medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Evaluation of Junior Doctors' Knowledge of Corneal Donation and the New Opt-Out System in England

Bhavesh Gopal[1], Owuraku Asiedu Titi-Lartey[2], Princeton Fernandes[3], Nur-Emel Noubani[1], Elizabeth Blatherwick[4], Dalia G. Said,[5,6] Harminder S. Dua,[5,6] Darren Shu Jeng Ting[5,6]

Collaborators: Rachel Byrne, Eleanor Green, Laura Sandland-Taylor, Laura Weir, Shahid Mohammed, Basal Atwi, Yara Hreish, Zara Faizi, Natalie Mok, Thomas Poundall, Sahana Bala, Sudha Bhagwansingh Hayne, Mohamad Ali Mortada

[1] Pilgrim Hospital, Lincolnshire, UK.

[2] Lincoln County Hospital, Lincolnshire, UK.

[3] Hull Royal Infirmary, Hull, UK.

[4] Nottingham Tissue and Eye Donation Partners, Queen's Medical Centre, Nottingham, UK.

[5] Department of Ophthalmology, Queen's Medical Centre, Nottingham, UK.

[6] Academic Ophthalmology, Division of Clinical Neuroscience, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK.

Corresponding author: Dr. Darren S. J. Ting

Corresponding address: Academic Ophthalmology, Division of Clinical Neuroscience, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, NG7 2RD, UK.

Email: ting.darren@gmail.com

Funding / support: DSJT acknowledges support from the Medical Research Council / Fight for Sight Clinical Research Fellowship (MR/T001674/1), and the Fight for Sight / John Lee, Royal College of Ophthalmologists Primer Fellowship (24CO4).

Conflict of interest: None

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To evaluate the knowledge of corneal donation and the new opt-out system among junior doctors in the East Midlands, UK.

Methods: This was a cross-sectional study performed during June-September 2020. A 26-item questionnaire-based survey was disseminated to all 340 junior doctors working in the East Midlands, UK. Relevant data, including participants' background, knowledge of corneal donation and the new opt-out system introduced in England, were analysed.

Results: A total of 143 responses were received (response rate=42.1%). Nineteen (13.3%) junior doctors had previously discussed about corneal donation. The majority (100, 69.9%) of them perceived the importance of obtaining consent for corneal donation as junior doctors, but only 24 (16.8%) felt comfortable in discussing corneal donation. The knowledge of corneal donation was low, with a mean correct response rate of 33.3±20.8%. Only 28 (19.6%) doctors were aware of the 24-hour death-to-enucleation time limit. The majority (116, 81.1%) of doctors would consider certifying a death on the ward quicker if they knew it could potentially compromise the quality of corneas. Most (103, 72%) doctors were aware of the new opt-out system but only 56 (39.2%) doctors correctly stated that donation can only proceed with family consent.

Conclusion: Junior doctors working at the frontline services serve as valuable members in contributing to the process of obtaining consent for organ/tissue donation. Our study highlights the lack of knowledge of corneal donation and the opt-out system amongst junior doctors in the UK. Targeted postgraduate training during the induction process may potentially enhance the donation rate.

Key words: Corneal donation; Eye donation; Junior doctors; Opt-out system; Organ donation; Presumed consent

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

According to the most recent WHO report, corneal blindness represents the 5th leading cause of blindness and visual impairment globally, affecting around 6 million of the population.[1, 2] Any significant insult to the cornea, secondary to infection, trauma, degeneration, inflammation or nutritional deficiency, can potentially lead to irreversible corneal opacity, culminating in visual impairment and blindness.[2]

Corneal transplantation or keratoplasty serves as the mainstay of treatment in restoring vision in patients affected by corneal opacity.[3] It is the most commonly performed transplantation worldwide, with >40000 cases and >3000 cases being performed annually in the US and the UK, respectively.[3] With the continual refinement in surgical techniques and understanding of the immunology in corneal transplantation, the long-term outcomes of corneal transplants have significantly improved in the recent decades.[4-6] However, the success of corneal transplantation has been persistently challenged by the global shortage of donor cornea tissues. This issue is further exacerbated by the recent COVID-19 pandemic due to the significant decrease in potential eye donors.[7] Gain et al.[8] recently conducted a global survey and reported that there was only 1 cornea available for 70 needed in the world, highlighting the need for increased effort in improving the eye donation rate and availability of donor corneas.

