

Abstract (#2)

Introduction (#3)

Methods (#4)


Results (#10)


Discussion (#15)

Acknowledgements (#16)

References (#19)

About the Author(s)

Ngozika E. Ezinne 
(mailto:ezinne.ngozi@gmail.com)
 (<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3138-0213>)
Discipline of Optometry,
University of KwaZulu-Natal,
South Africa

Khathutshelo P. Mashige 
(<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8199-0891>)
Discipline of Optometry,
University of KwaZulu-Natal,
South Africa

Citation

Ezinne NE, Mashige KP. Refractive error and visual impairment in primary school children in Onitsha, Anambra State, Nigeria. *Afr Vision Eye Health*. 2018;77(1), a455. <https://doi.org/10.4102/aveh.v77i1.455> (<https://doi.org/10.4102/aveh.v77i1.455>)

Original Research

Refractive error and visual impairment in primary school children in Onitsha, Anambra State, Nigeria

Ngozika E. Ezinne, Khathutshelo P. Mashige

Received: 20 Apr. 2018; **Accepted:** 12 July 2018; **Published:** 1 Aug. 2018

Copyright: © 2018. The Author(s). Licensee: AOSIS.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract

Background: Vision problems have been shown to adversely affect children's educational and social development.

Aim: To determine the prevalence of refractive error and visual impairment in primary school children in Onitsha, Anambra State, Nigeria.

Setting: The study was conducted in a primary school in Onitsha, Anambra State, Nigeria.

Methods: A stratified random cluster sampling method was used to select primary schools in Onitsha North and South. A total of 1020 children were included in the study. Visual acuity measurements, ocular motilities, retinoscopy and fundae were performed.

Results: The prevalence of uncorrected, presenting and best corrected visual acuity was 86.6%, 86.6% and 86.6% respectively. Refractive error accounted for 86.6% of all causes of visual impairment (astigmatism (36.1%) and hyperopia (17.5%). Refractive error and visual impairment were highest among children aged between 6 and 7 years.

Conclusion: The prevalence of refractive error and visual impairment in primary school children in Onitsha, Anambra State, Nigeria is high. There is a need for services and strategies to address these conditions in that area.

Introduction

Refractive error (RE) is an optical defect of the eye that prevents light from being focused correctly on the retina, causing visual impairment (VI) and blindness worldwide. ¹ (#CIT0001_455) In 2006, 153 million people had uncorrected refractive error (URE) or visual impairment (VI) worldwide. ² (#CIT0004_455) The resulting VI can lead to health, socio-economic and educational problems in developing countries such as Nigeria. ³ (#CIT0005_455) Refractive error can be corrected by refractive surgery, with spectacles being the most common and cost-effective method.

Studies on the prevalence of RE and VI have been conducted in various parts of the world. In South-Eastern Nigeria, ⁴ (#CIT0008_455) and South-South, ⁵ (#CIT0009_455) the prevalence and causes of VI, with most being conducted on older children and VI peculiar to children in each community, as this varies from

geographical and socio-economical differences, which may have a VI in Onitsha, Anambra State, Nigeria. Data on RE and VI will be used in this group. In addition, the information can be used as baseline

Methods

Onitsha is an urban area located on the eastern bank of the Niger children from all the private and public schools in Onitsha North are projected to be 15 324 by the year 2017.^{10 (#CIT0010_455)} A multi the baseline sample size was determined using the equation^{11 (#C}

$$N = (Z)^2 (1.0 - P) (P) / ([B][P])^2$$

where P is the anticipated prevalence of RE, B is the desired error previous studies conducted in Nigeria ranged between 7.3% and 2 estimates from previous studies, was used. The minimum sample adjust for anticipated absenteeism and non-participation rate, which

Children aged between 5 and 15 years whose parents or legal guardians were children who gave verbal assent and/or signed assent, children younger than 5 years and older than 15 years, those who provide informed consent were excluded from the study. Ethical approval was given by the Biomedical Research and Ethics Committee (BE620/16) and Onitsha Declaration of Helsinki for research involving human subjects. The children in their schools. Each school provided a room in which the children would be called out of class to have their eyes tested

