Evaluating Criteria-Based Thresholds in Cataract Commissioning and Their Contribution to Variable Access to Surgery – an Observational Study

J. Lisle[1], N. Ansari[2]

[1]Department of Ophthalmology, Rotherham General Hospital, Sheffield; [2]Department of Ophthalmology, Royal Hallamshire Hospital, Sheffield

Copyright
The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in BMJ editions and any other BMJPGL products and sublicences such use and exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence.

Competing Interests
All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form (available on request from the corresponding author) and declare:
no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years, no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Contributors and guarantor:

JL was the principal author, contributed to design and data collection, performed the analysis, and prepared this article. NA contributed to study design and data collection, and the drafting of this article. Mr Mohamad Jabir, Consultant Ophthalmologist, Department of Ophthalmology, Rotherham General Hospital, Sheffield, is the guarantor. (mohamad.jabir@nhs.net)

Transparency declaration
The lead author affirms that this manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained.

Ethical Approval
Ethical approval was not required for this study, as it is based on publicly accessible information relating to patient populations and involved not patient level intervention.

Funding and Study Sponsors
This study received no funding and had no sponsors.

Patient and public involvement:
There was no involvement from individual patients or members of the public, analysis was done on a population basis

Trial registration details (registry and number) – N/A

Data sharing statement – No additional data available

Protocol – N/A

STROBE Observational Study checklist: attached in a supplementary file

Abstract

Objectives

Previous work has suggested wide variation in policies for cataract surgery across different Commissioning Groups, but did not evaluate the potential impact of that variation on access.

This study characterises the variation in rates of cataract surgery across England, reviews threshold policies against NICE guidance, and explores whether stringency of policy has a significant effect on access, to determine whether threshold policies are contributing to unequal access to surgery. It examines the effect of social deprivation and the impact of prior approval processes, where these are in place.

Methods

Information on number of surgeries undertaken and threshold policy were provided from 127 Clinical Commissioning Groups ("CCGs") through Freedom of Information request. The results were grouped by threshold stringency and analysed on an age group-corrected basis. ANOVA testing was performed to assess effect of policy stringency on regional rates of cataract surgery.

Results

In the population over 60 years old, rates of cataract surgery vary across CCGs, from 1,980 to 6,427 per 100,000 population with a standard deviation (784.76) of 22% of the mean value, 3,598.

There is variability in threshold policies for cataract surgery between CCGs: 33 had no policy, 45 utilised NICE-compliant policies, accessible on the basis of Quality of Life ("QoL") impact, and 39 required that Visual Acuity ("VA") threshold be exceeded, against current NICE guidance. Increasing restrictiveness of policy is associated with decreasing rates of cataract surgery ($p<0.01$) and accounts for 18% of the total variation seen. Variation in deprivation across CCGs contributes to 11% of the total deviation ($p<0.01$).

There is little evidential basis to many policies, with 40% of policies not citing any supporting evidence. Prior approval processes represent 7.3% of total cataract activity but are not significantly associated with a reduced rate of cataract surgery ($p=0.56$).

Conclusion

Over two-thirds of CCGs continue to use threshold-based policies for access to cataract surgery, with increasing stringency of policy associated with decreasing cataract activity. A third of CCGs control access solely on the basis of visual acuity requirements, despite NICE guidance to the contrary. There is a need for consistency in policy across CCGs, and introduction of validated quality of life impact assessment tool to reduce variability of access.

Introduction

Cataract is the primary cause of blindness globally, and the second leading cause of visual impairment[1]. Surgery is the only effective treatment[2]; and is the most commonly performed surgical procedure in the UK, with more than 400,000 cases performed each year[3]. It has excellent outcomes, and is associated with improvements in visual acuity (VA), visual function, and quality of life (QOL)[4–6].

Unfortunately, rates of cataract surgery across England demonstrate significant geographical variability, suggesting inequitable access and creating an emerging public impression of a "postcode lottery"[7,8]. The Royal National Institute for the Blind reported that in 2015/16 rates of cataract surgery across England varied from 328 to 1,166 per 100,000 of total population[9]. This variability appears to be widening over time despite absolute rates of surgery increasing to meet rising demand, as for the period 1998-2003, rates of cataract surgery between local authority areas ranged more narrowly from 172 to 548 people per 100,000 population[10]. The reasons for these differences in surgery rates remain largely unclear. In the US, population studies have linked age, deprivation, race, UV exposure, and urban vs rural residency[11]; but to-date, only social deprivation has been positively correlated with higher rates of cataract surgery in the UK ($r^2 = 0.24$ in 2007)[10]. Previous work has identified significant regional variation of clinical thresholds for access to surgery[7], but until now work has focused on population demographics, and the effect of local policy on rates of surgery has been overlooked.