To date, a number of key barriers to corneal donation have been highlighted in the literature. One of the most common issues is related to the concern of disfigurement following corneal donation.[9, 10] Another important barrier to corneal donation is the lack of awareness and knowledge of corneal donation amongst the general public.[10-12] In addition, staff may feel uncomfortable or unconfident in discussing corneal donation with the patients and the relatives.[13] To address the constant deficit of donor corneas, various countries have considered and implemented a range of initiatives and research programmes, including campaigns to increase public awareness of corneal donation, introduction of telephone

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

consent, refinement in the eye retrieval and eye banking systems, and development of corneal cell-based therapy.[14-18]

On 20th May 2020, England has implemented an opt-out system, also known as the Max and Keira's Law, with an aim to improve the rate of organ and tissue donation,[19, 20] joining countries such as Spain, France and Italy, and many others. Under the new, soft opt-out system, all adults in England are now assumed to be willing organ and tissue donors unless they have registered their intent otherwise. However, the process of eye donation remains largely unchanged as consent from the family members of the decreased is still required before retrieval can proceed. Wales is currently operating on a "deemed consent" system, which is similar to an opt-out system, and Scotland is expected to implement the opt-out system in March 2021.

Junior doctors working at frontline services, particularly those who work in intensive care, oncology and palliative care units, may serve as valuable members to the multi-disciplinary team in contributing to the process of organ and tissue donations. Hakeem et al.[21] previously conducted an online survey assessing the knowledge of organ donation and transplantation among the junior doctors in the UK and demonstrated that 84% of the doctors felt inadequate in discussing organ and tissue donation with the potential donors or their family members. Nonetheless, the knowledge of corneal donation among junior doctors in the UK in the context of the recently introduced opt-out system and its impact has not been explored. Our study aimed to evaluate the knowledge of corneal donation and the opt-out system among the junior doctors in the UK.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This was a cross-sectional study performed between 28 June 2020 and 29 September 2020. A 26-item questionnaire-based survey, using an online platform (Google Forms), was distributed to the junior doctors / house officers (within the first 3 years of medical practice)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

who were working in the East Midlands, UK. The catchment area included Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and the majority of Lincolnshire and involved nine different hospitals, which included Chesterfield Royal Hospital, Derbyshire Royal Infirmary, Derby City General Hospital, Grantham Hospital, King's Mill Hospital, Lincoln County Hospital, Nottingham City Hospital, Queen's Medical Centre, and Pilgrim Hospital.

The questionnaire was composed of 26 questions, which evaluated the background and ophthalmology training of participants (6 items), knowledge of corneal (and tissue) donation (13 items) and the new opt-out system (2 items), views and experience in obtaining consent for corneal donation (4 items), and views on certifying death (1 item). The detail of the questionnaire is provided in **Supplementary Figure 1**. The suitability and contraindications to corneal donation was based on the guideline set out by the National Health Service Blood and Transplant (NHSBT).[22]

Ethics approval was obtained from the Research Ethic Committee at the University of Nottingham, UK, prior to the conduct of study (Reference: FMHS 45-0720). Informed consent was obtained from all participating doctors. The study was conducted in accordance with the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS version 26.0 (IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Armonk, NY, USA). All continuous data were presented as mean ± standard deviation (SD). Comparison between groups was conducted using Pearson's Chi square or Fisher's Exact test where appropriate for categorical variables and unpaired T test or Mann-Whitney U test for continuous variables. A total of 13 questions were asked to evaluate the knowledge of corneal (and tissue) donation. For analytic purpose, junior doctors were divided into two groups based on the number of correct answers provided, namely <50%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

correct response (i.e. 0-6 correct answers) and >50% correct response (i.e. 7-13 correct answers). P-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

Background of ophthalmology training and intent for corneal donation

Of all 340 junior doctors, 143 survey responses were received, yielding a response rate of 42.1%. The majority of them were Foundation Year 1 doctors (83, 58.0%), followed by Foundation Year 2 doctors (50, 35%) and others (10, 7.0%; **Table 1**).

The amount of previous undergraduate teaching on ophthalmology was 11.4 ± 12.1 days (ranged, 0-90 days). Only 24 (16.8%) junior doctors had undergone an ophthalmology training rotation during their Foundation Year training. Of all, 87 (60.8%) of the junior doctors were willing to donate their corneas.