Clinical examination

Clinical examinations were conducted by five optometrists in the 1 Anambra State, Nigeria. Examination procedures followed the original distance visual acuity (VA) was measured with a retro-illuminated Ocular deviations were evaluated with a cover test at both distance degree of tropia measured using corneal light reflex and neutralising

Examination of the anterior segment was performed with a penlight used: two drops of 1% cyclopentolate eye drops administered 15 minutes administered. The light reflex and pupil dilation were checked after or greater and a light reflex was absent. Cycloplegic refraction was in a semi-dark room at a distance of 67 cm and a +1.50 D lens in the according to the manufacturer's instructions. The auto-refractor wave rankings were obtained for each eye. Using the objective refraction refractive error was determined using the trial frame. Refractive error was refractive correction with or without pinhole.

Examination of the crystalline lens, vitreous and fundus was performed who had an unaided VA of 20/40 or worse in either eye to ascertain

Pilot study

Prior to the main study, a pilot study was conducted among 50 primary procedures, methods and logistics. All queries that arose from the main study were performed.

Definition of terms

Uncorrected VA of 20/40 or less was regarded as mainly because of 20/40 or less, less than 20/63 and 20/200 or less were used in defining or more and astigmatism as -0.50 D or more using subjective refraction

Data management and analysis

Class enumeration and clinical examination data forms were reviewed. Assistance of a statistician was sought for the data analysis, which

Of the 97 children who had RE, 45 (46.4%) had myopia, 35 (36.1 two (43.3%) children who had RE were males, while RE was higher aged between 14 and 15 years (**Figure 3 (#F0003_455)**). Refractive error (0.00) and gender (Pearson's $\chi^2 = 4.17, p = 0.04$). Myopia was significantly associated with age and gender ($p < 0.05$). Hyperopia were not significantly associated with age and gender ($p > 0.05$).



FIGURE 3: Distribution of refractive error by age group.

The prevalence of 9.7% for URE is higher than the 2.2% reported Nigeria, specifically the 7.3% and 8.7% in Lagos,^{28 (#CIT0028_455}; However, the prevalence is lower than 22.5% and 58.0% reported prevalence recorded in Bavelsa study could be because of the fact

and normal VA could have been missed. In addition, the current study was conducted among 4- to 15-year-olds, which could have accounted for this difference in rates of conditions than in the general population.^{9 (#CIT0009_455)} for the differences between them. For example, the current study of RE, while a sample size of 4225 and VA of 20/32 or worse were

Comparison of the current study with studies in Africa shows that ^{5 (#T0005_455)}). The differences observed in the prevalence of RE among authors and differences in demographic variables. Moreover, lifestyle variations in the prevalence of RE.^{31 (#CIT0031_455)} Recently, increased near work and indoor activities common among urban dwellers, have been suggested to be factors influencing the prevalence of RE.^{32 (#CIT0032_455)} However, other studies have shown the prevalence of RE in developed areas.^{33 (#CIT0033_455)} Although racial and ethnic differences have also shown that genetically determined factors (such as eye color and light exposure) to impact RE development in black people.^{2 (#CIT0002_455)}

Various studies have shown that gender differences at the age of 10 years, with parameters of males and females being reported, which suggests a higher prevalence found to be significantly higher in females (56.7%) than males (41.7%).^{9 (#CIT0006_455)} South-South Nigeria,^{9 (#CIT0009_455)} Kebbi State N

Studies have shown that the human eye grows by 5 mm from birth to 12 years of age.^{7 (#CIT0006_455)} The prevalence of RE has been reported to increase with age in the population,^{7 (#CIT0007_455)} indicating the possibility of a relationship between RE and age. The highest (48.9%) among children 11 to 13 years old. Similar findings were reported in ^{9 (#CIT0009_455)} in South-South Nigeria. However, a study in Enugu State found no significant difference between RE and age. The large age range of 12–21 years used in

