%) wore soft spherical or soft lenses (37%). For
173 more than half of the wearers, their CLs materials was polymer-hydrogel (53.1%) and 32.1% wore
174 silicone-hydrogel lenses while (14.8%) wore RGP lenses. Most (60.5%) wore daily disposable
175 CLs and 15.6% wore monthly disposables.

176 Most (61%) record cards did not reflect the type of lens system used. About one-quarter
177 (24.3%) used multipurpose solution and 14% used Boston solution. The mean number of the daily
178 hours and the average number of days the wearers used their lenses were recorded as 7.8 (SD, 3.1;

179 range 1.5-18 hours) per day and for about 4 days per week. Majority (60%) wore CL for more than
180 16 hours per day and 44.45% wore them more than 4 days a week.

181 *Association between demographic variables and the purpose of wear*

182 Figure 1 shows the results for the purpose of CL wear by a) age group and b) gender. Chi-
183 square analysis showed that the purpose of CLs wear differed between age groups ($p = 0.001$) and
184 gender of the respondents ($p = 0.001$). Compared with other age groups, those in the 18 to 30 years
185 age group were more likely to wear fashion CLs (61.0%) whereas therapeutic purposes were the
186 main reason for CL use among those younger than 18 years (43.8%, $P = 0.001$). In contrast, CL
187 wearers older than 40 years (35.9%) were more likely to use CLs for refractive error correction
188 compared to younger wearers (<18 years, 12.5%, $P = 0.001$).

189 A higher percentage of females (67.0% versus 40.7%) wore CL for fashion reasons
190 whereas more males than females (39.5% versus 23.4%) used CLs for refractive error correction
191 ($P = 0.001$).

192 *Association between demographic variables and the CLs material*

193 Age and gender were significantly associated with lens materials worn (both P-values
194 <0.05) (Figure 2). Participants between the ages of 18 and 30 years were more likely to be
195 prescribed hydrogel CLs compared with teenagers (less than 18 years) (64.1% versus 25.0%, $P <$
196 0.001) and older adults (more than 40 years) (34.1%, $P < 0.001$), who were more likely to be
197 prescribed silicon hydrogel CL. There was a significant association between CL material and
198 gender, and 58.3% of females compared with 43.7% of males were prescribed hydrogel CLs ($P =$
199 0.031). No other significant association was found between the material prescribed and other
200 demographic variables.

201 ***Association between demographic variables and the replacement schedule***
202 ***(wearing regimen) of CLs***

203 Age and gender were associated with the CL wear regimen ($P < 0.001$) (Figure 3). A higher
204 proportion of those below 18 years of age used monthly disposable CLs (43.8%) compared with
205 other age groups (43.8% versus maximum of 29.5% among those aged more than 40 years,
206 respectively, $P < 0.001$). Compared with other age groups, teenagers were less likely to use daily
207 disposable CLs, which was rather more commonly used by females than males (66.7% versus
208 49.4%). By contrast, males were more likely to use extended wear CLs (yearly disposables, 21.8%
209 versus 10.9%, $P = 0.040$) than females.

210 ***Association between demographic variables and the modality of wear***

211 The modality of wear (full time or part time wear) was not dependent on the age group
212 ($P=0.068$) and gender ($P=0.718$). However, in those older than 18 years, there was a tendency for
213 more wearers to use their lenses for eight or more hours each day (46.2% in the <18 years age
214 group compared with 55.4%, 75% and 70.6% in the 18-30, 31-40, >40 years age groups,
215 respectively). Majority of those who were employed wore their lenses for about eight or more daily
216 hours compared with those who were unemployed at the time of this study (68.0% versus 52.4%,
217 $P = 0.030$).