Experience and views on corneal donation

The mean number of discussions of corneal donation held between the junior doctors and the potential donors or their family members was 0.2 ± 0.6 (ranged, 0-4), with the majority (124, 86.7%) of junior doctors having never held any discussion on corneal donation (**Table 2**). However, 100 (69.9%) of them felt that it was important to know how to obtain consent for corneal donation as a junior doctor. Only 24 (16.8%) doctors felt comfortable in discussing corneal donation with the family members and only 6 (4.2%) junior doctors felt that they had received adequate undergraduate training to discuss corneal donation. The most common source of information on corneal donation was obtained from the internet (71, 49.7%), followed by undergraduate teaching (43, 30.1%) and health professionals (32, 22.4%).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Background of ophthalmology training and intent for corneal donation among the junior doctors.

Parameters	**Total N = 143**
	N (%)
Level of training	
Foundation Year 1	83 (58.0)
Foundation Year 2	50 (35.0)
Other	10 (7.0)
Amount of undergraduate ophthalmology teaching, days	
0	5 (3.5)
1-7	55 (38.5)
8-14	65 (45.5)
15-30	11 (7.7)
>30	7 (4.9)
Any ophthalmology rotation during Foundation Year programme	
Yes	24 (16.8)
No	119 (83.2)
Willingness to donate corneas	
Yes	87 (60.8)
No	15 (10.5)
Uncertain	41 (28.7)
Presence of family members with corneal diseases needing a corneal transplant	
Yes	3 (2.1)
No	140 (97.9)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Experience and views on corneal donation among the junior doctors in the UK.

Parameters	**Total N = 143**
	N (%)
Number of previous discussions with potential donors or their family members on corneal donation	
0	124 (86.7)
1	12 (8.4)
2	5 (3.5)
>2	2 (1.4)
Felt that it was important to know how to obtain consent for corneal donation	
Yes	100 (69.9)
No	26 (18.2)
Maybe	17 (11.9)
Comfortable in discussing corneal donation	
Very or somewhat comfortable	24 (16.8)
Neutral	45 (31,5)
Very or somewhat uncomfortable	74 (51.7)
Felt that undergraduate teaching was sufficient for discussing corneal donation	
Yes	6 (4.2)
No	137 (95.8)
Sources of corneal donation information	
Undergraduate teaching	43 (30.1)
FY training	18 (12.6)
Internet	71 (49.7)
Social media	23 (16.1)
Health professionals	32 (22.4)
Friends	21 (14.7)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Knowledge of corneal (and tissue) donation

The knowledge of corneal (and tissue) donation, including 3 items on ocular conditions and 10 items on general health or systemic conditions, among the junior doctors is summarised in **Figure 1**.

Overall, the mean correct response rate was 31.9 ± 20.4% (ranged, 0-76.9%). With regard to knowledge of ocular contraindications to corneal donation (3 items), the mean correct response rate was 33.3 ± 30.9 (ranged, 0-100%). Only <30% of the junior doctors knew that previous cataract surgery, glaucoma and macular diseases were not contraindications to corneal donation.

In terms of knowledge on general health or systemic conditions for corneal donation, the mean correct response rate was 42.2 ± 26.5 (ranged, 0-70.0%). The most common correct response was related to question on blood borne infections (90, 62.9%), followed by general health diseases such as diabetes and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (67, 46.8%), death of unknown cause (37.8%), and haematological malignancies (37.8%). Only 28 (19.6%) and 51 (35.7%) junior doctors were correct about the 24-hour death-to-enucleation and the ideal 6-hour death-to-body chilling time limit (for tissue donation). Forty (28.0%) junior doctors were correct that there was no age limit for corneal donation.

The knowledge of corneal donation was not found to be significantly associated with the amount of undergraduate ophthalmology teaching (p=0.19), previous ophthalmology rotation (p=0.71), previous experience in discussing corneal donation (p=0.73), and willingness to donate their own corneas (p=0.16; **Table 3**).

Knowledge on the new opt-out organ donation system in England

The majority (103, 72%) of junior doctors were aware of the recently introduced opt-out organ and tissue donation system in England. In the event of family members refusing to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

donate organs and tissues of the deceased patient, only 56 (39.2%) junior doctors correctly stated that the organs and/or tissues cannot be retrieved.

Views on certifying death

With regard to views on certifying death, 116 (81.1%) junior doctors would consider certifying a death on the ward quicker if they knew it could compromise the quality of corneas.

