

1 PREVALENCE OF MYOPIA AMONG PUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN IN SOUTHERN  
2 BRAZIL

3

4 Authors: Patrícia Ioschpe Gus<sup>1</sup>, Raquel Silveira de Maman<sup>2</sup>, Arthur Dementshuk  
5 Lengler<sup>3</sup>, Antônia Stumpf Martins<sup>3</sup>, Maria Antônia Torres Arteche<sup>3</sup>, Marina Puerari  
6 Pieta<sup>2</sup>, Gabriel Leivas<sup>3</sup>, Rafael Carloto<sup>2</sup>, Diane Marinho<sup>4</sup>, Márcia Beatriz Tartarella<sup>5</sup>,  
7 Helena Pakter<sup>4</sup>, Caroline Fabris<sup>6</sup>, Terla Castro<sup>7</sup>, Fernando Kronbauer<sup>8</sup>, Carina  
8 Colossi<sup>9</sup>, Monica Jong<sup>10</sup>, Serge Resnikoff<sup>11</sup>.

9

10 Affiliations:

11 1 - Department of Ophthalmology, Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre, Universidade  
12 Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil.

13 2 - Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil

14 3 - Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil

15 4 - Department of Ophthalmology, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto  
16 Alegre, Brazil

17 5 - Department of Ophthalmology, Universidade Federal de São Paulo, São Paulo,  
18 Brazil

19 6 - Hospital Moinhos de Vento, Porto Alegre, Brazil

20 7 - Complexo Hospitalar Santa Casa, Porto Alegre, Brazil

21 8 - Centro de Olhos Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil

22 9 - Instituto Ivo Corrêa Meyer, Viamão, Brazil

23 10 - Johnson and Johnson Vision, Sydney, Australia

24 11- School of Optometry and Vision Science, UNSW Sydney, Australia and Consultant

25 Brien Holden Vision Institute, Sydney, Australia

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

26

27 CORRESPONDING AUTHOR: [patriciagus@me.com](mailto:patriciagus@me.com)

28

29 Abstract:

30

31 **Purpose:** Myopia has been considered a public health issue by the World Health  
32 Organization since 2015. The growing incidence of myopia worldwide, called the  
33 myopia epidemic, and its potential blinding complications in adulthood like cataract,  
34 glaucoma, retinal detachment and maculopathy, have been extensively published and  
35 discussed in peer review papers. Nonetheless, little information about Latin America  
36 is available. This study aims to detect the prevalence of myopia in southern Brazil, the  
37 biggest country of South America. **Methods:** A prospective cross sectional study  
38 recruited 330 public school children between 2019 and 2021, aged 5 to 20 years old.  
39 All children underwent a comprehensive eye examination and detailed lifestyle  
40 questionnaire. The Pearson correlation coefficient, Kruskal Wallis and the Chi-Square  
41 Test were used to assess simple correlations and associations between myopia and  
42 medical conditions, use of medications, ophthalmic history and family history of ocular  
43 conditions, besides demographics and lifestyle focused on screen time/day.  
44 Associations between the results of the ophthalmologic evaluation and all factors  
45 included in the questionnaire were analyzed using the Generalized Estimating  
46 Equation model (GEE). The prevalence of hyperopia and astigmatism were also  
47 assessed. **Results:** Total prevalence of myopia was 17.4% (CI 13.8 – 21.7%). Low  
48 myopia (-0.50D to -5.75D) comprised 15.2% (CI 11.9 – 19.3%) and high myopia (-  
49 6,00D or worse) was 2.1% (CI 1.1 – 4.1%). Relative risk of myopia for females was  
50 1.6 (CI 1.00 – 2.57%) and each additional hour of screen time increased a child's

51 chance of having myopia by 6.5%. The prevalence of hyperopia was 7,7% (CI 5.4 -  
52 10.9%) and of astigmatism, either myopic or hyperopic, was 25.6% (CI 21.4 – 30.2%).

53 **Conclusions:** Brazil has always been considered a hyperopic country. These are the  
54 highest reported prevalences of myopia under cycloplegia and the first paper to  
55 present myopia as a more prevalent refractive error than hyperopia among Brazilian  
56 school children to date.

57

58 Keywords: myopia, Brazil, schoolchildren, prevalence, epidemiology, keratoconus, dry  
59 eye.

60

## 61 **Introduction**

62

63 Myopia was recognized as a public health issue by the WHO in 2015 and is  
64 known to significantly increase the risk of complications and morbidity in the fourth  
65 decade of life, such as cataract, glaucoma, retinal detachment and myopic  
66 maculopathy [1-4]. East Asia has the highest prevalence of myopia in the world, and,  
67 alongside this, a growing prevalence of sight threatening myopia related pathologies  
68 [2,4,5]. Myopia is increasing worldwide and population-based eye health data at the  
69 country level is needed to develop strategies for public health interventions [3,6,5].