218 ***Association of lens care system and wearing modality***

219 Figure 4 shows the distribution of the CLs by wearing modality. Many (71.8%) silicone
220 hydrogel and 2.3% of hydrogel wearers used multipurpose solutions to care for their lenses while
221 94.4% of RGP CL wearers used the Boston solution. There was a significant association between

222 the lens care systems and the contact lens wear regimen/replacement schedules ($P<0.0005$). All
223 CL wearers who were prescribed weekly replacement lenses used multipurpose solution. However,
224 lens care system used by some monthly replacements (2.6%) and twice more of the yearly
225 replacement CL wearers (5.6%) were not recorded in their files at the time of the review.

226

227 **Discussion**

228 This retrospective study investigated the characteristics of CL wearers and their association
229 with lens characteristics in a clinic population in T&T over two years. The study found that CLs
230 wearers were mostly young, unemployed females who lived in the urban areas of T&T. Soft,
231 polymer-hydrogel and daily disposable CLs were the most frequently used CL types, materials
232 and wearing regimen, respectively among the respondents. Although most respondents were full
233 time lens wearers, fashion was cited as the main reason for lens wear.

234 The findings that most CL wearers were females and used them for fashion reasons are
235 consistent with previous studies and this can be attributed to the perception that CLs are used for
236 fashions [4, 6, 8]. The fact that daily disposable CLs were more common among females than
237 males suggests that females may be prioritizing their expenditure on facial fashions than males
238 since wear of daily disposable lenses is a more expensive option than extended wear lenses [12].
239 Similarly, cost of daily disposable lenses may explain the finding that daily disposable CLs was
240 not the lens of choice for teenagers.

241 The majority of older respondents (> 40 years) used CLs for refractive error correction,
242 which is consistent with trends observed in the USA where the use of CLs for presbyopia

243 correction is on the rise [11]. This may be due to the advancement of contact lens materials [4] and
244 better understanding of the relationship between the corneal surface and the prescribed CL
245 materials [3]. In contrast, younger patients showed a preference for fashion CLs use, however,
246 64.8% were unemployed compared with only 13.2% of those aged 31-40 years who also had more
247 people using. While the use of CLs for fashion purpose among young people in this review is high,
248 there is a tendency for increased ocular complications in this age group due to poor compliance
249 [9]. There is need for targeted contact lens education either in form of booklet or media campaign
250 to encourage proper lens hygiene and improve compliance [20].

251 Previous studies have shown that CL related complications including discomfort were
252 higher among presbyopes than non-presbyopes [13, 19] while young lens wearers showed poorer
253 care/compliance than their older counterparts [9]. In a study done by Young et al., they reported
254 that silicone-hydrogel CLs provided better comfort than the hydrogel CLs, especially in the
255 adverse environment [21]. These may explain the preference to fit most teenagers and presbyopes
256 with silicon-hydrogel CL material compared with most adults aged between 18 and 40 years, who
257 were fitted with hydrogel CLs material in this study.

258 **Limitations and strengths**

259 The following limitations should be considered in the interpretation of the study findings
260 and when comparing this study to previous or future studies. First, the CL wearers from a
261 University clinic in Trinidad and Tobago reported in this study do not represent all CL wearers in
262 Trinidad and Tobago since the data was collected from one clinic. Second, as with all
263 questionnaire-based studies, this study could not expand some questions which would have
264 provided a clearer understanding of the individual's CL wear and care habits. Third, without

265 directly observing the CL wearers, the researchers could not verify the participant responses. In
266 addition, incomplete documentation common in retrospective studies was another limitation. For
267 example, the type of lens care system used was not recorded for majority of the patients in this
268 study. Despite the limitations, our study provided baseline data on the demographical profile of
269 CL in T&T and could be used for comparison across the Caribbean in future studies. Although,
270 our study sample may be biased towards clinic population it reflected the small population of the
271 island (1.399 million) and greater than the sample size used in similar studies elsewhere including
272 Ghana [8], Australia [22], Malaysia [23], Maldives [24], Saudi Arabia [25], South Africa [26], and
273 Jordan [27]. Further studies on CL use in the Caribbean including the investigation of other factors
274 such as types of refractive error, knowledge and attitude of lens wearers and hygiene are warranted.

