

1 ORIGINAL PAPER

2

3 **Influence of Chinese eye exercises on myopia control in an East**
4 **Asian population: a meta-analysis**

5

6 Paradi Sangvatanakul, Jakkree Tangthianchaichana, Adis Tasanarong, Noel Pabalan*,
7 Phuntila Tharabenjasin

8

9

10 Chulabhorn International College of Medicine, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 * noelpabalan@mail.com

19 <http://www.cicm.tu.ac.th>

20

21

22 **Short title:** Chinese eye exercises myopia meta-analysis

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45 List of abbreviations

46	AM	analysis model
47	cc	case-control
48	CEE	Chinese eye exercises
49	CI	confidence interval
50	D	diopter
51	EH	eliminated heterogeneity
52	F	fixed-effects
53	GS	gained significance
54	GIV	generic inverse variance
55	I ²	measure of variability
56	IQR	interquartile range
57	Log	logarithm
58	LS	lost significance
59	maf	minor allele frequency
60	MC	myopia control
61	MQJ	methodological quality judgment
62	n	number of studies
63	NOS	Newcastle-Ottawa Scale
64	OR	odds ratio
65	P ^a	P-value for association
66	P ^b	P-value for heterogeneity
67	PRISMA	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
68	PRO	pre-outlier
69	PSO	post-outlier
70	R	random-effects
71	[R]	Reference
72	RCT	randomized control trial
73	RNS	retained non-significance
74	RH	reduced heterogeneity
75	SD	standard deviation
76	SE	standard error
77	SW	Shapiro-Wilk
78	xs	cross-section

79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96

97 Abstract

98

99 **Objective** The rates of myopia (-0.50 diopter), and high myopia (≥ -6.0 diopter) have been increasing in
100 East Asian populations; the reasons for which may include the combinations of genetic, environment and
101 behavioural factors. The most affected demography point to the young elite population of intellectuals
102 produced from universities. Of the several recommendations to address the myopia epidemic, the influence
103 of Chinese eye exercises (CEE) have been examined. However, reports have been inconsistent, prompting a
104 meta-analysis to obtain more precise estimates.

105 **Methods** Eight articles were included in the meta-analysis where we operated on the hypothesis that CEE
106 either increased or reduced myopia control. We compared the subjects that performed CEE against those that
107 did not. We used and estimated odds ratios [ORs] and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) using the generic
108 inverse variance method. Subgroup analysis involved quality (high/serious and low/non-serious) and
109 frequency (> 5 times/week) of performing CEE comprised. Heterogeneity was subjected to outlier treatment
110 which split the findings into pre- (PRO) and post- (PSO) outlier. The strength of evidence in our findings
111 were based on high significance ($P^a < 10^{-5}$), surviving the Bonferroni correction and homogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$).
112 Outcomes with these features comprised our core findings.

113 **Results** Our core findings were found in the PSO overall indicating elevated myopia control (OR 0.72, 95%
114 CI 0.61-0.86, $P^a = 0.0002$) and CEE subgroups (Serious: OR 0.75, 95% CI 0.68-0.84, $P^a < 10^{-5}$; Frequent:
115 OR 0.55, 95% CI 0.45-0.68, $P^a < 10^{-5}$). The low quality subgroup outcome was null in PRO (OR 0.97, 95%
116 CI 0.50-1.86, $P^a = 0.92$) but conveyed significantly less myopia control in PSO (OR 1.57, 95% CI 1.24-2.01,
117 $P^a = 0.0002$).

118 **Conclusions** This meta-analysis found that CEE afforded 28% greater control of myopia. Enabled by outlier
119 treatment, this finding was homogeneous and consistent. Subgroup effects elevated myopia control to 62%
120 when CEE was done up to 5 times a week. Improper CEE performance implied reduced myopia control of
121 up to 57%.

122 **Keywords:** Chinese eye exercises, myopia, meta-analysis

123

124

125

126

127 Introduction

128 Myopia is one of the most commonly occurring defects of the human eye refraction. Defined as \geq
129 -0.50 diopter (D), this ocular defect has three levels, low (≤ -3.0 D), medium (-3.0 D to -5.9 D)
130 and high (≥ -6.0 D). About one-fifth of the myopic global population can develop high myopia
131 (≥ -6.0 D) rendering this eye disorder a significant epidemiological concern [1,2]. This concern is
132 highlighted with a worldwide estimate of ~ 1.4 billion myopic individuals comprising $> 20\%$ of the
133 global population [3]. Moreover, this percentage is projected to increase to 50% (~ 4.7 billion) by
134 the year 2050 [3]. This increase in myopia prevalence will have substantial social, educational, and
135 economic consequences to modern society. While geographic distribution of myopia prevalence
136 varies between countries, this eye defect has become epidemic in East and Southeast Asia [3] with
137 the fastest growing tendency pointing to the countries of Singapore and China [4]. Demographic
138 comparisons among 12-year-olds show higher prevalence of myopia in Asians (Singapore: 62% ;
139 China: 49.7%) than Caucasians (USA: 20% ; Australia: 11.9%) [5,3]. In a study of Chinese
140 schoolchildren, myopia was reported to be present among 33.6% of first graders and 54% of
141 seventh graders [6]. Yet, these percentages pale when compared with older Chinese teenagers and
142 young adults where myopia is present in 90% of this demography [7]. Even more serious
143 prevalence data was shown by a Shanghai study where myopia was present among 94.9% of
144 undergraduate students and 96.9% of postgraduate students, and 19.5% of all myopic students had
145 high myopia [8]. Data from the Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China in 2017
146 show that there are about 27.5 million university or college students affected with myopia [9]. Age-
147 wise, myopia currently affects people from 10 to 39 years, but this demographic age range is
148 predicted to widen from 10 to 79 years by the year 2050 [3]. Etiology of myopia is complex with
149 genetic and environmental factors playing a role. Associations of genetic polymorphisms with
150 myopia have been investigated [10-12], so has the impact of family history on the incidence of
151 myopia among children [13,14]. Even high intelligence was shown to be associated with myopia