In England, 135 Clinical Commissioning Groups determine health policy for local populations of typically a few hundred thousand people. The policies include whether and what thresholds are set for access to cataract surgery, and are expected to comply with guidance from the National Institute of Clinical Excellence ("NICE"). A 2012 evaluation of CCG commissioning policies found marked variation of commissioning policies for cataract surgery across CCGs, and highlighted the use of arbitrary visual acuity thresholds to determine access[7]. In response to this and the variability in rates of cataract operations, the Royal College of Ophthalmologists published its 2015 evidence-based guidance on commissioning for cataract surgery[12], recommending access to surgery on the basis of visual function as opposed to visual acuity. Subsequently, NICE published the results of its systematic review and economic modelling for cataract surgery in 2016[13]. Because of the progressive nature of cataracts, this suggested that with very few exceptions, immediate first-eye surgery is cost-effective, even with no immediate health-related quality of life gain. For the majority of symptomatic patients it is not cost-effective to delay surgery until a visual acuity threshold is met, and NICE guidance was duly updated to advise "not to restrict access to cataract surgery on the basis of visual acuity". Despite this, subsequent evidence has continued to point towards increasingly restrictive commissioning policies: a recent investigation by *The BMJ* found that the proportion of referrals for cataract surgery subject to a prior approval process was increasing, representing 22% of the total cataract activity in 2018/2019[14].

In this study, we describe CCGs' commissioning policies for cataract surgery and evaluate their compliance with NICE guidance. We characterise the variation in rates of cataract surgery across England, and explore any association with restrictiveness of policy, to determine whether threshold policies are contributing to unequal access to surgery. Finally, we examine the effect of social deprivation and the impact of prior approval processes, where these are in place.

Methods

A Freedom of Information (FOI) request was made to 135 CCGs in England in July 2020. Each CCG was asked to provide their clinical threshold policy for cataract surgery and, for each financial year from 2016-17 to 2019-20, to provide the following:

- The number of prior approval requests the CCG received for cataract surgery;
- The number of prior approval requests for cataract surgery that the CCG approved;
- The CCG's total number of cataract operations carried out.

Healthcare Resource Groups (HRG) is a clinical coding system used in hospitals across England. Cataract activity data was collected using cataract-related HRG codes, the complete list of which is attached in Appendix 1.

Two authors independently reviewed the responses and assessed each CCG's cataract commissioning policy threshold criteria. Specified lifestyle factors and Snellen chart visual acuity requirements were noted, as well as thresholds for second eye surgery. Each policy's date of publication was recorded, along with the nature of any referenced evidence, if present. To calculate local rates of cataract surgery, responses were collated with the 2019/20 age-stratified registered population for each CCG as obtained from NHS Digital online publications[15], and calculated as the number of cataract operations per 100,000 of over-60 population of each CCG to control for variation in age demographics. CCG budget allocation for 2019/20 was also obtained from NHS Digital online publications. The Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) was used as a measure of social deprivation for each CCG. The IMD is a calculated measure of social deprivation, incorporating seven distinct domains of deprivation including income, employment, and health, and is published as an anonymised dataset by the Office for National Statistics[16].

Policies were grouped according to their compliance with current NICE guidance not to restrict access on the basis of visual acuity. Accordingly, three groups of increasing restrictiveness were formed, based on whether a patient could access surgery based on visual acuity, or quality of life impact:

- Those with no policy
- Policies that can be satisfied by a QOL impact (i.e. those with QOL only, or QOL *or* VA requirements)
- NICE – incompliant policies requiring a VA impact (i.e. those with VA only, or VA *and* QOL requirements). Patients in this group with a VA above the requirement would be unable to access surgery, regardless of the severity of the impact on their quality of life.