275

276 **Conclusions**

277 This study found that about one in every two respondents attending the optometry clinic in
278 T&T used CLs with young adults aged 18-30 years, and females more likely to use them for
279 fashion and older males for correction of refractive errors. Age, gender and employment status
280 were the main determinants of lens wear among respondents in this study.

281

282 **References**

- 283 1. Gammoh Y, Abdu M. Contact lens procurement and usage habits among adults in Sudan. PLoS
284 One. 2021;16(5):e0251987. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0251987

- 285 2. Dumbleton K, Caffery B, Dogru M, Hickson-Curran S, Kern J, Kojima T, et al. The TFOS International
286 Workshop on Contact Lens Discomfort: report of the subcommittee on epidemiology. *Invest ophthalmol*
287 *Vis Sci* 2013;54(11):TFOS20-TFOS36.
- 288 3. Stapleton F, Tan J. Impact of contact lens material, design, and fitting on discomfort. *Eye Contact*
289 *Lens*. 2017;43(1):32-39. doi: 10.1097/ICL.0000000000000318.
- 290 4. Musgrave CSA, Fang F. Contact lens materials: a materials science perspective. *Materials*
291 2019;12(2):261. doi: 10.3390/ma12020261
- 292 5. Corbin GS, Bennett L, Espejo L, Carducci S, Sacco A, Hannigan R, et al. A multicenter investigation
293 of OPTI-FREE® RepleniSH® multi-purpose disinfecting solution impact on soft contact lens patient comfort.
294 *Clin Ophthalmol*. 2010;4:47-57. doi: 10.2147/opth.s7498
- 295 6. Abahussin M, AlAnazi M, Ogbuehi KC, Osuagwu UL. Prevalence, use and sale of contact lenses in
296 Saudi Arabia: survey on university women and non-ophthalmic stores. *Cont Lens Anterior Eye*.
297 2014;37(3):185-90. doi: 10.1016/j.clae.2013.10.001.
- 298 7. Lee Y, Lim C-W, Saw S-M, Koh D. The prevalence and pattern of contact lens use in a Singapore
299 community. *CLAO*. 2000;26(1):21-5.
- 300 8. Ocansey S, Oveneri Ogbomo G, Abu EK, Morny EKA, Adjei-Boye O. Profile, knowledge, and
301 attitude of contact lens users regarding contact lens wear in Ghana. *Cont Lens Anterior Eye*
302 2019;42(2):170-7. doi: 10.1016/j.clae.2018.10.012.
- 303 9. Li W, Sun X, Wang Z, Zhang Y. A survey of contact lens-related complications in a tertiary hospital
304 in China. *Cont Anterior Eye* 2018;41(2):201-4. doi: 10.1016/j.clae.2017.10.007.
- 305 10. Morgan PB, Efron N, Helland M, et al. Global trends in prescribing contact lenses for extended
306 wear. *Cont Lens Anterior Eye* 2011;34(1):32-5. doi: 10.1016/j.clae.2010.06.007.
- 307 11. Efron N, Nichols JJ, Woods CA, Morgan PB. Trends in US contact lens prescribing 2002 to 2014.
308 *Optom Vis Sci* 2015;92(7):758-67. doi: 10.1097/OPX.0000000000000623.