70 Japan, China, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan report prevalences of 80%  
71 or more young adults with myopia [7,8,9]. Countries of Europe and the United States  
72 have myopia rates of 30.6% and 25.4%, respectively, which rises to almost 50% if only  
73 the young population is considered (25 - 29 years old) [7,10]. Risk factors include high  
74 demanding education, many hours of reading and near work daily, little time of  
75 activities outdoors, urban areas lifestyle, parental high level education, female sex and

76 ethnicity (Asians are mostly affected) [1-9]. More recently, due to the Covid-19  
77 lockdowns, the incidence of myopia has increased approximately 4% in Chinese  
78 children aged 3 to 6 years [10]. The prevalence of myopia is lower in middle and low-  
79 income countries are described as ranging from 1.4 to 14.4% in Latin America and 3.4  
80 to 11.4% in Africa, based on ancient statistics [11,12].

81         There is little information about myopia in Brazil. Local studies have used  
82 different methodology, examined different populations and did not all use cycloplegia,  
83 which tends to overestimate myopia prevalence [13-17]. Vilar et al. compared two  
84 studies conducted in the same ophthalmology hospital in Goiânia (Goiás) at different  
85 periods of time [16]. In the evaluation carried out between 1995 and 2000, the  
86 prevalence of myopia was 3.6%; in 2014, the study found the prevalence of myopia  
87 was 9% [16]. Garcia et al. reported the prevalence of myopia among all refractive errors  
88 in Northeastern Brazil in 2001 was 13.3% in randomly selected students [14].

89         A recent review paper reported that the prevalence of myopia in Brazil was 3.6  
90 to 9.6%, but it was based on publications from several decades ago [12]. Recent  
91 papers describe higher prevalences, with rates that varied between 15.2 and 20.4%  
92 [13,17]. The first, a retrospective study carried out in São Paulo, evaluated school  
93 children under cycloplegia [17]. The second, a prospective cross-sectional study  
94 carried out in the equatorial region, evaluated school children under no cycloplegia  
95 [13]. The prevalence of myopia in southern Brazil has never been studied. There is a  
96 need to better understand the prevalence of myopia in Brazil to develop public health  
97 strategies.

98

## 99 **Materials and Methods**

100

101 This cross-sectional study was conducted in children from public schools in the  
102 region of Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul. Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre Ethics  
103 Committee approved this study, which adhered to the tenets of the Declaration of  
104 Helsinki. Guardians of the children provided written informed consent. All children  
105 underwent a comprehensive ophthalmologic examination. The children were not  
106 previously screened. A questionnaire on sociodemographic characteristics was  
107 completed by participants.

108

### 109 *Sampling*

110

111 Participants were public school children in the region of Porto Alegre and the  
112 study was part of a charitable program that provided spectacles for refractive  
113 disorders. Schools were selected by the Public Ministry. Considering the prevalence  
114 of myopia in Brazilian school children as 20.4% based on a recent study [13], a sample  
115 size of 250 was needed to achieve a 95% confidence level and a confidence interval  
116 of 10% [18,19]. The final number of participants determined was 278 to allow for up to  
117 10% non participation [19].

118 The study began in 2019, was paused due to the novel coronavirus pandemic  
119 and resumed in 2021. Children included in the study were aged 5 to 20 years.  
120 Exclusion criteria was severe neuro psychomotor developmental disorders who were  
121 unable to report visual acuity, subjects with congenital eye disorders (cataract,  
122 anophthalmic cavity, strabismus and glaucoma) and contact lens wear on the date of  
123 the exam. The examinations were conducted by medical residents and staff using a  
124 standardized protocol at 5 different medical centers in Porto Alegre: Hospital de  
125 Clínicas de Porto Alegre, Hospital Nossa Senhora da Conceição, Complexo Santa

126 Casa, Centro de Olhos Rio Grande do Sul and Instituto Ivo Corrêa Meyer. A  
127 questionnaire on sociodemographic characteristics was completed by participants.

128

### 129 Defintions

130

131 Myopia was defined as a cycloplegic spherical equivalent refraction equal to or  
132 worse than -0.50D [20]. The cut off for high myopia was defined as -6,00D or worse  
133 [10]. Spherical equivalents greater than or equal to +2.00D were defined as hyperopia  
134 [21,22]. Astigmatism was defined as -1.00D (cylindrical diopters) or more [21,23].

135

### 136 *Measurements*

137

138 All students were at first submitted to a non cycloplegic auto-refraction of both eyes  
139 (HRK 7000 Huvitz, South Korea), with at least 3 measurements per eye. Binocular  
140 UCVA and BCVA for distance were determined using a standard Snellen chart. School  
141 children with UCVA of 0 LogMAR without complaints did not undergo cycloplegia.  
142 School children with visual acuity of 0.10 LogMAR or worse, or 0 LogMAR with visual  
143 complaints, were instilled with 1% tropicamide (1 drop in each eye, repeated 5 minutes  
144 later) and evaluated after 25-30 minutes, with autorefraction (3 measurements per  
145 eye), followed by binocular subjective refraction. In hyperopic patients, binocular  
146 subjective dynamic refraction was performed prior to pupil dilation with mydriatic eye  
147 drops. All participants underwent corneal tomography using Galilei G4 (Ziemer,  
148 Germany) for keratometry and corneal thickness measurements. Keratometric  
149 keratoconus was defined as maximum keratometry >47.2D [24]. Ocular biometry using  
150 ultrasonic AL-100 biometer (Tomey, Japan) was used for axial length measurement,

151 3 measurements per eye. Subsequent evaluation consisted of retinal mapping and slit  
152 lamp biomicroscopy.