Myopia was the most prevalent (46.4%) URE found in this study. In an urban environment, children engage more in indoor and near work activities.^{32 (#CIT0032_455)} Studies in Abia State^{8 (#CIT0008_455)} and Bayelsa State^{32 (#CIT0032_455)} condition among primary school children aged between 7 and 17 years. In these environments, variations in the prevalence rates could be attributed to the current study used a sample size of 998 and an age range of 7–17 years. In addition, the present study used a sample size of 4225 and an age range of 7–17 years. In addition, the present study

Studies in Tanzania and South Africa by Wedner et al.^{14 (#CIT0014_455)} found myopia to be the most prevalent refractive condition among children aged between 5 and 17 years. In China,^{36 (#CIT0036_455)} Vietnam,^{37 (#CIT0037_455)} Egypt^{38 (#CIT0038_455)} studies was attributed to the high prevalence of myopia in Asians. Early detection and management being highly indicated for educational purposes.

In this study, myopia was found to increase with age, starting from grade 6 which is the grade for preparing and writing entrance examinations. The onset of myopia. A possible reason could be the onset of juvenile myopia because of axial elongation that is usually caused by intensive near work. The progression starting from 12 to 17 years in Abia State, Nigeria, with ^{15 (#CIT0039_455)} and South Africa,^{15 (#CIT0015_455)} with the upward trend in the prevalence of myopia.

Myopia was found to be significantly associated with males ($p = 0.001$) and with near work activities, such as computer video games, chatting on phones, reading, and doing chores. Msiska et al.^{17 (#CIT0017_455)} also found myopia to be significantly associated with near work. Mayeku^{18 (#CIT0018_455)} reported contrary results in Tanzanian and Nigerian studies. ^{18 (#CIT0020_455)} did not find any significant association between gender and myopia. One of the reasons for the differences observed in the prevalence of myopia could be among the reasons for the differences observed in the prevalence of astigmatism are important, as most asthenopic symptoms that could be attributed to astigmatism of -0.50 D or worse found in this study was high.

with increased near work. The prevalence is lower than 38.8% reported in South-East Nigeria, which is comparable to 6.1% and 7.8% recorded in South-South Nigeria and South-West Nigeria, respectively. The discrepancies could be the inclusion of diverse age and ethnic groups in the study.

With-the-rule astigmatism was the most common type found in the study. Similar findings were reported by Atif et al. ¹⁶ (#CIT0016_455) and Naidoo et al. ¹⁵ (#CIT0015_455) found astigmatism to increase with age, the study did not find astigmatism to increase with age, the variability in gender difference in the prevalence of astigmatism in this study, the

The prevalence of hyperopia was low (**Table 5 (#T0005_455)**), which involved in near work and less outdoor activities, thus reducing the prevalence of hyperopia. The prevalence of hyperopia in this study is higher than those reported in other Nigerian studies but lower than those reported in other African studies (**#T0005_455**). This wide variation could in part be because of the differences in the various studies. For example, Ahuama and Atowa (**#CIT0008_455**) reported a prevalence of hyperopia of 10.5% and higher (**Table 5 (#T0005_455)**). The study by Ahuama and Atowa (**#CIT0008_455**) could have increased the prevalence of hyperopia, as it is well represented in the literature (**#CIT0017_455**, **#CIT0019_455**). Hyperopia was found to decrease with age because of the fact that this younger age group is prone to be more involved in near work compared with the older age groups. Similar findings were reported in Nigeria (**#CIT0008_455**) as well as in China, **36 (#CIT0036_455)** Chile **39 (#CIT0039_455)** and in the present study, a result similar to that reported by Opubiri et al. (**#CIT0040_455**) but contrary to findings obtained by Kawuma and Mayeku (**#CIT0041_455**). The refractive error in some of these studies could also have influenced the prevalence of hyperopia.

The prevalence of VI was 1.3%, indicating that VI is relatively uncommon that reported in other Nigerian studies by Megbeleyin and Asana² (**Table 5 (#T0005_455)**). It is, however, not possible to make genetic backgrounds and methodologies used. Most (84%) uncorrected VI in other studies, ^{9 (#CIT0009_455)}, ^{15 (#CIT0015_455)}, ^{19 (#CIT0019_455)} (^{#CIT0043_455}), ^{44 (#CIT0044_455)}, ^{45 (#CIT0045_455)}, ^{46 (#CIT0046_455)} amblyopia, retinal disorders, corneal opacity and albinism, which is reported in Ghana by Kumah et al. ^{20 (#CIT0020_455)} This study also recorded 1.3% of VI.

