Asian and Western refractive centile curves from meta-analysis of population refraction data





Centiles - a well established concept in paediatrics

- Gives immediate snapshot of where a child is in terms of growth and allows monitoring over time
- Great advantage is that most parents have been trained in the concept before you ever meet them



"Relatively" new in eye care

Originally introduced by Monroe J. Hirsch in 1952. Recently emerged as a clinical priority.



Why refraction centiles

- > Axial length centiles already available
- > Axial length is a key metric for myopia management

BUT...

- > Very few practitioners have access to biometry right now
- > Population-Based Refractive centiles:
 - Are a precise indicator of likely future progression
 - Allow clinicians to explain what a child's prescription means in terms of risk in a way that is intuitive to parents (more difficult with axial length)
 - Support evidence-based personalised clinical decision making





CENTILE METHODOLOGY

Data Sources – published epidemiological data from Asia, USA, Europe

>

- > 35,645 refraction measurements
- > 8 large population-based studies

WESTERN					
NHANES	USA	8,915 ^ª			
NICER	Northern Ireland	2,424 ^b			
IES	Republic of Ireland	1,626 ^b			

> 12,965 European/North American eyes

22,680 Asian eyes

ASIAN South Korea 11,569 ^a **KNHANES** China 1,563 ^b GTES China 3,940^b RESC 3,676^b China HSS China 1.932^a **JDES**

Table 1: Data summary of studies included in the meta-analysisAbbreviations: KNHANES, Korean National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey; GTES, GuangzhouTwin Eye Study; RESC, Refractive Error Study in Children; HSS, Haidian School Survey; JDES, JinenanDistrict Eye Study; NHANES, National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey; NICER, Northern IrelandChildhood Errors of Refraction study; IES, Ireland Eye Study; N, number^a Non-cycloplegic refraction^b Cycloplegic refraction



Centile Methodology

- Secondary data meta-analysis of refraction data
- > Multi-Gaussian
- > Better fit than Box Cox Power Exponential
 - Empirical quantiles were generated by age, group and gender
 - o Cumulative Distribution Function model created
 - Specific centile curves generated by weighted cubic spline interpolation according to the number of participants in each age group in each study

Refractive error data non-normal



Centile Charts: Regional Comparison - Girls





Centile Charts: Regional Comparison - Boys





Centile Charts: Gender Comparison

ASIA

Median refraction (age 6) +0.25D Boys +0.24D Girls

Median refraction myopic by age 10 (boys), 9.5(girls)

Gender differences minimal until age 11, increased with age and were greatest in myopes





Centile Charts: Gender Comparison

WEST

Median refraction (age 6) **+1.33D Boys +1.34D Girls** Median refraction did not reach myopia by age 18 Gender differences most marked in hyperopes





Some Practical Applications

ADULT EQUIVALENT REFRACTION

ASIA

For incipient myopia (-0.5D) at different ages

GENDER	AGE	CENTILE	AT 16 YRS
male	6	centile = 85.53%	-9
	7	centile = 76.91%	-7.38
	8	centile = 66.63%	-6.3
	9	centile = 55.62%	-5.42
	10	centile = 46.64%	-4.88
female	6	centile = 85.7%	-9.97
	7	centile = 78.3%	-7.73
	8	centile = 67.36%	-6.29
	9	centile = 55.34%	-5.56
	10	centile = 44.88%	-5.06

WEST

For incipient myopia (-0.5D) at different ages

GENDER	AGE	CENTILE	AT 16 YRS
male	6	centile = 99.37%	-7
	7	centile = 96.63%	-4.9
	8	centile = 91.93%	-3.36
	9	centile = 85.71%	-2.11
	10	centile = 80.87%	-1.55
female	6	centile = 99.56%	-6.82
	7	centile = 96.26%	-4.44
	8	centile = 90.83%	-3.11
	9	centile = 85.47%	-2.28
	10	centile = 80.62%	-1.66







Which equates to a lower ADULT EQUIVALENT REFRACTION



Some Practical Applications

ANNUAL PROGRESSION

Evaluation of centile predicted progression

10,774 myopes < 20 years with longitudinal EHR data (at least three visits)

Correlation between centile predicted progression and measured progression

Using SER centile position: Using Progression centiles: $R^2 = 0.93$. MAE: 0.24D $R^2 = 0.85$. MAE: 0.32D

Using Enhanced Machine Learning Model: $R^2 = 0.95$. MAE: 0.21D



Clinical Value

> Centile charts utilised by agencies such as the CDC & WHO as clinically important means of monitoring child growth

For Refractive Error

Risk Profiling

- > Identification of Pre-myopes
- > Adult predictions of future refraction and axial length
- > Ocular disease and vision impairment risk estimation

Myopia control treatment monitoring

- Treatment efficacy analysis
- Personalised clinical decision making

Centiles provide a more complete clinical picture for every patient

Enhance Treatment Uptake

Enhance Treatment Retention

Better Health Outcomes

Clinical Trial Value

- > Ethical Concerns
- > Recruitment & Retention Concerns

Applications

- Patient selection trial participants often not representative of clinical populations
- > Evaluating trial representativeness
- Trial risk management safety, efficacy and protection against dropout

Virtual Control Group

- > Avoid the need for placebo control group and/or safety net against preferential dropout of fast progressing controls
- Individual patient-level efficacy analytics how each participants progression compares to real world expected progression





Conclusion

Refraction centile charts

- > Support evidence based clinical decision making
- > Are more relevant to clinicians than axial centiles right now
- > Can promote better uptake and retention for myopia control treatments
- > Bring added value in the clinical trial space



Thanks to my co-authors and wider team at CERI



Prof. Kathryn J. Saunders



Dr. Siofra Harrington



Prof. Daniel I. Flitcroft



Thank you

