



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1038/eye.2017.163](https://doi.org/10.1038/eye.2017.163)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Adams, G. G. W., Williams, C., Modi, N., Xing, W., Bunce, C., Dahlmann-Noor, A., & UK Retinopathy of Prematurity Special Interest Group (2017). Can we reduce the burden of the current UK guidelines for retinopathy of prematurity screening? *Eye (London, England)*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/eye.2017.163>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 **Can we reduce the burden of the current UK guidelines for Retinopathy of Prematurity (ROP)**
2 **screening?**

3

4 Authors

5 Gillian Adams¹ MD FRCS

6 Cathy Williams²

7 Neena Modi³

8 Wen Xing⁴

9 Catey Bunce⁵ DSc

10 UK Retinopathy of Prematurity Special Interest Group⁶

11 Annegret Dahlmann-Noor^{1,4} MD PhD

12

13 Authors' addresses:

14 1. Paediatric and Strabismus Service, Moorfields Eye Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, 162 City Road,
15 London EC1V 2PD, United Kingdom

16 2. School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol, Office Room BG2, Oakfield
17 House, Oakfield Grove, Clifton BS8 2BN, cathy.williams@bristol.ac.uk

18 3. Section of Neonatal Medicine, Department of Medicine, Imperial College London, London SW10
19 9NH, United Kingdom n.modi@imperial.ac.uk

20 4. National Institute of Health Research Biomedical Research Centre for Ophthalmology, University
21 College London Institute of Ophthalmology and Moorfields Eye Hospital, 162 City Road, London
22 EC1V 2PD, United Kingdom

23 5. Department of Primary Care & Public Health Sciences, King's College London, 4th Floor, Addison
24 House, Guy's Campus, London, SE1 1UL, catey.bunce@kcl.ac.uk

25 6. Members of the UK Retinopathy of Prematurity Special Interest Group are listed before the
26 references

27

28 Corresponding author:

29 Annegret Dahlmann-Noor

30 NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at Moorfields Eye Hospital and UCL Institute of Ophthalmology

31 162 City Road, London EC1V 2PD, UK

32 annegret.dahlmann-noor@moorfields.nhs.uk

33

34 Conflict of interest: No conflicting relationship exists for any author.

35 Financial support for this work: Supported in part by the National Institute for Health Research Biomedical
36 Research Centre at Moorfields Eye Hospital NHS Foundation Trust and UCL Institute of Ophthalmology.

37

38 Keywords: Child, Infant, Congenital, Hereditary and Neonatal Diseases and Abnormalities, Retinopathy,
39 Prematurity, Screening

40

41 **Word count:** 928

42

43 Infants born more than 8-10 weeks preterm are at risk of developing sight-threatening retinopathy
44 of prematurity (ROP). In the UK and other countries, paediatric ophthalmologists systematically
45 screen infants at risk, with the aim of identifying ROP requiring treatment to prevent adverse
46 structural outcomes such as retinal detachment and macular dragging, and poor functional
47 outcomes such as sight impairment.

48 ROP screening involves instillation of mydriatics, application of a lid speculum, and fundoscopy via
49 indirect ophthalmoscopy or digital imaging, and is distressing for infants. Changes in blood pressure,
50 respiratory rate, oxygen saturation and pulse rate and facial changes indicative of pain are common.

51 ^{1 2 3} Repeated screening is required at weekly or two-weekly intervals either until ROP has
52 spontaneously regressed, or a need for treatment has been established.

53

54 ROP screening requires a skilled workforce available 52 weeks a year. Failure to identify infants
55 requiring treatment at the appropriate time, as well as resulting in blindness for the premature
56 infant, can have significant adverse medicolegal considerations. ⁴ Over recent years, the increasing
57 number of infants surviving preterm birth has resulted in an increased need for trained paediatric
58 ophthalmologists.

59

60 There is no universal consensus on the cut-off for gestational age (GA) that should determine the
61 need for screening, and as ROP is a developmental disorder it is illogical for birth weight (BW) to be
62 included in the selection algorithm. The inclusion of BW likely arose before universal assignment of
63 GA through early ultrasound assessment, and remains a historical anachronism. In the US, screening
64 is recommended for GA of 30 weeks or less and BW of 1,500g or less (plus selected infants with a
65 higher GA and BW and an unstable clinical course). ⁵ In Canada, infants are screened if GA is 30+6/7
66 or less, regardless of BW, or if BW is 1,250g or less. ⁶ In Sweden, screening is undertaken for GA of 31
67 weeks or less, with no consideration of BW. ⁷

68 The current UK guidelines (2008) recommend screening for infants with a GA of less than 32 weeks
69 or BW less than 1,501 g.⁸ We recently reported that of 8,112 infants with BW less than 1,500g born
70 over a one-year period in the UK and Northern Ireland, 327 (4%) required ROP treatment.⁹ A
71 revision of the UK ROP screening guidelines is now under consideration.

72 Is it possible to reduce the UK screening burden?

73 In our recent national study, the median GA of infants requiring ROP treatment was 25 weeks and
74 the median BW 706 g.⁹ No baby was over 32 weeks GA and all were 31 weeks GA or less; only one
75 baby had a BW over 1,500 g (BW 2,080g, GA 30+1 weeks, diabetic mother).