152 [15]. Consequently, populations with a higher level of education are reported to have higher
153 proportions of myopia [16]. Thus, we look at the intertwining of high educational attainment with
154 genetics as influencing myopia prevalence [17]. The complication of environmental factors
155 affecting myopia is that they are tied to human behavior, which in the modern context, is also
156 tethered to the influence of technology (smartphones and computers). Still, these behavioral factors
157 and technological influence afford greater human direct control compared to genetics in addressing
158 the myopia epidemic. A major contributory factor in the environmental context point to the
159 ubiquitous use of smartphones and computers [7], which dictates the behaviors of those at most risk
160 for myopia. Risk behaviors for myopia include the following: One, high educational pressure in
161 East and Southeast Asia does not permit children to spend extended time outdoors [18,19]. Thus,
162 less outdoor activities promotes sedentary behavior. Two, long hours of exposure to digital screens
163 [20]. Three, continuous reading without rests, has been shown to lead to myopia [21,22]. Myopia
164 not only impacts upon physical health, but also increases risk of eye complications, including
165 myopic retinopathy, myopic glaucoma, retinal detachments, and blindness [23-25]. High myopia (\geq
166 -6.0 D) can result in loss of vision due to retinal detachment, neovascularization, cataract,
167 glaucoma, or macular atrophy [1,26]. It can also cause impaired vision and blindness [27].
168 Interventions have been developed to prevent and control myopia [28]. Increased time for outdoor
169 activities could effectively prevent myopia [29-32]. In its presence, however, myopia progression is
170 hindered with low-dose atropine and orthokeratology [33,34]. Even then, these two therapeutic
171 approaches may only be used for myopic control, rather than prevention. Therefore, there is a need
172 to introduce a simple and easy-to-use intervention for myopia control. Chinese eye exercises (CEE),
173 an intervention for visual protection and myopia prevention and progression, originated from the
174 theories of Traditional Chinese Medicine [35]. Yet, reports of CEE effects in preventing myopia
175 have been inconsistent where studies have suggested reduced risk and others have shown risk

176 increases. This prompted a meta-analysis to obtain a more precise estimate of association. We
177 aim to foster better understanding of the role of CEE in myopia onset and progression.

178 **Materials and Methods**

179 **Selection of studies**

180 We searched MEDLINE using PubMed, Google Scholar and Science Direct for relevant
181 publications as of October 01, 2019. Terms used were “*Chinese eye exercises*”, and “*myopia*”, as
182 medical subject heading and text, unrestricted by language. References cited in the retrieved articles
183 were also screened manually to identify additional eligible studies. In cases of duplicate articles, we
184 selected the one with a later date of publication. Inclusion criteria were (1) case-control design
185 evaluating the association between CEE and myopia; (2) eye exercise in the presence and absence
186 of myopia and (3) presence of raw frequency data or presence of odds ratios (ORs) and 95%
187 confidence intervals (CIs). Exclusion criteria were (1) those not involving myopia and CEE; (2)
188 reviews; and (3) studies whose raw data were unusable/absent. Primary study authors were
189 contacted in order to obtain more information on incomplete data.

190 **Data extraction**

191 Two investigators (PS and NP) independently extracted data. Disagreements were adjudicated by a
192 third investigator (PT) until arrival at a consensus. The following information were obtained from
193 each publication: first author’s name, published year, country of origin, age of participants, details
194 of the myopia condition, and study design.

195 **Data distribution**

196 Data distribution was assessed with the Shapiro-Wilks (SW) test using SPSS 20.0 (IBM Corp.,
197 Armonk, NY, USA). Normal distribution ($P > 0.05$) warranted descriptive and inferential
198 expressions of mean \pm standard deviation (SD) and the parametric approach, respectively.
199 Otherwise, the median with interquartile range (IQR) and non-parametric tests were used,
200 respectively.

201 Methodological quality of the studies

202 We assessed the methodological quality of the included studies using two scales that were
203 appropriate to the study design. The Jadad scale [36], for randomized control trials (RCTs) has five
204 questions that examines randomization, double-blind and attrition. It provides a total score that
205 ranges from zero to five, where zero indicates low quality and five, high quality [36]. We used the
206 Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for cross-sectional (xs) and case-control (cc) studies [37]. The ★-
207 based NOS contains eight items with three dimensions (number of ★ in parentheses): selection (4),
208 comparability (1), and outcome (3). The NOS scores range from zero up to nine ★ for cc studies and
209 zero to 10 ★ for xs studies. Low, moderate and high have scores of < 4, 4-5 and ≥ 6-7, respectively.

210 Risk of bias

211 Risk of bias assessment followed the Cochrane handbook [38], which was applied to cc and RCT
212 study designs [39]. This method evaluates biases originating from sequence generation (selection
213 bias), allocation sequence concealment (selection bias), blinding of participants and personnel
214 (performance bias), blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias), incomplete outcome data
215 (attrition bias), and selective outcome reporting (reporting bias). Every item was judged as either
216 yes, no, or unclear. More items judged as “yes” indicated a low likelihood of bias. In contrast, high
217 likelihood of bias garnered more “no” judgements. Insufficient descriptions merited “unclear”
218 judgment. Judgments were assigned by two of the authors (NP and PT) working independently, and
219 discrepancies were remedied through discussions with a third investigator (PS) to obtain a
220 consensus.