To assess the impact on restrictiveness of policy on cataract surgery rates, analysis of variance (ANOVA) testing was performed on the cohorts, and a Tukey's test for post-hoc analysis of pairwise differences between the groups. The Eta-squared measure of effect size was calculated to give an estimate of the proportion of variance accounted for by the variation in policy restrictiveness. To assess whether budget limitations were driving policy decisions, a secondary ANOVA test was performed on the CCG's budget per head for each of the cohorts. Pearsons' correlation coefficient was calculated for IMD scores to determine the effect size of deprivation on variation in surgery rates.

Results

Of the 135 CCGs contacted, 127 (94%) responded. Ten (7%) did not provide information on cataract surgery activity and were excluded, to leave 117 CCGs (87%) for analysis.

Variation in commissioning policy

There was wide variability of policy criteria between CCGs (Table 1). Thirty-three CCGs (28%) had no policy in place restricting access. Of those with policies in place, 45 utilised NICE-compliant thresholds based on quality of life impact: a small minority, 6, with solely a QOL requirement, and 39 allowing for consideration of visual acuity *or* lifestyle factors. One third of CCGs (39) restricted access to surgery on the basis of visual acuity, against current NICE recommendations. Eight of these did so based on visual acuity alone, and 31 required both a visual acuity *and* QOL threshold to be reached.

Visual acuity requirements in CCGs requiring a visual acuity threshold were either 6/9 or 6/12. There was no overall difference in surgery rates between those setting the threshold at 6/9 and those setting it at 6/12.

Six CCGs utilised assessment questionnaires which numerically scored VA and QOL impact, with a minimum total score threshold. Four CCGs used one questionnaire tool, scored such that a minimum VA of 6/9 needed to be reached regardless of QOL measures. One questionnaire required a minimum score in both VA and QOL domains, and the final questionnaire's threshold could be reached with QOL impact score alone. Accordingly, these CCGs were grouped based on these VA and QOL requirements, irrespective of their use of questionnaires.

Only four CCGs made no provision for second eye surgery in their cataract commissioning policies. The majority (64) required the same criteria as for the first eye, with a further eight adding anisometropia in addition to the first eye surgery criteria. Eight CCGs had markedly more restrictive criteria for second eye surgery, with a best-corrected visual acuity requirement of 6/24 in the second eye.

Policy Type	**Number of CCGs**	**Cataract procedures/ 100,000 over 60 population**	**2020 CCG Budget allocation/ head £k**
No Threshold Policy	**33**	**4,039**	**1,866**
NICE-compliant QOL threshold	**45**	**3,631**	**1,822**
QOL only	6	3,642	1,786
QOL or VA	39	3,629	1,829
6/9	18	3,767	1,905
6/12	21	3,511	1,738
NICE-incompliant VA threshold	**39**	**3,186**	**1,809**
Visual Acuity alone	8	2,870	1,836
6/9	1	2,311	1,987
6/12	7	2,950	1,811
Visual Acuity and QOL	31	3,268	1,802
6/9	24	3,231	1,810
6/12	7	3,394	1,779
Total	**117**		

Table 1: Rates of cataract surgery and CCG budget allocation for cohorts of stringency of policy

Quality of Life measures

There was substantial heterogeneity in specified QOL measures across CCGs. Precise wording varied across policies, but QOL considerations were categorised into general areas incorporating binocular driving, occupational requirements, reduced contrast sensitivity, glare, reading, falls, caring needs, activities of daily living, and medical, e.g. for assessment of medical retina conditions or glaucoma. Policies were most likely to consider glare and binocular driving, with few considering falls risk or caring needs.

Policy QOL parameter	**Number of CCGs considering**
Binocular driving	36
Glare	32
Occupation	22
Reading	19
Medical assessment	19
Reduced contrast sensitivity	14
ADLS	12
Caring needs	7
Falls	6

Table 1: Number of CCG policies considering different QOL measures

Rates of cataract surgery

Rates of cataract surgery ranged varied across CCGs, from 1,980 to 6,427 per 100,000 population over 60 years' age (3.24 fold variation), with a standard deviation (784.76) of 22% of the mean value, 3,598.