Table 3. Factors that may influence the knowledge of corneal and tissue donation among the junior doctors in the UK. For analytic purpose, junior doctors were divided into two groups based on the number of correct answers (a total of 13 questions). Group A refers to those with less than 50% correct response (0-6 correct answers) and Group B refers to those with more than 50% correct response (7-13 correct answers).

Parameters	**Group A Total N = 117; N (%)**	**Group B Total N = 26; N (%)**	**P-value**
Number of UG ophthalmology teaching, days	10.8 ± 11.3	14.3 ± 15.2	0.19
Previous ophthalmology training rotation during FYP			0.71
Yes	19 (16.2)	5 (19.2)	
No	98 (83.8)	21 (80.8)	
Previous discussion of corneal donation			0.73
Yes	15 (12.8)	4 (15.4)	
No	102 (87.2)	22 (84.6)	
Willingness to donate own corneas			0.16
Yes	68 (58.1)	19 (73.1)	
No	49 (41.9)	7 (26.9)	

UG = Undergraduate; FYP = Foundation year programme
Continuous values are presented in mean ± standard deviation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

DISCUSSION

To the best of our knowledge, this represents the first study examining the views and knowledge of corneal donation and the new opt-out system among junior doctors in the UK. We observed that only 17% of the junior doctors felt comfortable in discussing corneal donation with the potential donors or their family members. This is likely related to the low amount of ophthalmology teaching provided during the undergraduate curriculum in the UK, as shown in our survey (a mean of 11.4 days) and previous studies.[23, 24] In addition, the lack of knowledge of corneal donation among the junior doctors, reflected by ~33% correct responses to the questions on eligibility for corneal donation, further affected their confidence and competence in discussing corneal donation with the family members.

Currently, in the UK, consent for corneal donation is primarily obtained by a team of well-trained, specialised nurses from the National Referral Centre (NRC) embedded within the NHSBT. This process takes place as soon as the death has been certified and notified to the NRC. Although junior doctors working at frontline services are not expected to obtain consent for corneal donation in the UK, they are the key multi-disciplinary members who have daily contact with the patients and potential organ/tissue donors and may therefore play an important role in the process of organ and tissue donations (see **Figure 2** for the eye and tissue donation process in England).[25] In addition, junior doctors are usually the key members in discussing the advance directives such as “Do not attempt cardiopulmonary resuscitation (DNACPR)” with the family members. Therefore a successful relationship of trust has already been built throughout the process of care, which could improve the conversion rate of corneal donation.[26] Our study showed that around 13% of the junior doctors had been involved in the discussion of corneal donation with the family members, and this figure is likely to increase under the new opt-out system. Studies have shown that prior knowledge of corneal donation serves as an important factor in influencing the willingness of donating the corneas.[9, 27] Therefore, if an earlier discussion on corneal donation can be held between the junior doctors and potential donors or their family

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

members, the chances of corneal donation can be potentially improved when it comes to the stage of formal consenting by the NRC.

The National Health Service Blood and Transplant (NHSBT) has set a 24-hour cut-off interval between death and retrieval of donor corneas and the body should preferably be refrigerated.[22] For other tissues, it is also recommended that the body should be refrigerated within an ideal window of 6 hours after death and the procurement of tissues needs to be completed within 24-48 hours.[22] If not refrigerated, the tissues (excluding corneas) will then need to be retrieved within 12 hours of death due to the risk of tissue contamination. As the responsibility of certifying death often rests on the junior doctors, they play a vital role in determining the promptness in death certification and subsequent eye retrieval, which has an important influence on the suitability and quality of the donor corneas.[28]

Patel et al.[29] demonstrated that, in the event of long death-to-enucleation interval (i.e. >12 hours), the quality of donor corneas such as endothelial cell density was better if the corneas were refrigerated. Another study similarly observed a positive effect of early body refrigeration on the transplant suitability of the donor corneas.[30] In the UK, the mean interval of death-to-enucleation was around 17-18 hours based on a previous North East England study.[15] Therefore junior doctors should be encouraged to ensure timely certification to allow for early refrigeration of the body to preserve the quality of tissues, including the donor corneal tissues. In our study, we demonstrated that only 20% and 36% of the junior doctors were aware of the 24-hour death-to-enucleation and the ideal 6-hour death-to-body refrigeration time limit, respectively. However, 81% of them would consider certifying deaths on the ward quicker if they knew the delay could potentially compromise the quality of tissues and corneas.[28] Therefore, it would be useful to improve the awareness of the tissue retrieval guideline among the junior doctors and relevant healthcare workers who are involved in the process of corneal donation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