221 Meta-analysis

222 Because we addressed the issues of myopia onset and progression, we hypothesized that performing
223 CEE would afford greater or lesser control of myopia. Greater and lesser control entailed less and
224 more risk, respectively. In order to quantify this control, we assessed the types of data provided by
225 each article, which were ORs and 95% CIs or raw frequency data (number of participants who

226 performed CEE versus those that did not). In the presence of both, we opted to extract the former.
227 Presence of raw data prompted their extraction from each study and were used to calculate study-
228 specific ORs with 95% CIs. The study-specific ORs were transformed logarithmically (log OR).
229 We also derived the standard error (SE) from the 95% CI [40]. Using the generic inverse variant
230 (GIV) method [41], log OR and SE from each paper were entered as the operating data in Review
231 Manager (RevMan) 5.3 (Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, England). Subgroup analysis consisted of
232 high quality (HQ)/serious, low quality (LQ) and frequency of performing CEE. Heterogeneity
233 between studies was estimated with the χ^2 -based Q test [42], with threshold of significance set at P^b
234 < 0.10 . Heterogeneity was also quantified with the I^2 statistic which measures variability between
235 studies [43]. I^2 values of $> 75\%$ indicate substantial variability and 0% , zero heterogeneity
236 (homogeneity). Evidence of functional similarities in population features of the studies warranted
237 using the fixed-effects model [44], otherwise the random-effects model [41] was used. Sources of
238 heterogeneity were detected with the Galbraith plot [45] followed by re-analysis (outlier treatment).
239 Of note, outlier treatment dichotomized the comparisons into pre-outlier (PRO) and post-outlier
240 (PSO). Sensitivity analysis, which involves omitting one study at a time and recalculating the
241 pooled OR, was used to test for robustness of the summary effects. Publication bias was considered
242 for assessment if the comparisons met two conditions: (i) ≥ 10 studies only [46] and (ii) significant
243 outcomes. Multiple comparisons were Bonferroni-corrected. Except for heterogeneity estimation
244 [42], two-sided P-values of ≤ 0.05 were considered significant. Other data were analyzed using
245 SIGMASTAT 2.03, SIGMAPLOT 11.0 (Systat Software, San Jose, CA, USA) and SPSS 20.0 (IBM Co.,
246 Armonk, NY, USA).

247

248

249

250

251 Results

252 Search results and study features

253 [Figure 1](#) outlines the study selection process in a PRISMA-sanctioned flowchart (Preferred

254 Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses). Initial search resulted in 60 citations,

255 followed by a series of omissions that eventually yielded eight articles for inclusion [\[47-54\]](#).

256

Fig 1 Summary flowchart of literature search

257

258

259

260

261

262

263


264

265

266

267

268



269 Characteristics of the included studies


270 [Table 1](#) shows the year span of the included articles (2011-2019) and ethnic composition, Chinese
271 (n = 6) and Indian (n = 2). Non-normal (SW: P = 0.022) age distribution of the participants in the
272 collection of studies showed a young demography (median: 12.7 years, IQR: 11.3-20.7).
273 Methodological quality of the component studies was generally high for xs but probably not for
274 RCT studies. [S1 and S2 Tables](#) detail the scores for each study based on the Jadad (RCT) and NOS
275 (cc/xs) scales. This meta-analysis followed the PRISMA guidelines ([S3 Table](#)).

276 Risk of bias outcomes

277 Although [Fig 2](#) shows a general low risk of bias based on the six criteria, [Fig 3](#) delineates the poor
278 quality of the Rathod et al study [47] which contrasted with the high quality of Li et al [51] and
279 Kang et al [48].

280 **Fig 2** Risk of bias analysis of CEE influence on myopia using the
281 Cochrane Collaboration tool

282



283

284 1: random sequence generation; 2: allocation concealment; 3: blinding of participants

285 and personnel; 4: blinding of outcome assessment; 5: incomplete data outcome;

286 6: selective reporting

287

288

289

290

291

292

293 **Fig 3** Risk of bias summary among and RCT/cc
 294 studies that examined the influence of CEE on myopia
 295

	Rathod 2011	Li 2015	Kang 2016	bias	
	+	+	+	selection	1
	?	+	+	selection	2
	+	+	+	performance	3
	-	+	+	detection	4
	-	+	+	attrition	5
	-	+	+	reporting	6
	-	?	?	other bias	

296 CEE: Chinese eye exercise; RCT: randomized control
 297 trial; cc : case-control; 1: random sequence generation;
 298 2: allocation concealment; 3: blinding of participants and
 299 personnel; 4: blinding of outcome assessment; 5: incomplete
 300 data outcome; 6: selective reporting
 301

302
 303
 304
 305

Meta-analysis outcomes

306 **Table 2** shows six significant outcomes, four of which are attributed to outlier treatment. One
 307 finding indicating less myopia control was found in the LQ subgroup (OR 1.57, 95% CI 1.24-2.01,
 308 $P^a = 0.0002$). Otherwise, most of the findings indicate greater control of myopia. In PRO, OR
 309 magnitude was greater (ORs 0.38-0.49, 95% CIs 0.22-0.82, $P^a = 0.0007-0.007$) than PSO, whose
 310 findings are modulated (ORs 0.55-0.75, 95% CIs 0.45-0.86, $P^a < 10^{-5}-0.0002$). Significance,
 311 however, was greater in PSO (up to $P^a < 10^{-5}$) than in PRO (up to $P^a = 0.0007$).

312


313 Mechanism of outlier treatment

314 The mechanism of outlier treatment for the CEE analysis is visualized in Figs 4-6. Fig 4 shows the
 315 PRO forest plot, non-significant (OR 0.84, 95% CI 0.48-1.49, $P^a = 0.55$) and heterogeneous ($P^b <$
 316 10^{-5} , $I^2 = 94\%$). The Galbraith plot identifies five studies in three articles [50-52] as the sources of
 317 heterogeneity (outliers), located above and below the +2 and -2 confidence limits (Fig 5). In Fig 6,
 318 the PSO outcome (outliers omitted) shows eliminated heterogeneity ($P^b = 0.95$, $I^2 = 0\%$); greater
 319 myopia control (OR 0.72, 95% CI 0.61-0.86) and escalated significance ($P^a = 0.0002$). This
 320 operation is numerically summarized in Table 2.