76

77 Tightening the UK screening criteria to reduce the number of infants screened unnecessarily should
78 ensure that no cases of ROP requiring treatment are missed. Possible scenarios are to 1) keep the
79 current GA indication of 31+6 weeks whilst lowering the BW cutoff to less than 1,251g, 2) lower the
80 GA cutoff to 30+6 weeks whilst keeping a BW of less than 1,501g, or 3) lower both GA and BW cutoff
81 (GA of 30+6 and birth weight of less than 1,251g), 4) use GA only of 31+6 or less, 5) use GA only of
82 30+6 or less.

83 With information provided by the Neonatal Data Analysis Unit (NDAU) from the National Neonatal
84 Research Database we examined the effect any changes in screening criteria would have on the
85 number of babies undergoing screening. The data covers the same time period as the national
86 treatment study.

87 The first option would reduce the number of infants screened by 1,071 babies or 11.1%, the second
88 by 12.6% (1,210 babies), the third by 28.9% (2,790 babies), the fourth by 14.7% (1,414 babies), and
89 the fifth by 35.5% (3,421 babies) (Table 1). Options 1, 2 and 4 would have included all infants
90 requiring treatment in the national treatment study cohort. Option 3 would have missed one infant

91 who required treatment (GA 31+0 weeks, BW 1,400g) and narrowly included another (GA 30+6
92 weeks, BW 1,480g), and option 5 would have missed the baby of 31+0 weeks GA.

93 A previous report from the NDAU has cautioned that reducing the screening criteria to <31 weeks
94 GA or BW<1251g (scenario 3) would over a three-year period from 2009 to 2011 have missed 8
95 babies requiring treatment.¹⁰

96 Based on these figures, it appears safe to tighten the UK ROP screening guidelines to include infants
97 with a GA of 31+6 weeks or less or BW less than 1,251g (scenario 1), or those with GA of 30+6 weeks
98 or BW less than 1,501g (scenario 2). It would not be safe to lower both GA and BW cutoffs (scenario
99 3). Alternatively, an age only inclusion criteria could be used which, based on our data, would need
100 to be 31+6 or less (scenario 4). The risk of only using GA as an inclusion criteria is that occasionally
101 infants born at over 32 weeks GA may have a very low BW due to growth restriction. However the
102 effect of growth restriction as an independent risk factor for ROP is unknown. Although uncertain
103 GA was an important consideration in an earlier age, in well-developed healthcare systems with
104 good obstetric care and ultrasound dating, this is now an unusual event.

105 Tightening the guidelines would spare 11 to 14.7% of infants the distress of repeated screening
106 assessments, and reduce the economic burden of screening to the NHS.

107 We suggest that further prospective research analysing screening and treatment data from both
108 ophthalmology and neonatal sources might allow further refinement in guidelines.

109

110

111 **Acknowledgements**

112 We thank Daniel Gray and Eugene Statnikov from the Neonatal Data Analysis Unit for supplying data from
113 the National Neonatal Research Database. We thank the Moorfields Special Trustees (grant ST 14 01 D) and
114 the Birmingham Eye Foundation for their generous funding for the British Ophthalmic Surveillance Unit
115 study of retinopathy of prematurity requiring treatment, which has informed this work. The research was
116 supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centre based at
117 Moorfields Eye Hospital NHS Foundation Trust and UCL Institute of Ophthalmology. The views expressed are
118 those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health.

119

120 **Members of the UK ROP Special Interest Group:**

121 Abbott, Joseph; Aclimandos, Wagih; Adams, Gill; Al-Khaier, Ayman; Allen, Louise; Arashvan, Kayvan;
122 Ashworth, Jane; Barampouti, Faye; Barnes, Jonathan; Barrett, Victoria; Barry, John Sebastian; Bates, Adam;
123 Berk, Tulin; Biswas, Susmito; Blaikie, Andrew; Brennan, Rosie; Bunting, Howard; Butcher, Jeremy; Butler,
124 Lucilla; Chan-Ling, Tailoi; Chan, Jonathan; Child, Christopher; Choi, Jessy; Clark, David; Clifford, Luke;
125 Dabbagh, Ahmad; Dahlmann-Noor, Annegret; Dawidek, Gervase; Dhir, Luna; Drake, Karen; Edwards, Richard;
126 Esakowitz, Leonard; Escardo-Paton, Julia; Evans, Anthony; Fleck, Brian; Geh, Vernon; George, Nick;
127 Gnanaray, Lawrence; Goyal, Raina; Haigh, Paul; Hancox, Joanne; Haynes, Richard; Heath, Dominic;
128 Henderson, Robert; Hillier, Roxane; Hingorani, Melanie; Jain, Saurabh; Jain, Sunila; Jones, David; Kafil-
129 Hussain, Namir; Kelly, Simon; Kenawy, Nihal; Kipioti, Tina; Kulkarni, Archana; Lavy, Tim; Laws, David; Lawson,
130 Joanna; Leitch, Jane; Ling, Roland; Long, Vernon; Macrae, Mary; Mahmood, Usman; Markham, Richard;
131 Marr, Jane; May, Kristina; McLoone, Eibhlin; Moosa, Murad; Morton, Claire; Mount, Ali; Muen, Wisam;
132 Mulvihill, Alan; Munshi, Vineeta; Muqit, Mahi; Murray, Robert; Nair, Ranjit; Newman, William; O'Colmain,
133 Una; Patel, Chetan; Patel, Himanshu; Pedraza, Luis Amaya; Pilling, Rachel; Puvanachandra, Narman; Quinn,
134 Anthony; Rathod, Dinesh; Reddy, Aravind; Reddy, Ashwin; Rowlands, Alison; Scotcher, Stephen; Scott,
135 Christopher; Sekhri, Rajnish; Shafiq, Ayad; Sleep, Tamsin; Tambe, Katya; Tandon, Anamika; Tappin, Alison;
136 Taylor, Robert; Theodoro, Maria; Thomas, Shery; Thompson, Graham; Tiffin, Peter; Ullah, Muhammed