We observed that the amount of ophthalmology teaching provided during the undergraduate training was low, with a mean number of 11 days. Therefore, it would be difficult or impractical to incorporate teaching on corneal donation in undergraduate training. Moreover, depending on the clinical rotation during the Foundation Year programme, many doctors may never be involved in the discussion of organ and tissue donations, as shown in our survey. Interestingly, the knowledge of corneal donation was not shown to be influenced by the amount of undergraduate teaching, previous ophthalmology rotation, and previous discussion with family on corneal donation Therefore, training on corneal (and tissue) donation may be best targeted during postgraduate training, particularly in training rotations that usually deal with end-of-life care such as intensive care and oncology specialties. A potential strategy could be to incorporate a short mandatory training course (e.g. 30 minutes) at the start of these training rotations or be included as part of the junior doctor induction pack to improve the knowledge of corneal and tissue donation. In fact, Piemonte et al.[31] found that training for physicians and nurses was the only modifiable factor to improve organ donation in intensive care units. Interestingly, previous discussion with family on corneal donation was not associated with a knowledge of corneal donation. As discussion of corneal and tissue donation with the family is relatively low among the junior doctors, we suggest that training of junior doctors should focus more on raising the awareness of the time limits and earlier death certification and notification of the relevant eye donation/retrieval personnel, instead of improving the knowledge of the actual contraindications of corneal and tissue donation. Apart from forming part of their induction, a model could be established by which the junior doctors could trigger contact with the specialised nurse-led retrieval team, if one exists in the hospital, who would then be better placed to initiate the consent process with the relatives of the deceased.

The UK currently operates on a ‘soft opt-out’ system whereby all adults are assumed to be organ and tissue donors. However, donation cannot be proceeded without the consent of family members of the deceased patient. Therefore, the implementation of an opt-out system

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

may not automatically translate to an improvement in organ and tissue donations.[32] A systematic review conducted by Ahmad et al.[20] showed that opt-out systems increase the donation rate by 21-76% over 5-14 years. However, another review demonstrated a conflicting finding whereby the donation rate was similar between opt-out and opt-in systems, highlighting the need for addressing other barriers to organ donation. One of the main barriers could be attributed to the misperception of the opt-out system, as shown in our survey. While 72% of the junior doctors were aware of the new opt-out system, only 39% of them were correct about the fact that donation cannot proceed in the event of family refusal. Such misperception may affect the rate of donation as the junior doctors would not take the initiatives to discuss about organ and tissue donations, thinking that presumed consent automatically translates to donation.

One of the study limitations was that this survey only included the junior doctors working in the East Midlands, UK. However, these junior doctors were likely to have graduated from different medical schools, as reflected by the difference in the amount of undergraduate ophthalmology training received. It would be useful to survey the junior doctors working in other regions of the UK to enable a more generalised assessment of the knowledge and postgraduate training in corneal donation in the future. The reason we chose to survey junior doctors because they are the group of doctors who are most commonly involved in the initial process of death certification, which triggers the notification of the eye donation team. Secondly, the accuracy of the collected data relied on the honesty of the participants as this study was performed as an online survey. However, the relatively low number of correct responses provided by the respondents suggests that these were likely the true responses of the junior doctors.

Our survey highlighted that there were clear deficits in the knowledge of corneal donation and the new opt-out system among the junior doctors in East Midland, UK. Given the persistent shortage of donor corneas and the recent impact of COVID-19 on corneal

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

donation, further targeted postgraduate training, particularly in specialties that deal with end-of-life care, could potentially enhance the corneal and tissue donation rate in the future. Similar studies exploring the knowledge and barriers to organ and non-ocular tissue donations would be valuable. In addition, consolidating the tissue donation endeavour for all tissues into one organised approach would reduce duplication and the potential aggravation caused to the relatives of the deceased at a time when they are grieving and vulnerable.

CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT

Study conceptualisation and design: BP and DSJT

Data collection: BP, OATL, PF, NEN, and all collaborators.

Date interpretation: BP, EB, DGS, HSD and DSJT

Manuscript drafting: BP and DSJT

Critical revision of the manuscript: OATL, PF, NEN, EB, DGS and HSG.