321

322 **Fig 4** Forest plot outcome in the CEE analysis

323



324

325

326 O: onset; P: progression; Diamond denotes the pooled odds ratio (OR), here indicating more myopia control
 327 (0.84). Squares indicate the OR in each study. Horizontal lines on either side of each square represent the
 328 95% confidence intervals (CI). The Z test for overall effect is non-significant ($P^a = 0.55$). The chi-square test
 329 shows the presence of heterogeneity ($P^b < 10^{-5}$, $I^2 = 94\%$); I^2 : a measure of variability expressed in %

330

331

332

333


334

335

336

337 **Fig 5** Galbraith plot in the CEE analysis

338



339

340

341


342

343

log OR: logarithm of standardized odds ratio; SE: standard error. The two studies above the +2 and the one study below the -2 confidence limits are the outliers.

344 **Fig 6** Forest plot outcome of outlier treatment in the CEE analysis

345



346

347

348

349

350

351

352

O: onset; P: progression; The diamond denotes the pooled odds ratio (OR) indicating even more myopia control (0.72) compared with the forest plot in Fig 4. Squares indicate the OR in each study. Horizontal lines on either side of each square represent the 95% confidence intervals (CI). The Z test for overall effect was significant ($P^a = 0.0002$). The chi-square test indicates zero heterogeneity ($P^b = 0.95$, $I^2 = 0\%$); I^2 : a measure of variability expressed in %

353

354 Sensitivity analysis and publication bias

355 [Table 3](#) shows that five of the six significant outcomes were robust. Only the LQ comparison was

356 non-robust on account of one study contributing to its stability [\[50\]](#). We found no evidence of

357 publication bias ([Table 4](#)).

358

359 **Discussion**

360 **Summary of associations**

361 Our principal findings point to the consistency of significant control of myopia which is supported

362 by homogeneity, robustness and stability. Outlier treatment has unraveled significant and

363 homogeneous associations which were not present in the component single-study outcomes.

364 Conflicting outcomes between primary studies may be attributed to small sample sizes. Outcomes

365 based on small sample sizes appear to be common in clinical studies [\[55\]](#) and are prone to the risk

366 of Type 1 error. Outlier treatment and subgroup analysis underpinned the importance of doing CEE

367 properly and frequently (> 5 time/week) for better myopia control and highlighted the adverse

368 consequence of improper CEE performance. This meta-analysis showed that outcomes were more

369 dependent on xs than cc or RCTs. The xs studies had high sample sizes but not RCTs in our meta-

370 analysis. This is unsurprising since RCTs require greater logistical organization than xs studies,

371 which are mainly questionnaire-based. In fact, two xs studies [\[52,49\]](#) included in our meta-analysis

372 recommended RCTs for better understanding of CEE influence on myopia.

373 **Comparison with a 2019 meta-analysis**

374 We compare our findings with a recent meta-analysis (Lu et al. 2019) in terms of methodology,

375 findings and conclusion [\[56\]](#). The initial difference is that Lu et al examined myopia onset only,

376 while we addressed both myopia onset and progression. Despite this difference, both meta-analyses

377 used the GIV approach, lending comparability to the outcomes. Lu et al overall findings indicated

378 increased risk for myopia onset (1.2-fold, n = 4) which contrasted with ours (28% more control of

379 myopia, n = 6). Lu et al stated the harmful effects of low quality CEE on myopia which prompted
380 us meta-analyze the data on low quality CEE from our included studies. Our initial low quality
381 subgroup finding showed a null effect (OR 0.97, 95% CI 0.50-1.86, P = 0.92) until it was subjected
382 to outlier treatment, the outcome of which indicated significantly less myopia control (OR 1.57,
383 95% CI 1.24-2.01, P = 0.0002). Thus, our PSO low quality finding concurred with the previous
384 meta-analysis [56].

385 CEE and myopia

386 CEE is an eye-care program that aims to protect against or prevent myopia and is mandated in
387 Chinese schools [51]. Massaging the acupoints around the eyes accelerates the blood circulation,
388 improves metabolism, rests the eye muscles, and relieves eye fatigue [57]. From the perspective of
389 traditional Chinese Medicine, Qi is stimulated in meridians by massaging the acupoints, thus
390 relieving eye strain [48]. By far, performing CEE was found to have a modest protective effect
391 against myopia [52]. In contrast, non-performance of CEE was found to increase the risk for
392 myopia [53]. A third variation in CEE study findings was the non-significant association between
393 performing CEE and risk of myopia onset and myopia progression [48]. These associative
394 variations may be due to the limited sample sizes and lack of rigor in measuring the quality of CEE
395 performed. In schools, most Chinese children were required to perform CEE only once or twice a
396 day, once in the morning and once in the afternoon, with 5 minutes for each time. Therefore, the
397 total time of performing CEE was at most 10 minutes a day and in some places the children only
398 performed the exercise once a day [48]. Studies have reported that most children could not perform
399 the CEE with standard manipulation. Previous studies showed that about 90% of Chinese children
400 did not perform CEE correctly, most of them could not find the exact periocular acupoints and did
401 not have accurate pressure and manipulation skills for the exercises although they did them every
402 day [58,59]. Our findings pointed to a significant 57% reduced control of myopia, which may
403 exacerbate the condition when performed improperly. On the other hand, we also showed

404 significantly better control (up to 51%) of myopia (which may retard its progression or reduce the
405 onset) when CEE is performed seriously. About 15% of total children and about a third of those
406 who performed them were found to achieve high quality CEE [48].