Rates of surgery per 100,000 population over 60 were highest in CCGs with no threshold policy (4,039, n=33), followed by those with QOL requirements limiting access (3631, n=45), and finally those restricting on the basis of visual acuity (3185, n=39) (Table 1). There was a statistically significant difference between groups as determined by Analysis of Variance ($F(2, 114) = 12.8$, $p=<0.001$). Post-hoc analyses using Tukey's HSD showed that rates of cataract surgery were significantly higher in CCGs with no policy restricting access, when compared to CCGs with a QOL ($p=0.037$) or VA ($p<0.001$) requirement, and that there was a significant difference between the QOL and VA requirement groups ($p=0.020$). The effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.183$) demonstrated that variation in policy accounted for 18.3% of the total variance seen.

Deprivation was significantly associated with increased rates of cataract surgery ($R^2=0.11$, $p<0.01$). There was no association between restrictiveness of policy and CCG budget allocation per person ($p=0.39$), and Tukey's post hoc analysis showed no significant difference in budget between any of the groups.

Rate of Cataract Surgery /100,000 over 60 population	No Policy (N=33)	QOL Limitation (N=45)	VA Limitation (N=39)	Total (N=117)
Mean	4039.31	3630.94	3186.15	3597.86
Std.Dev.	947.74	641.73	549.74	784.76

Table 4: Variance in Rate of cataract surgery /100,000 population over 60, by policy cohort



Figure 1: Rates of cataract surgery by policy stringency. *The shaded boxes extend to 1 standard deviation above and below the mean, which divides the data set. The whiskers extend to the minimum value and maximum value.*

Prior Approval

Prior approval requests totalled 33,306, of which 30,649 (92%) were approved, representing 7.3% of the total cataract activity (Table 3). A larger number of commissioning groups reported single-digit figures, often excluded for patient confidentiality purposes, which were most likely exceptional requests for cases not meeting threshold criteria. Thirteen CCGs reported more than 10% of 2019/20 activity generated from prior approval requests, and six CCGs had all of their cataract activity generated from prior approval processes. These six CCGs had a lower mean rate of cataract surgery per 100,000 over-60 population (M=3429) when compared to the other 111 CCGs (M= 3608), however the difference was not significant (p=0.56). Both the absolute number of prior approvals, and the proportion of total cataract activity that this represents, has increased each year since 2017/2018.

Year	PA requests Received by CCGS	PA Requests Accepted	Number Rejected	Total cataract activity	Proportion of Total Activity generated by PA (%)
2016/17	21,268	20,371	897	338,334	6.0
2017/18	22,708	21,637	1,071	362,913	6.0
2018/19	27,479	26,357	1,122	397,960	6.6
2019/20	33,306	30,649	2,657	419,225	7.3

Table 4: Prior approval and total cataract activity for the four financial years 2016-2020

Use of evidence in policies

Of the 84 CCGs with cataract commissioning policies, a quarter (21) cited current NICE guidance as supporting evidence. Curiously, six of these are restricting access on the basis of visual acuity (Table 4). Twenty-three policies referenced evidence, but not current NICE guidance, and 40 did not cite any supporting evidence. Given the paucity of evidence for the threshold policies, the majority were surprisingly recently updated: just seven were dated before the most recent publication of NICE guidance in 2016 (Table 5).

	Number of CCGs		
	No Evidence	Evidenced, but not current NICE	References Current NICE Guidance
NICE Compliant	15	15	15
NICE Non-Compliant	25	8	6
Percentage compliant	37.5%	65%	71%

Table 2: Evidential basis of cataract surgery policies

Date published	Undated	2014	2015	2016 NICE guidance issued	2017	2018	2019	2020
Number of CCGs	1	1	5	1	8	22	29	18

Table 3: Date of publication of cataract surgery policies across CCGs

Discussion

Salient findings

Over two-thirds of CCGs continue to restrict access to cataract surgery through clinical thresholds, with wide variation of policy criteria across CCGs. This study confirms the previously reported geographical variation in rates of cataract surgery, with a three-fold difference between the lowest and highest rates of surgery in the over 60 population and a standard deviation of 22% of the mean value. Although a degree of variability is to be expected due to differences in regional population characteristics, these figures account for age and it is difficult to reconcile them with what might be considered reasonable within the context of an equitable health service. Presence of a threshold policy, increasing restrictiveness of policy, and a higher level of socioeconomic deprivation are all significantly associated with reduced rates of surgery. Differences in deprivation across CCGs account for 11% of the total deviation, with variation in policy accounting for 18.3% of the total variance seen, suggesting that commissioning patterns are contributing more to regional variation in NHS cataract surgery rates than deprivation.