137 Aman; Watts, Patrick; West, Stephanie; Whyte, Iain; Wickham, Louisa; Williams, Cathy; Wong, Chien; Wren,
138 Siobhan; Zakir, Rahila

139

140 **References**

141

142 1. Laws DE, Morton C, Weindling M, Clark D. Systemic effects of screening for retinopathy of
143 prematurity. *The British journal of ophthalmology* 1996; **80**(5): 425-428.

144

145 2. Mukherjee AN, Watts P, Al-Madfai H, Manoj B, Roberts D. Impact of retinopathy of
146 prematurity screening examination on cardiorespiratory indices: a comparison of indirect
147 ophthalmoscopy and retcam imaging. *Ophthalmology* 2006; **113**(9): 1547-1552.

148

149 3. Mehta M, Adams G, Bunce C, Xing W, Hill M. Pilot study of the systemic effects of three
150 different screening methods used for retinopathy of prematurity. *Early human development*
151 2005; **81**(4): 355-360.

152

153 4. Wiggins RE, Jr., Gold RS, Menke AM. Twenty-five years of professional liability in pediatric
154 ophthalmology and strabismus: the OMIC experience. *Journal of AAPOS : the official*
155 *publication of the American Association for Pediatric Ophthalmology and Strabismus /*
156 *American Association for Pediatric Ophthalmology and Strabismus* 2015; **19**(6): 535-540.

157

158 5. Fierson WM, American Academy of Pediatrics Section on O, American Academy of O,
159 American Association for Pediatric O, Strabismus, American Association of Certified O.

160 Screening examination of premature infants for retinopathy of prematurity. *Pediatrics* 2013;
161 **131**(1): 189-195.

162

163 6. Jefferies AL, Canadian Paediatric Society F, Newborn C. Retinopathy of prematurity: An
164 update on screening and management. *Paediatr Child Health* 2016; **21**(2): 101-108.

165

166 7. Holmstrom G, Hellstrom A, Jakobsson P, Lundgren P, Tornqvist K, Wallin A. Evaluation of
167 new guidelines for ROP screening in Sweden using SWEDROP - a national quality register.
168 *Acta ophthalmologica* 2015; **93**(3): 265-268.

169

170 8. Wilkinson AR, Haines L, Head K, Fielder AR. UK retinopathy of prematurity guideline. *Early*
171 *human development* 2008; **84**(2): 71-74.

172

173 9. Adams GG, Bunce C, Xing W, Butler L, Long V, Reddy A *et al.* Treatment trends for
174 retinopathy of prematurity in the UK: active surveillance study of infants at risk. *BMJ Open*
175 2017; **7**(3): e013366.

176

177 10. Wong HS, Santhakumaran S, Statnikov Y, Gray D, Watkinson M, Modi N *et al.* Retinopathy of
178 prematurity in English neonatal units: a national population-based analysis using NHS
179 operational data. *Archives of disease in childhood Fetal and neonatal edition* 2014; **99**(3):
180 F196-202.

181

182

	Potential reduction in infants screened (%)							
	England	Scotland	Wales	Total	England	Scotland	Wales	Total
Number of infants with BW fulfilling current UK screening guidelines								
GA 31+6 weeks or less OR								
BW less than 1,501g	8767	503	368	9638				
Number of infants to be screened if guidelines tightened								
GA 31+6 weeks or less OR								
BW less than 1,251g	7783	457	327	8567	11.2	9.1	11.1	11.1
GA 30+6 weeks or less OR								
BW less than 1,501g	7683	439	306	8428	12.4	12.7	16.8	12.6
GA 30+6 weeks or less OR								
BW less than 1,251g	6243	360	245	6848	28.8	28.4	33.4	28.9
GA 31+6	7474	439	311	8224	14.7	12.7	15.4	14.7
GA 30+6	5672	333	212	6217	35.3	33.8	42.4	35.5

Table 1. Data on infants recorded in the National Neonatal Research Database (birth dates 1 December 2013 – 30 November 2014) and potential reduction in infants screened for ROP if UK screening guidelines tightened.