Final approval of the manuscript: All authors.

Funding: DSJT acknowledges support from the Medical Research Council / Fight for Sight Clinical Research Fellowship (MR/T001674/1), and the Fight for Sight / John Lee, Royal College of Ophthalmologists Primer Fellowship (24CO4).

Competing interests: None

Acknowledgement: None

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

MAIN MESSAGES

- Junior doctors play an important role in the eye donation pathway.
- Currently, there is a lack of knowledge of corneal donation and the new opt-out system among the junior doctors.
- Targeted postgraduate training during the induction process may potentially enhance the corneal donation rate.

CURRENT RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- Will targeted postgraduate training during the induction process improve the corneal and tissue donation rate?
- What is the knowledge of organ donation among the junior doctors?
- Can early death certification result in improvement in the quality and utilisation of donor corneas?

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

REFERENCES

1. Flaxman SR, Bourne RRA, Resnikoff S, Ackland P, Braithwaite T, Cicinelli MV, et al. Global causes of blindness and distance vision impairment 1990-2020: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Glob Health. 2017;5(12):e1221-e34.
2. Ting DSJ, Ho CS, Deshmukh R, Said DG, Dua HS. Infectious keratitis: An update on epidemiology, causative microorganisms, risk factors, and antimicrobial resistance. Eye (Lond). 2021; doi: 10.1038/s41433-020-01339-3.
3. Tan DT, Dart JK, Holland EJ, Kinoshita S. Corneal transplantation. Lancet. 2012;379(9827):1749-61.
4. Hos D, Matthaei M, Bock F, Maruyama K, Notara M, Clahsen T, et al. Immune reactions after modern lamellar (DALK, DSAEK, DMEK) versus conventional penetrating corneal transplantation. Prog Retin Eye Res. 2019;73:100768.
5. Ting DS, Sau CY, Srinivasan S, Ramaesh K, Mantry S, Roberts F. Changing trends in keratoplasty in the West of Scotland: a 10-year review. Br J Ophthalmol. 2012;96(3):405-8.
6. Woo JH, Ang M, Htoon HM, Tan D. Descemet Membrane Endothelial Keratoplasty Versus Descemet Stripping Automated Endothelial Keratoplasty and Penetrating Keratoplasty. Am J Ophthalmol. 2019;207:288-303.
7. Thuret G, Courrier E, Poinard S, Gain P, Baud'Huin M, Martinache I, et al. One threat, different answers: the impact of COVID-19 pandemic on cornea donation and donor selection across Europe. Br J Ophthalmol. 2020; doi: 10.1136/bjophthalmol-2020-317938.
8. Gain P, Jullienne R, He Z, Aldossary M, Acquart S, Cognasse F, et al. Global Survey of Corneal Transplantation and Eye Banking. JAMA Ophthalmol. 2016;134(2):167-73.
9. Lawlor M, Kerridge I, Ankeny R, Dobbins TA, Billson F. Specific unwillingness to donate eyes: the impact of disfigurement, knowledge and procurement on corneal donation. Am J Transplant. 2010;10(3):657-63.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

10. Acharya M, Farooqui JH, Dave A, Chaku D, Ganguly KK, Das A, et al. Eye donation in north India: Trends, awareness, influences and barriers. Indian J Ophthalmol. 2019;67(10):1570-4.
11. Noopur G, Praveen V, Radhika T, Sanjeev KG, Mani K, Deepak K. Attitudes and Perception Towards Eye Donation in Patients with Corneal Disease: A Case-controlled Population-based Study. Curr Eye Res. 2018;43(6):734-9.
12. Williams AM, Muir KW. Awareness and attitudes toward corneal donation: challenges and opportunities. Clin Ophthalmol. 2018;12:1049-59.
13. Gillon S, Hurlow A, Rayment C, Zacharias H, Lennard R. Obstacles to corneal donation amongst hospice inpatients: a questionnaire survey of multi-disciplinary team member's attitudes, knowledge, practice and experience. Palliat Med. 2012;26(7):939-46.
14. Ting DS, Potts J, Jones M, Lawther T, Armitage WJ, Figueiredo FC. Impact of telephone consent and potential for eye donation in the UK: the Newcastle Eye Centre study. Eye (Lond). 2016;30(3):342-8.
15. Ting DS, Potts J, Jones M, Lawther T, Armitage WJ, Figueiredo FC. Changing trend in the utilisation rate of donated corneas for keratoplasty in the UK: The North East England Study. Eye (Lond). 2016;30(11):1475-80.
16. Gupta N, Vashist P, Ganger A, Tandon R, Gupta SK. Eye donation and eye banking in India. Natl Med J India. 2018;31(5):283-6.
17. Röck D, Bartz-Schmidt KU, Röck T. Rates of and Experiences with Corneal Donation at the University Hospital Tübingen From 2002 To 2015. Ann Transplant. 2016;21:433-8.
18. Ting DSJ, Peh G, Adnan K, Mehta J. Translational and Regulatory Challenges of Corneal Endothelial Cell Therapy: A Global Perspective. Tissue Eng Part B Rev. 2021; doi: 10.1089/ten.TEB.2020.0319.
19. Iacobucci G. Organ donation: England will have "opt-out" system from May 2020. BMJ. 2020;368:m752.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