Despite four years having elapsed since the 2016 publication of current NICE guidance, a significant number of CCGs do not reflect NICE guidance in their policy, with one third restricting access on the basis of visual acuity despite NICE guidance to the contrary[13]. There is little or no evidential basis to many of the policies: although 92% of policies were updated after the 2016 NICE guidance, only a quarter of CCGs referenced the publication, with 48% not citing any evidence as the basis for their commissioning policy. Eleven CCGs still consider cataract surgery a "procedure of limited clinical value", despite its well-established excellent clinical outcomes and cost-effectiveness.

Strengths and Limitations

The FOI request had a good response rate (94%), and association between restrictiveness of policy and rate of surgery is highly significant, remaining so when populations are corrected for age. The number of CCGs mentioning a visual acuity requirement (78) is consistent with *The BMJ's* 2019 report (76), and the proportion of CCGs with no policy (28%) concordant with a 2017 RCOphth survey of clinical leads (34%)[17]. The variation described here is notably similar to that found in the 2012/13 NHS Atlas of Variation[1], which found a 2.9-fold variation of 1596 to 4610 operations per 100,000 population over 65 (M=3033).

The effects of IMD and policy differences found in this study leave 70.7% of the variance unexplained, despite correcting for age, and the study has several limitations. A major weakness of this study is the dependence on the nature and quality of the FOI response data, which may be unreliable. We cannot exclude variations in the way FOI data were collected or processed across CCGs. Additionally, our analysis is based upon criteria for first-eye surgery, but responses did not separate cataract activity between first- and second-eye surgery. Although only 10% of CCGs had more restrictive policies for second eye surgery, there is the possibility of distinct patterns of variation across CCGs for first- and second-eye surgery. Thirdly, private cataract surgery is, necessarily, omitted from this study because it bypasses CCG threshold criteria. However regional patterns of private work may contribute to the variability in rates of surgery across CCGs, and explain the discrepancy between the effect size of deprivation found in this study (11%), and that previously reported by Keenan *et al* (24%)[10], who used hospital episode statistics inclusive of private activity. Fourthly, the decision to set the level for age-correction at 60 years was based in part on a median age of cataract surgery of 67.7 years in the US[11]. However, this was based on data from the 1980s and, although results were significant regardless of correction for age, the decision for setting for over 60 as opposed to over 55, or 70, is arbitrary. Finally, in our interpretation of these results, we assume that policy is translated into practice, when adherence to these policies by referring ophthalmologists is not necessarily guaranteed. If clinicians were only loosely adhering to policy, this would perhaps explain the lack of effect of more restrictive VA requirements. A 2017 survey of ophthalmologists[17] found

that for the majority (73%), there was no specific monitoring of adherence to thresholds to access. On the other hand, this study found no association between reduced rates of surgery and prior approval processes which bypass clinician autonomy and drive higher compliance to policy, suggesting that policies are adhered to in practice. Finally, in addition to explicit criteria-based restrictions, and indeed even in CCGs without policies in place, it is possible that commissioners are utilizing implicit rationing to limit access: for example, by indirectly incentivising private operations through longer waiting times.

Heterogeneity of policies makes direct comparison between policies difficult, particularly between QOL considerations. A 2012 evaluation of threshold policies for cataract surgery[7] found a similarly substantial variability over the same domains, suggesting that these have not been revisited in almost a decade. The most common factor considered across CCGs is driving, however due to DVLA driving requirements being based on a minimum visual acuity of 6/12[18], this is essentially a surrogate visual acuity requirement. While this study shows that thresholds do impact access, and the impact is greater if policies are more restrictive, there is evidence to suggest that prioritization tools using QOL measures to assess visual function (as opposed to visual acuity) may be beneficial to allocate resources to patients with greater clinical need[19], and reduce waiting times[20]. If the NHS is to introduce prioritization for cataract surgery based on QOL impacts, these requirements need to be clearer and more consistent between CCGs. Indeed, it is unclear whether inconsistency in policies may be, in part, due to existing prioritization of competing health needs that vary across CCGS.