- 309 12. Morgan PB, Efron N, Woods CA, Consortium ICLPS. Determinants of the frequency of contact lens
310 wear. *Eye contact lens* 2013;39(3):200-4. doi: 10.1097/ICL.0b013e31827a7ad3.
- 311 13. Chalmers RL, Hunt C, Hickson-Curran S, Young G. Struggle with hydrogel CL wear increases with
312 age in young adults. *Cont Lens Anterior Eye* 2009;32(3):113-9. doi: 10.1016/j.clae.2008.12.001.
- 313 14. Mahabir B. as the twin island republican state in the Caribbean, trinidad and tobago is noted for
314 its many attributes including carnival, calypso, its multi. *Indian Diaspora in the Caribbean: History, Culture,
315 and Identity* 2012:113.
- 316 15. Trinidad And Tobago Population 2021 (Live) United States2021 [Available from:
317 <https://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/trinidad-and-tobago-population>.
- 318 16. Wang-Harris S. Optometric Education in Trinidad and Tobago: Developing a New Program in the
319 West Indies. *Optom Edu.* 2013;39(1).
- 320 17. TTOA. Trinidad & Tobago Optometrists Association Tunapuna, Trinidad, West Indies 2017
321 [Available from: <https://www.ttoptom.com/about>.
- 322 18. Digital legislative library. In: Affairs MotAGaL, editor. Port of Spain Trinidad, West Indies:
323 Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago; 2021.
- 324 19. Lorente-Velázquez A, García-Montero M, Gómez-Sanz FJ, Del Viejo LR, Hernández-Verdejo JL,
325 Madrid-Costa D. Comparison of the impact of nesofilcon A hydrogel contact lens on the ocular surface
326 and the comfort of presbyopic and non-presbyopic wearers. *Int J Ophthalmol.* 2019;12(4):640-646. doi:
327 10.18240/ijo.2019.04.19
- 328 20. Falahati-Marvast F, Alipour F, Farokhzadian J, Ahmadian L. Determining the information needs of
329 contact lens wearers for better education and more support: a qualitative study. *BMC ophthalmol*
330 2021;21(1):1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12886-021-02085-0>
- 331 21. Young G. Exploring the relationship between materials and ocular comfort and health. *Contact
332 Lens Spectr* 2007:37-40.

333

334 22. Wu Y, Carnt N, Stapleton F. Contact lens user profile, attitudes and level of compliance to lens care.
335 Cont Lens Anterior Eye 2010; 33(4):183–188. doi: 10.1016/j.clae.2010.02.002.

336 23. Bhandari M, Hung PR. Habits of contact lens wearers toward lens care in Malaysia. Med J Malaysia
337 2012; 67(3):274-277.

338 24. Gyawali R, Nestha Mohamed F, Bist J, Kandel H, Marasini S, et al. Compliance and hygiene behaviour
339 among soft contact lens wearers in the Maldives. Clin Exp Optom. 2014; 97(1):43–47. doi:
340 10.1111/cxo.12069.

341 **25.** Boqursain SK, Al-Hussain AS, Mubarak AAA, Al-Bujays DS, Al-Mustahi M. The attitude and awareness
342 of contact lens use among medical students of King Faisal University, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia. J Family Med
343 Prim Care 2021; 10(10):3765–3771. doi: 10.4103/jfmpc.jfmpc_707_21.

344 26. Khoza N, Moodley T, Sokhulu S, Sotyana NO, Suliman A, Hansraj R, et al. Knowledge, attitudes and
345 practices of contact lens use in a South African adolescent population. Afr Health Sci. 2020 Jun;20(2):768–
346 774. doi: 10.4314/ahs.v20i2.29. PMID: 33163042; PMCID: PMC7609115.

347 27. Bakkar MM, Alzghoul EA. Assessment of compliance with contact lens wear and care among university-
348 based population in Jordan. Contact Lens and Anterior Eye 2020; 43(4):395–401. doi:
349 10.1016/j.clae.2020.02.020.

350

351

352

353

356 **Figure legends**

357 Figure 1: Distribution of purpose of contact lens wear by: (a) age group and (b), gender of wearers

358 Figure 2: Distribution of purpose of contact lens materials by: (a) age group and (b), gender of
359 wearers

360 Figure 3: Distribution of contact lens wear regimen/replacement schedule *by: (a) age group and*
361 *(b), gender of wearers*

362 Figure 4: Distribution of contact lens care systems by wear modality

363




Figure 1




Figure 2





Figure 3




Figure 4