407 Strengths and limitations

408 Interpreting our findings should consider its limitations and strengths. Limitations include: (i)
409 Given the greater reliance on RCTs over xs studies [52,49] limits our meta-analysis findings
410 because xs data preclude direct evidence on the association between CEE and myopia [52]. (ii) All
411 the component studies were underpowered; (iii) the low quality subgroup finding was non-robust;
412 (iii) although less prevalent, myopia is not limited to the populations studied here, thus rendering
413 the results inapplicable to other ethnic groups. (v) Clinically, the long-term effect of myopia
414 prevention or slowing its progression remains an open question [51]. (vi) The likelihood of recall
415 bias regarding responses of the participants to the questionnaires may have affected the accuracy of
416 our study. However, impact of these limitations may have been mitigated with our assessments of
417 the risk of bias and methodological quality of the studies. On the other hand, the strengths comprise
418 of the following: (i) our use of the GIV allowed comparison with a previous meta-analysis. (ii)
419 Outlier treatment was key to generating significance and eliminating heterogeneity which
420 underpinned our core findings. This demonstrates the utility of this meta-analysis tool in elevating
421 the level of evidence for associations; (iii) subgroup analysis validated the overall findings, allowed
422 comparison and confirmed the adverse effect of LQ performance of CEE; (iv) all significant PSO
423 ORs survived the Bonferroni correction, thus minimizing the possibility of a Type 1 error; (v)
424 sensitivity treatment conferred robustness to most of the significant findings; (vi) no evidence of
425 publication bias.

426 Conclusions

427 We have shown the significant influence of CEE in controlling myopia, provided the performance
428 was serious and frequent. These findings are buttressed with layers of evidential strength which

429 include high statistical significance, stability and homogeneity. The substantial amount of evidence
430 presented here may render CEE as a useful preventative and therapeutic option in myopia control.
431 In spite of the evidence for associations, the complexity of CEE performance involves interactions
432 between genetic and non-genetic factors that may not have been covered in this meta-analysis
433 because of the logistical limitations. Additional well-designed studies exploring other parameters
434 would confirm or modify our results and add to the extant knowledge about the influence of CEE
435 in controlling myopia

436

437 References

438

- 439 1. Morgan IG, French AN, Ashby RS, Guo X, Ding X, He M, Rose KA (2018) The epidemics of myopia:
440 Aetiology and prevention. *Progress in retinal and eye research* 62:134-149.
441 doi:10.1016/j.preteyeres.2017.09.004
- 442 2. Morgan IG, Ohno-Matsui K, Saw SM (2012) Myopia. *Lancet* 379 (9827):1739-1748. doi:10.1016/S0140-
443 6736(12)60272-4
- 444 3. Holden BA, Fricke TR, Wilson DA, Jong M, Naidoo KS, Sankaridurg P, Wong TY, Naduvilath TJ,
445 Resnikoff S (2016) Global Prevalence of Myopia and High Myopia and Temporal Trends from 2000 through
446 2050. *Ophthalmology* 123 (5):1036-1042. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2016.01.006
- 447 4. Ding BY, Shih YF, Lin LLK, Hsiao CK, Wang IJ (2017) Myopia among schoolchildren in East Asia and
448 Singapore. *Survey of ophthalmology* 62 (5):677-697. doi:10.1016/j.survophthal.2017.03.006
- 449 5. Foster PJ, Jiang Y (2014) Epidemiology of myopia. *Eye* 28 (2):202-208. doi:10.1038/eye.2013.280
- 450 6. Li L, Zhong H, Li J, Li CR, Pan CW (2018) Incidence of myopia and biometric characteristics of premyopic
451 eyes among Chinese children and adolescents. *BMC ophthalmology* 18 (1):178. doi:10.1186/s12886-018-
452 0836-9
- 453 7. Dolgin E (2015) The myopia boom. *Nature* 519 (7543):276-278. doi:10.1038/519276a
- 454 8. Sun J, Zhou J, Zhao P, Lian J, Zhu H, Zhou Y, Sun Y, Wang Y, Zhao L, Wei Y, Wang L, Cun B, Ge S, Fan
455 X (2012) High prevalence of myopia and high myopia in 5060 Chinese university students in Shanghai.
456 *Investigative ophthalmology & visual science* 53 (12):7504-7509. doi:10.1167/iovs.11-8343
- 457 9. PRC MoE (2019) Number of Students of Formal Education by Type and Level 2018
458 http://www.moe.gov.cn/s78/A03/moe_560/jytjsj_2017/qg/201808/t20180808_344698.html Accessed 01
459 October 2019. Accessed 01 October 2019
- 460 10. Gong B, Qu C, Huang XF, Ye ZM, Zhang DD, Shi Y, Chen R, Liu YP, Shuai P (2016) Genetic
461 association of COL1A1 polymorphisms with high myopia in Asian population: a Meta-analysis. *International*
462 *journal of ophthalmology* 9 (8):1187-1193. doi:10.18240/ijo.2016.08.16
- 463 11. Tang SM, Lau T, Rong SS, Yazar S, Chen LJ, Mackey DA, Lucas RM, Pang CP, Yam JC (2019) Vitamin
464 D and its pathway genes in myopia: systematic review and meta-analysis. *The British journal of*
465 *ophthalmology* 103 (1):8-17. doi:10.1136/bjophthalmol-2018-312159
- 466 12. Zhang D, Zeng G, Hu J, McCormick K, Shi Y, Gong B (2017) Association of IGF1 polymorphism rs6214
467 with high myopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ophthalmic genetics* 38 (5):434-439.
468 doi:10.1080/13816810.2016.1253105
- 469 13. Xiang F, He M, Morgan IG (2012) The impact of severity of parental myopia on myopia in Chinese
470 children. *Optometry and vision science : official publication of the American Academy of Optometry* 89
471 (6):884-891. doi:10.1097/OPX.0b013e318255dc33
- 472 14. Mutti DO, Mitchell GL, Moeschberger ML, Jones LA, Zadnik K (2002) Parental myopia, near work, school
473 achievement, and children's refractive error. *Investigative ophthalmology & visual science* 43 (12):3633-3640
- 474 15. Verma A, Verma A (2015) A novel review of the evidence linking myopia and high intelligence. *Journal of*
475 *ophthalmology* 2015:271746. doi:10.1155/2015/271746
- 476 16. Mirshahi A, Ponto KA, Hoehn R, Zwiener I, Zeller T, Lackner K, Beutel ME, Pfeiffer N (2014) Myopia and
477 level of education: results from the Gutenberg Health Study. *Ophthalmology* 121 (10):2047-2052.
478 doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2014.04.017