Several limitations of our study must be acknowledged. First, some 5- and 6-year-olds was difficult because of poor attention span, lack of other population-based RESC surveys and the fact that the sample was from one state or country. Future studies should include all children in Onits

In conclusion, this is the first RESC study undertaken in Onitsha, and primary school children were 9.7% and 1.3%, respectively. These need to conduct local studies to establish regional baseline data to screening for teachers and school healthcare may ensure early de

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Onitsha North and South Education Secretaries

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no financial or personal relation

Authors' contributions

N.E.E. and K.P.M. made equal contributions to the writing of this a

References

1. Dandona L, Dandona R, Srinivas M, et al. Blindness in the Indian
2. Holden BA, Sulaiman S, Knox K. The challenge of providing spect
3. Dandona R, Dandona L, Srinivas M, et al. Refractive error in child

4. Adeoti CO. Beliefs and attitude towards spectacles. *Nig J Clin Pra*
5. Ayanniyi A, Mahmoud AO, Olatunji FO. Causes and prevalence of 2010;13:248–253.
6. Faderin MA, Ajaiyeoba AI. Refractive errors in primary school chil <https://doi.org/10.4314/njo.v9i1.11913> (<https://doi.org/1>
7. Balarabe AH, Adamu I, Abubakar A. Vision screening to detect re *Med J*. 2015;18:61–65. <https://doi.org/10.4103/1118-8561>
8. Ahuama OC, Atowa UC. Distribution of refractive errors among s
9. Opubiri I, Adedayo A, Megbalayin E. Refractive error pattern of c
10. Mitchell ML, Jolley JM. Research design explained. 7th ed. Belmo
11. UN Habitat. Structure plan for Onitsha and Satellite Towns. 2009
12. Ibenimo O, Egbe CP. Screening for refractive error among primar <https://doi.org/10.11604/pamj.2013.14.74.1345> (<https://doi.org/10.11604/pamj.2013.14.74.1345>)
13. Assefa WY, Wasie TB, Shiferaw D, Tsegaw A, Eshete Z. Prevalenc 2012;194:372–376.
14. Wedner SH, Ross DA, Balira R, Kaji L, Foster A. Prevalence of eye 2000;84:1291–1297. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjo.84.11.12>
15. Naidoo KS, Raghunandan A, Mashige KP, et al. Refractive error a 2003;44:3764–3770. <https://doi.org/10.1167/iov.03-028>
16. Atif AB, Talha AK, Elmadina AM. Refractive errors status among c <https://doi.org/10.4103/1858-540X.184236> (<https://doi.org/10.4103/1858-540X.184236>)
17. Msiska V, Njuguna M, Kariuki M. Magnitude and pattern of signific *Ophthalmol*. 2009;15:18–20.
18. Kawuma M, Mayeku R. A survey of the prevalence of refractive e
19. Muma M, Kariuki MM, Kimani K. Prevalence of significant refracti 2007;13:48–51.
20. Kumah BD, Ebri A, Abdul-Kabir M, et al. Vision in private school c <https://doi.org/10.1097/OPX.0000000000000099> (<https://doi.org/10.1097/OPX.0000000000000099>)
21. Megbelayin OE, Asana EU. Visual impairment among school child 20.
22. Mohammed AG, Wasfi EI, Abdel Khalek EM. Refractive error amo
23. Nebiyat K, Alemayehu W, Tigist SW. Refractive errors among sch
24. Jafer K, Abomesh, G. Prevalence of refractive error and visual im *Health Sci*. 2014;24:353–358. <https://doi.org/10.4314/ejhs>
25. Ovenseri-Ogbomo GO, Assien R. Refractive error in school childre <https://doi.org/10.4102/aveh.v69i2.129> (<https://doi.org/10.4102/aveh.v69i2.129>)
26. Ovenseri-Ogbomo GO, Omuemu VO. Prevalence of refractive err <https://doi.org/10.2147/OPX.S10583> (<https://doi.org/10.2147/OPX.S10583>)
27. Semanyenzi SE, Karimurio J, Nzayirambaho M. Prevalence and p 83.