20. Ahmad MU, Hanna A, Mohamed AZ, Schlindwein A, Pley C, Bahner I, et al. A Systematic Review of Opt-out Versus Opt-in Consent on Deceased Organ Donation and Transplantation (2006-2016). World J Surg. 2019;43(12):3161-71.
21. Hakeem AR, Dave R, Prasad KR, Menon KV, Lewington A, Fernando B, et al. An imperative need to change organ donation and transplant curriculum results of a nationwide United kingdom junior doctor survey. Transplantation. 2015;99(4):771-85.
22. https://www.transfusionguidelines.org/red-book/chapter-21-tissue-banking-tissue-retrieval-and-processing/21-2-retrieval. [accessed on 1st December 2020]
23. Welch S, Eckstein M. Ophthalmology teaching in medical schools: a survey in the UK. Br J Ophthalmol. 2011;95(5):748-9.
24. Baylis O, Murray PI, Dayan M. Undergraduate ophthalmology education - A survey of UK medical schools. Med Teach. 2011;33(6):468-71.
25. Weller JM, Barrow M, Gasquoine S. Interprofessional collaboration among junior doctors and nurses in the hospital setting. Med Educ. 2011;45(5):478-87.
26. Ladin K. Organ Donation as a Collective Action Problem: Ethical Considerations and Implications for Practice. AMA J Ethics. 2016;18(2):156-62.
27. Paraz CM, Truong HT, Sai DK, Cajucom-Uy HY, Chan CL, Kassim SM. Knowledge and attitudes toward corneal donation among Singaporean youth: a cross-sectional study. Eye Vis (Lond). 2016;3:17.
28. Röck T, Hofmann J, Thaler S, Bramkamp M, Bartz-Schmidt KU, Yoeruek E, et al. Factors that influence the suitability of human organ-cultured corneas. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol. 2016;254(1):135-41.
29. Patel D, Tandon R, Ganger A, Vij A, Lalwani S, Kumar A. Study of death to preservation time and its impact on utilisation of donor corneas. Trop Doct. 2017;47(4):365-70.
30. Munir WM, Brown CH, Munir SZ, Hoover CK. Effect of Body Refrigeration Time on Cornea Donor Tissue. Cornea. 2021.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

31. Piemonte G, Migliaccio ML, Bambi S, Bombardi M, D'Antonio L, Guazzini A, et al. Factors influencing consent to organ donation after brain death certification: a survey of 29 Intensive Care Units. Minerva Anestesiol. 2018;84(9):1044-52.
32. Hossain P. Presumed consent and the implications for eye donation. Eye (Lond). 2020; doi: 10.1038/s41433-020-01266-3.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. A summary of the knowledge of corneal and tissue donation amongst junior doctors in the UK. Columns 1-3 and 7-13 are related to general health or systemic conditions whereas columns 4-6 are related to ocular conditions. For each question, the correct response is provided in bracket (Y = Suitable for donation; N = Not suitable for donation). The answers provided by the respondents are divided into either correct, incorrect or uncertain responses. CNS = Central nervous system; DM = Diabetes mellitus; COPD = Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease

Figure 2. A summary of the eye donation process in England. This pathway highlights the important role of junior doctors, who are often the first point of contact in certifying hospital death and influencing the timeliness of body refrigeration in mortuary and notification of the eye / tissue donation team.

Knowledge of cornea and tissue donation among the junior doctors



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252895; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Tissue and Eye Donation Process In England