CCGs stand to benefit from restricting access, by reducing the number of operations and therefore expenditure. One may reasonably assume that financial constraints are a driving factor behind restrictiveness of commissioning policies, with less well-funded CCGs utilising stricter criteria to manage finite budgets. However, the CCG budget allocation formula includes weighting for health need. We found no association between stringency of policy and CCG budget allocation per person ($p=0.39$); suggesting that CCG funding per head is not driving policy decisions.

A notable proportion of cataract activity (7.3%) is from prior approval. This study found that both the absolute number of prior approvals, and the proportion of total cataract activity that this represents, has increased each year since 2016 (6.0%, 6.0%, and 6.6% respectively). A 2019 investigation by the BMJ[14] generated similar findings across all three years, but with an even higher proportion of prior approval activity for 2018/19 (7.0%, 10% and 22% respectively).The cause for the dissimilarity is unclear, given both studies used FOI requests to obtain the same information on prior approvals requested for those years. The difference may be due to differences in the selection of responding CCGs, but could also attest to unreliability of FOI response data. This study found no significant difference between CCGs using prior approval and those not, suggesting that the onerous process is a superfluous one for minimal or no benefit. Given that 92.7% of cataract activity was not through prior approval processes, this study suggests that it is unlikely to be a main factor for variable rates across CCGs. Instead, access is being limited largely by the presence and stringency of threshold policies themselves, rather than the way these are processed.

Conclusion

This study confirms previous work identifying wide variation across CCGs in both rates of cataract surgery, and criteria for access. Furthermore, this is the first study that the authors are aware of to report a significant association between the presence and restrictiveness of cataract surgery criteria, and the established geographical variability in rates of cataract surgery. It suggests that, against national guidance, commissioners continue to limit access to surgery to many patients with capacity to benefit, using arbitrary thresholds and with almost half of all policies having no evidential basis. A notable proportion of CCGs still utilise resource-intensive prior approval processes for cataracts, or consider surgery a “procedure of limited clinical value”. These findings are contrary to the established

clinical benefit and cost-effectiveness of cataract surgery and current NICE guidance, and hard to reconcile with the principle of equity in healthcare.

Ethics

Ethical approval was not required for this study, as it is based on publicly accessible information relating to patient populations and involved not patient level intervention.

Appendix 1

Z30A Complex, Cataract or Lens Procedures, with CC Score 2+

BZ30B Complex, Cataract or Lens Procedures, with CC Score 0-1

BZ31A Very Major, Cataract or Lens Procedures, with CC Score 2+

BZ31B Very Major, Cataract or Lens Procedures, with CC Score 0-1

BZ32A Intermediate, Cataract or Lens Procedures, with CC Score 2+

BZ32B Intermediate, Cataract or Lens Procedures, with CC Score 0-1

BZ33Z Minor, Cataract or Lens Procedures

BZ34A Phacoemulsification Cataract Extraction and Lens Implant, with CC Score 4+

BZ34B Phacoemulsification Cataract Extraction and Lens Implant, with CC Score 2-3

BZ34C Phacoemulsification Cataract Extraction and Lens Implant, with CC Score 0-1

Bibliography

1. Pascolini, D. & Mariotti, S. P. Global estimates of visual impairment: 2010. *Br. J. Ophthalmol.* **96,** 614–618 (2012).
2. de Silva, S. R., Riaz, Y. & Evans, J. R. Phacoemulsification with posterior chamber intraocular lens versus extracapsular cataract extraction (ECCE) with posterior chamber intraocular lens for age-related cataract. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* CD008812 (2014). doi:10.1002/14651858.CD008812.pub2
3. The Royal College of Ophthalmologists. The Way Forward - Cataract Surgery. 2015. Available at < https://www.rcophth.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/RCOphth-The-Way-Forward-Cataract-300117.pdf>
4. Gillespie, L. D. *et al.* Interventions for preventing falls in older people living in the community. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* CD007146 (2012). doi:10.1002/14651858.CD007146.pub3
5. Harwood, R. H. *et al.* Falls and health status in elderly women following first eye cataract surgery: a randomised controlled trial. *Br. J. Ophthalmol.* **89,** 53–59 (2005).
6. Sach, T. H. *et al.* Falls and health status in elderly women following first eye cataract surgery: an economic evaluation conducted alongside a randomised controlled trial. *Br. J. Ophthalmol.* **91,** 1675–1679 (2007).