- 479 17. Verhoeven VJ, Buitendijk GH, Consortium for Refractive E, Myopia, Rivadeneira F, Uitterlinden AG,
480 Vingerling JR, Hofman A, Klaver CC (2013) Education influences the role of genetics in myopia. *European*
481 *journal of epidemiology* 28 (12):973-980. doi:10.1007/s10654-013-9856-1
- 482 18. Zhou Z, Morgan IG, Chen Q, Jin L, He M, Congdon N (2015) Disordered sleep and myopia risk among
483 Chinese children. *PloS one* 10 (3):e0121796. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0121796
- 484 19. Morgan IG, French AN, Rose KA (2018) Intense schooling linked to myopia. *Bmj* 361:k2248.
485 doi:10.1136/bmj.k2248
- 486 20. Fernandez-Montero A, Olmo-Jimenez JM, Olmo N, Bes-Rastrollo M, Moreno-Galarraga L, Moreno-
487 Montanes J, Martinez-Gonzalez MA (2015) The impact of computer use in myopia progression: a cohort
488 study in Spain. *Preventive medicine* 71:67-71. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2014.12.005
- 489 21. Ip JM, Saw SM, Rose KA, Morgan IG, Kifley A, Wang JJ, Mitchell P (2008) Role of near work in myopia:
490 findings in a sample of Australian school children. *Investigative ophthalmology & visual science* 49 (7):2903-
491 2910. doi:10.1167/iovs.07-0804
- 492 22. You X, Wang L, Tan H, He X, Qu X, Shi H, Zhu J, Zou H (2016) Near Work Related Behaviors
493 Associated with Myopic Shifts among Primary School Students in the Jiading District of Shanghai: A School-
494 Based One-Year Cohort Study. *PloS one* 11 (5):e0154671. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0154671
- 495 23. Liu HH, Xu L, Wang YX, Wang S, You QS, Jonas JB (2010) Prevalence and progression of myopic
496 retinopathy in Chinese adults: the Beijing Eye Study. *Ophthalmology* 117 (9):1763-1768.
497 doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2010.01.020
- 498 24. Saw SM, Gazzard G, Shih-Yen EC, Chua WH (2005) Myopia and associated pathological complications.
499 *Ophthalmic & physiological optics : the journal of the British College of Ophthalmic Opticians* 25 (5):381-391.
500 doi:10.1111/j.1475-1313.2005.00298.x
- 501 25. Xu L, Wang Y, Wang S, Wang Y, Jonas JB (2007) High myopia and glaucoma susceptibility the Beijing
502 Eye Study. *Ophthalmology* 114 (2):216-220. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2006.06.050
- 503 26. Zejmo M, Forminska-Kapuscik M, Pieczara E, Filipek E, Mrukwa-Kominek E, Samochowiec-Donocik E,
504 Leszczynski R, Smuzynska M (2009) Etiopathogenesis and management of high-degree myopia. Part I.
505 *Medical science monitor : international medical journal of experimental and clinical research* 15 (9):RA199-
506 202
- 507 27. Wong TY, Ferreira A, Hughes R, Carter G, Mitchell P (2014) Epidemiology and disease burden of
508 pathologic myopia and myopic choroidal neovascularization: an evidence-based systematic review.
509 *American journal of ophthalmology* 157 (1):9-25 e12. doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2013.08.010
- 510 28. Huang J, Wen D, Wang Q, McAlinden C, Flitcroft I, Chen H, Saw SM, Chen H, Bao F, Zhao Y, Hu L, Li
511 X, Gao R, Lu W, Du Y, Jinag Z, Yu A, Lian H, Jiang Q, Yu Y, Qu J (2016) Efficacy Comparison of 16
512 Interventions for Myopia Control in Children: A Network Meta-analysis. *Ophthalmology* 123 (4):697-708.
513 doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2015.11.010
- 514 29. Cao K, Wan Y, Yusufu M, Wang N (2019) Significance of Outdoor Time for Myopia Prevention: A
515 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Based on Randomized Controlled Trials. *Ophthalmic research*:1-9.
516 doi:10.1159/000501937
- 517 30. Deng L, Pang Y (2019) Effect of Outdoor Activities in Myopia Control: Meta-analysis of Clinical Studies.
518 *Optometry and vision science : official publication of the American Academy of Optometry* 96 (4):276-282.
519 doi:10.1097/OPX.0000000000001357
- 520 31. He M, Xiang F, Zeng Y, Mai J, Chen Q, Zhang J, Smith W, Rose K, Morgan IG (2015) Effect of Time
521 Spent Outdoors at School on the Development of Myopia Among Children in China: A Randomized Clinical
522 Trial. *Jama* 314 (11):1142-1148. doi:10.1001/jama.2015.10803
- 523 32. Rose KA, Morgan IG, Ip J, Kifley A, Huynh S, Smith W, Mitchell P (2008) Outdoor activity reduces the
524 prevalence of myopia in children. *Ophthalmology* 115 (8):1279-1285. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2007.12.019
- 525 33. Gong Q, Janowski M, Luo M, Wei H, Chen B, Yang G, Liu L (2017) Efficacy and Adverse Effects of
526 Atropine in Childhood Myopia: A Meta-analysis. *JAMA ophthalmology* 135 (6):624-630.
527 doi:10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2017.1091
- 528 34. Lipson MJ, Brooks MM, Koffler BH (2018) The Role of Orthokeratology in Myopia Control: A Review. *Eye*
529 *& contact lens* 44 (4):224-230. doi:10.1097/ICL.0000000000000520
- 530 35. Ostberg O, Horie Y, Feng Y (1992) On the merits of ancient Chinese eye acupressure practices. *Applied*
531 *ergonomics* 23 (5):343-348. doi:10.1016/0003-6870(92)90296-8
- 532 36. Jadad AR, Moore RA, Carroll D, Jenkinson C, Reynolds DJ, Gavaghan DJ, McQuay HJ (1996)
533 Assessing the quality of reports of randomized clinical trials: is blinding necessary? *Controlled clinical trials*
534 17 (1):1-12
- 535 37. Wells GA, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M (2011) The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale
536 (NOS) for assessing the quality of non-randomised studies in meta-analyses. . Ottawa Hospital Research
537 Institute http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clical_epidemiology/oxford.asp Accessed 01 October 2019. Accessed
538 11 October 2019