28. Balogun M. Refractive errors in primary school children in Lagos medical college in *Ophthalmology*, Nigeria. 1999; p. 39–42.
29. Nkanga DG, Dolin P. School vision screening program in Enugu, N
30. Yoloye MO. Patterns of visual defects and eye diseases among pr the National Post Graduate Medical College in *Ophthalmology*. 19
31. Wen G, Tarczy-Hornoch K, McKean-Cowdin R, et al. Prevalence of Paediatric Eye Disease Study. *Ophthalmology*. 2013;120:2109–2 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ophtha.2013.06.039>)
32. Hashemi H, Abbastabar H, Yekta A, Heydarian S, Khabazkhoob M 2017;29:1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joco.2017.02.007>
33. Resnikoff S, Pascolini D, Mariotti SP. Global magnitude of visual i 2008;86:63–70. <https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.07.041210> (<https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.07.041210>)
34. O'Donoghue L, McClelland JF, Logan NS, Rudnicka AR, Owen CG, *Ophthalmol*. 2010;94:1155–1159. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjophth.2010.191155>
35. Saw SM, Gazzard G, Au Eong KG, Tan TH. Myopia: Attempts to a <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjo.86.11.1306> (<https://doi.org/10.1136/bjo.86.11.1306>)
36. Zhao J, Pan X, Sui R, Munoz SR, Sperduto RD, Ellwein LB. Refrac 2000;129:427–435. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-9394\(00\)00454-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-9394(00)00454-7)
37. Paudel P, Ramson P, Naduvilath T, et al. Prevalence of vision imp *Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2004;45:793–799.
38. Gamal AN, Ahmed AT, Yehia Sala EM, Rania Ahmed Abdel AS, Asi *Ophthalmic Epidemiol* 2015;22(2):246–252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09286580.2015.1008658>
39. Maul E, Barroso S, Munoz SR, Sperduto RD, Ellwein LB. Refractiv [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-9394\(99\)00454-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-9394(99)00454-7) ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-9394\(99\)00454-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-9394(99)00454-7))
40. Mahjoob M, Heydarian S, Nejati J, Ansari-Moghaddam A, Ravand Eastern Iran. *Asian Pacific J Tropic Biomed*. 2016;6:181–184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apjtb.2015.10.008>
41. Ajaiyeoba AI, Isawumi MA, Adeoye AO, Oluleye TS. Prevalence a *Ann Afr Med J*. 2006;4:197–203.
42. Desalegn A, Tsegaw A, Shiferaw D, Woretaw H. Knowledge, attitu northwest Ethiopia. *BMC Ophthalmol*. 2016;16:184. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12918-016-0788-8>
43. World Health Organization. Cumulative official updates to ICD-10 <http://www.who.int/classifications/icd/OfficialWHOUpdates>

44. Chuka-Okosa CM. Refractive error among students of a post prim
<https://doi.org/10.4314/wajm.v24i1.28166> (<https://doi.org/10.4314/wajm.v24i1.28166>)
 45. Abebe B. Unilateral blindness and low vision due to strabismic an
 46. Yoseph W, Samson B. Screening for ocular abnormalities and sub
2002;16:1657-1661.
 47. Taha AO, Ibrahim SM. Prevalence of manifest horizontal strabism
57. <https://doi.org/10.4103/1858-540X.169437> (<https://doi.org/10.4103/1858-540X.169437>)
 48. Akpe BA, Abadom EG, Omoti EA. Prevalence of amblyopia in prin
<https://doi.org/10.4103/2384-5589.170174> (<https://doi.org/10.4103/2384-5589.170174>)
 49. Kassa T, Daegu GA. Prevalence of refractive errors in pre-school
2004;17:117-124.
-