7. Coronini-Cronberg, S., Lee, H., Darzi, A. & Smith, P. Evaluation of clinical threshold policies for cataract surgery among English commissioners. *J Health Serv Res Policy* **17,** 241–247 (2012).

8. The NHS Atlas of Variation 2015. Map 18, 2012/13. Available at <https://fingertips.phe.org.uk/profile/atlas-of-variation>

9. RNIB. Surgery deferred. Sight denied. Variation in cataract surgery provision across England, 2013. Available at: . *Royal National Institute for the Blind* (2017). at <https://www.rnib.org.uk/sites/default/files/Surgery%20deferred%20sight%20denied%20Campaign%20report.pdf>

10. Keenan, T., Rosen, P., Yeates, D. & Goldacre, M. Time trends and geographical variation in cataract surgery rates in England: study of surgical workload. *Br. J. Ophthalmol.* **91,** 901–904 (2007).

11. Kauh, C. Y., Blachley, T. S., Lichter, P. R., Lee, P. P. & Stein, J. D. Geographic variation in the rate and timing of cataract surgery among US communities. *JAMA Ophthalmol.* **134,** 267–276 (2016).

12. The Royal College of Ophthalmologists. Commissioning Guide: Cataract Surgery. (2015). at <http://https:www.rcophth.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Commissioning-Guide-Cataract-Surgery-Final-February-2015.pdf>

13. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (UK). *Cataracts in adults: management*. (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (UK), 2017).

14. Iacobucci, G. Leading ophthalmologist vows to stamp out “unjustified” screening for cataract surgery. *BMJ* **365,** l2326 (2019).

15. Patients Registered at a GP Practice - NHS Digital. at <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/patients-registered-at-a-gp-practice>

16. English indices of deprivation 2019 - GOV.UK. at <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019>

17. 66% of Clinical Leads surveyed by the RCOphth confirm cataract rationing is restricting access to surgery - The Royal College of Ophthalmologists. at <https://www.rcophth.ac.uk/2017/11/cataract-rationing-survey-reveals-66-of-responding-eye-units-have-some-restrictions-to-access-surgery/>

18. Driving eyesight rules - GOV.UK. at <https://www.gov.uk/driving-eyesight-rules>

19. Lundström, M. *et al.* NIKE: a new clinical tool for establishing levels of indications for cataract surgery. *Acta Ophthalmol. Scand.* **84,** 495–501 (2006).

20. Ng, J. Q. & Lundström, M. Impact of a national system for waitlist prioritization: the experience with NIKE and cataract surgery in Sweden. *Acta Ophthalmol.* **92,** 378–381 (2014).

STROBE (Strengthening The Reporting of OBservational Studies in Epidemiology) Checklist

A checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies. You must report the page number in your manuscript where you consider each of the items listed in this checklist. If you have not included this information, either revise your manuscript accordingly before submitting or note N/A.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

Section and Item	Item No.	Recommendation	Reported on Page No.
Title and Abstract	1	(*a*) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(*b*) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/Rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	3
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	3
Methods			
Study Design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	4
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	4
Participants	6	(*a*) *Cohort study*—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	
		Case-control study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls	
		Cross-sectional study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	4
		(*b*) *Cohort study*—For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	
		Case-control study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	4

Section and Item	Item No.	Recommendation	Reported on Page No.
Data Sources/ Measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	4
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	4
Study Size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	4
Quantitative Variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	4
Statistical Methods	12	(*a*) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	4
		(*b*) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	4
		(*c*) Explain how missing data were addressed	4
		(*d*) *Cohort study*—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	
		Case-control study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed	
		Cross-sectional study—If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	4
		(*e*) Describe any sensitivity analyses	n/a
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	5
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	n/a
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	n/a
Descriptive Data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	5,9
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	5
		(c) *Cohort study*—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	n/a
Outcome Data	15*	*Cohort study*—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	
		Case-control study—Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	
		Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	6

Section and Item	Item No.	Recommendation	Reported on Page No.
Main Results	16	(*a*) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	6
		(*b*) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	n/a
		(*c*) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	n/a
Other Analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	6
Discussion			
Key Results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	9
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	9,10
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	9,10
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	9,10
Other Information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	1

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Once you have completed this checklist, please save a copy and upload it as part of your submission. DO NOT include this checklist as part of the main manuscript document. It must be uploaded as a separate file.