- 539 38. Higgins JPT GSe (2011) Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 5.1.0
540 [updated March 2011] (available from www.cochrane-handbook.org). Cochrane Collaboration.
- 541 39. Savovic J, Weeks L, Sterne JA, Turner L, Altman DG, Moher D, Higgins JP (2014) Evaluation of the
542 Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing the risk of bias in randomized trials: focus groups, online survey,
543 proposed recommendations and their implementation. *Systematic reviews* 3:37. doi:10.1186/2046-4053-3-37
544 40. Obtaining standard errors from confidence intervals and P values. [https://handbook-5-](https://handbook-5-1.cochrane.org/chapter_7/7_7_2_obtaining_standard_errors_from_confidence_intervals_and.htm)
545 [1.cochrane.org/chapter_7/7_7_2_obtaining_standard_errors_from_confidence_intervals_and.htm](https://handbook-5-1.cochrane.org/chapter_7/7_7_2_obtaining_standard_errors_from_confidence_intervals_and.htm)
546 (Accessed 11 October 2019).
- 547 41. DerSimonian R, Laird N (1986) Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Controlled clinical trials* 7 (3):177-188
- 548 42. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG (2003) Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *Bmj*
549 327 (7414):557-560
- 550 43. Higgins JP, Thompson SG (2002) Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med* 21 (11):1539-
551 1558
- 552 44. Mantel N, Haenszel W (1959) Statistical aspects of the analysis of data from retrospective studies of
553 disease. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 22 (4):719-748
- 554 45. Galbraith RF (1988) A note on graphical presentation of estimated odds ratios from several clinical trials.
555 *Stat Med* 7 (8):889-894
- 556 46. Ioannidis JP, Trikalinos TA (2007) The appropriateness of asymmetry tests for publication bias in meta-
557 analyses: a large survey. *CMAJ* 176 (8):1091-1096. doi:10.1503/cmaj.060410
- 558 47. Rathod V, Desai D, Alagesan J (2011) Effect of Eye Exercises on Myopia - Randomized Controlled
559 Study. *J Pharm Biomed Sci (JPBMS)* 10 (10):1-4
- 560 48. Kang MT, Li SM, Peng X, Li L, Ran A, Meng B, Sun Y, Liu LR, Li H, Millodot M, Wang N (2016) Chinese
561 Eye Exercises and Myopia Development in School Age Children: A Nested Case-control Study. *Scientific*
562 *reports* 6:28531. doi:10.1038/srep28531
- 563 49. Lin Z, Vasudevan B, Jhanji V, Gao TY, Wang NL, Wang Q, Wang J, Ciuffreda KJ, Liang YB (2013) Eye
564 exercises of acupoints: their impact on refractive error and visual symptoms in Chinese urban children. *BMC*
565 *complementary and alternative medicine* 13:306. doi:10.1186/1472-6882-13-306
- 566 50. Han X, Miao H, Huang D (2014) Investigation of junior school student myopia in high - altitude Tibetan
567 areas in Qinghai Province. *Int Eye Sci* 14 (5):913-915
- 568 51. Li SM, Kang MT, Peng XX, Li SY, Wang Y, Li L, Yu J, Qiu LX, Sun YY, Liu LR, Li H, Sun X, Millodot M,
569 Wang N (2015) Efficacy of Chinese eye exercises on reducing accommodative lag in school-aged children: a
570 randomized controlled trial. *PloS one* 10 (3):e0117552. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0117552
- 571 52. Lin Z, Vasudevan B, Fang SJ, Jhanji V, Mao GY, Han W, Gao TY, Ciuffreda KJ, Liang YB (2016) Eye
572 exercises of acupoints: their impact on myopia and visual symptoms in Chinese rural children. *BMC*
573 *complementary and alternative medicine* 16:349. doi:10.1186/s12906-016-1289-4
- 574 53. Wang L, Du M, Yi H, Duan S, Guo W, Qin P, Hao Z, Sun J (2017) Prevalence of and Factors Associated
575 with Myopia in Inner Mongolia Medical Students in China, a cross-sectional study. *BMC ophthalmology* 17
576 (1):52. doi:10.1186/s12886-017-0446-y
- 577 54. Huang L, Kawasaki H, Liu Y, Wang Z (2019) The prevalence of myopia and the factors associated with it
578 among university students in Nanjing: A cross-sectional study. *Medicine* 98 (10):e14777.
579 doi:10.1097/MD.00000000000014777
- 580 55. Khan A, Fahl Mar K, Brown WA (2018) The Impact of Underpowered Studies on Clinical Trial Results.
581 *The American journal of psychiatry* 175 (2):188. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2017.17091016
- 582 56. Lu Z, Ouyang M, Zhang R, Tang X, Zhong H (2019) Association between Chinese eye exercises and
583 onset of myopia: a meta-analysis. *Int J Clin Exp Med* 12 (5):4580-4588
- 584 57. Field T (2009) Massage therapy, acupressure, and reflexology. Paper presented at the Complementary
585 and Alternative Therapies Research Washington D.C.,
- 586 58. Xiong R (2001) Survey on the nonstandard performance of Chinese eye exercises in children. *Chinese*
587 *Journal of School Health* 22 (1)
- 588 59. Zhao R, Zhu J (2012) Beliefs and behavior related to Chinese students eye exercises among primary
589 and secondary school teachers and students in Shanghai. *Chinese Journal of School Health* 33 (3)
- 590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597

598 **Data availability**

599 The data [frequency, odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals] supporting this meta-analysis are from
600 previously reported studies and datasets, which have been cited. The processed data are available from the
601 corresponding author upon request.
602

603 **Conflicts of interest**

604 The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper
605

606 **Funding statement**

607 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-
608 profit sectors
609

610 **Supplementary materials**

611 S1 Table Jadad DOCX

612 S2 Table NOS DOCX

613 S3 Table PRISMA DOCX
614

615 **Author contributions**

Conceptualization: PS, JT

Formal analysis: NP, PT, PS

Investigation: NP, PT, PS

Methodology: NP, PT

Resources: PS, JT, AT

Supervision: AT

Validation: NP, PT, KP

Writing – original draft: NP, PT, PS

Writing – review & editing: NP, PT, PS, AT

616 **Table 1** Characteristics of the included studies
617

K	Lu et al	First author	[R]	Year	Country	Age (y) mean ± SD (range)	Myopia details	Study design	MQJ
1	○	Rathod	[47]	2011	India	21 ± 1.4	30 subjects	RCT *	Poor
2	✓	Kang	[48]	2012	China	12.7 ± 0.5	School age	cc **	High
3	✓	Lin	[49]	2013	China	11.1 ± 3.2	Acupoints urban	xs **	High
4	✓	Han	[50]	2014	China	High school	High altitude	xs **	Low
5	○	Li	[51]	2015	India	10-14	School age	RCT *	Good
6	✓	Lin	[52]	2016	China	11.1 ± 2.4	Acupoints rural	xs **	High
7	✓	Wang	[53]	2017	China	21.1 ± 1.6	Medical students	xs **	High
8	○	Huang	[54]	2019	China	19.6 ± 0.9	University	xs **	High

618 K: number designation of the article; (R) Reference; inclusion of the article in the previous meta-analysis (Lu et al 2019) is
619 indicated by ✓, otherwise ○. SD: standard deviation; RCT: randomized control trial; cc: case-control; xs: cross-sectional;
620 * Jadad scale (S1 Table); ** NOS (S2 Table); MQJ: methodological quality judgment
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632

633
634

Table 2 Summary associations between CEE and myopia

	Test of association				Test of heterogeneity				Test of association				Test of heterogeneity				Effect of outlier treatment	
	n	OR	95% CI	P ^a	MC	P ^b	I ² (%)	AM	n	OR	95% CI	P ^a	MC	P ^b	I ² (%)	AM	Sig	Het
	PRO								PSO									
CEE	9	0.84	0.48-1.49	0.55	more	10 ⁻⁵	94	R	6	0.72	0.61-0.86	0.0002 ✓*	more	0.95	0	F	GS	EH
Serious (HQ)	7	0.49	0.29-0.82	0.007 * *	more	10 ⁻⁵	97	R	4	0.75	0.68-0.84	10⁻⁵ ✓*	more	0.46	0	F	ES	EH
LQ	6	0.97	0.50-1.86	0.92	null	10 ⁻⁵	88	R	4	1.57	1.24-2.01	0.0002 ✓ _δ	less	0.53	0	F	GS	EH
Frequent	5	0.38	0.22-0.67	0.0007 ✓*	more	10 ⁻⁵	95	R	3	0.55	0.45-0.68	10⁻⁵ ✓*	more	0.12	52	F	ES	RH

635 CEE: Chinese eye exercise; HQ: high quality; LQ: low quality; n: number of studies; OR: odds ratio; CI: confidence interval; P^a: P-value for association; in: increased risk;
 636 MC: myopia control; null: ORs 0.97-1.03; P^b: P-value for heterogeneity; I²: measure of variability; AM: analysis model; R: random-effects; F: fixed-effects; PRO: pre-
 637 outlier; PSO: post outlier; RS: retained significance; RNS: retained non-significance; RH: reduced heterogeneity; EH: eliminated heterogeneity; values in bold indicate
 638 significant associations; Bonferroni correction (* did not survive, ✓ survived); * robust; _δ non-robust (Table 3).
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648

649 **Table 3** Outcomes of sensitivity treatment on the significant findings
650

Comparison	OS	P ^a	Sensitivity outcome
CEE	PSO	0.0002	Robust
Serious (HQ)	PRO	0.007	Robust
Serious (HQ)	PSO	10 ⁻⁵	Robust
Frequent	PRO	0.0007	Robust
Frequent	PSO	10 ⁻⁵	Robust
LQ	PSO	0.0002	Han [50]

651 CEE: Chinese eye exercise; OS: outlier status; HQ: high quality; LQ: low quality;
652 PSO: post-outlier; PRO: pre-outlier; P^a: P-value for association; bracketed number
653 indicates the reference number, the study that contributed to non-robustness of the
654 comparison

655
656
657
658

Table 4 Outcomes of publication bias tests on the significant findings

Comparison	OS	P ^a	SW P- value	Normal distribution	PBT	Coefficient	PBT P-value	Evidence of PB
CEE	PSO	0.0002	0.421	Yes	Egger	Intercept	0.586	None
Serious (HQ)	PRO	0.007	0.316	Yes	Egger	Intercept	0.924	None
Serious (HQ)	PSO	10 ⁻⁵	0.216	Yes	Egger	Intercept	0.140	None
Frequent	PRO	0.0007	0.092	Yes	Egger	Intercept	0.184	None
Frequent	PSO	10 ⁻⁵	0.593	Yes	Egger	Intercept	0.999	None
LQ	PSO	0.0002	0.129	Yes	Egger	Intercept	0.943	None

659 CEE: HQ: high quality; LQ: low quality; OS: outlier status; P^a: P-value for association; SW: Shapiro-
660 Wilk; PBT: publication bias test