153 A questionnaire about lifestyle, medical and family history for ocular and  
154 systemic diseases, itchy eyes, history of asthma, bronchitis or rhinitis, hours of daily  
155 screen time (including cell phone, tablet and computer) and medications in use was  
156 completed by the participants and their guardians.

157

### 158 *Statistics*

159

160 All statistical analysis was performed using SPSS version 18.0 software (SPSS,  
161 Chicago). The Pearson Correlation Coefficient, Kruskal Wallis and the Chi-Square  
162 Test were used to assess simple correlations and associations between variables.  
163 Associations between the results of the ophthalmologic evaluation and all factors  
164 included in the questionnaire were analyzed using the Generalized Estimating  
165 Equation Model (GEE). Confidence interval of 95% and  $p \leq 0.05$  were chosen for  
166 statistical significance. Association between demographics and lifestyle with low and  
167 high myopia were assessed too.

168

### 169 **Results**

170

#### 171 *Participants*

172

173 A total of 333 school children were evaluated in this study and 52% of those were  
174 males. Ethnicity based on self classification was 37.5% white, 39% afro-descendants  
175 and 0.4% other; 23.1% did not classify themselves. Mean age was 12.74 years (95%

176 CI 12.38-13.10). More than half were aged 10-15 years (53.4%); 20.4% were younger  
177 than 9 years and 26.1% were older than or equal to 16 years. Most participants were  
178 from the Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre (52%). Three children were excluded  
179 from the analysis due to technical difficulties during the measurements (Table 1).

180 **Table 1 - Demographics of the 333 study participants**

	N°	Rate (%)
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	173	52
Female	160	48
<b>Skin Color</b>		
White	125	37.5
Afro-descendant	131	39
Not Referred	77	23.1
<b>Age</b>		



<= 9	68	20.4
10 - 15	178	53.4
>=16	87	26.1
Medical Center		
HCPA	174	52
HNSC	40	12
CSC	39	12
CORS	43	13
IICM	37	11

181 Note: HCPA = Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre; HNSC = Hospital Nossa  
182 Senhora da Conceição; CSC = Complexo Santa Casa; CORS = Centro de Olhos  
183 Rio Grande do Sul; IICM = Instituto Ivo Corrêa Meyer

184            Approximately 51% of children achieved UCVA 0 LogMar bilaterally and 34.5%  
185 wore spectacles. Average screen time use was 4.92 hours (95% CI 4.48-5.35). 63.4%  
186 of children rubbed their eyes; 28% used chronic medications for non-ocular conditions;  
187 26% had some type of allergy or atopy (allergic conjunctivitis; rhinitis or asthma), but  
188 only 4% used eye drops (antihistamine and/ or lubricants) regularly.

189

190 *Prevalence of refractive errors*

191

192            Prevalence of myopia was 17.4% (CI 13.8 – 21.7%). Low myopia corresponded  
193 to 15.2% (CI 11.9 – 19.3%), while high myopia was present in 2.1% (CI 1.1 – 4.1%).  
194 Mean myopia was -2.73 (SD 2.69). Hyperopia prevalence was 7.7% (CI 5.4 -10.9%)  
195 and astigmatism prevalence was 25.6% (CI 21.4 – 30.2%)(Table 2).

196 Table 2. Refractive errors prevalence

	N	Rate (%)	95% CI
Myopia ( $\geq -0.50D$ )	58	17.4	13.8 - 21.7
High Myopia ( $\geq -6.00D$ )	7	2.1	1.1-4.1
Low Myopia (-0.50 to -5.75D)	51	15.2	11.9-19.3

Hyperopia ( $\geq +2.00D$ )	26	7.7%	5.4-10.9
Astigmatism ( $\leq 1.00D$ )	1.06	25.6%	21.4-30.2

197 *Note:* CI = Confidence Interval

198

199 *Risk factors associated with myopia*

200

201 Sex disclosed a significant difference in myopia prevalence: 21.3% for females  
 202 and 13.2% for males ( $p < 0.01$ ). Females presented a relative risk of 1.6 (CI 1.00 –  
 203 2.57%) ( $p = 0.047$ ). Each additional hour of screen time increased a child's chance of  
 204 having myopia by 6.5% (CI 1.01-1.12%) ( $p = 0.01$ ). No association was found between  
 205 ethnicity, age or rubbing the eyes with low or high myopia. Table 3 shows the  
 206 association between risk factors and myopia.

207

208 **Table 3.** Association between risk factors and myopia

	RR	95% CI	SD	<i>p</i>
Sex	1.6	[1.00-2.57]	-	0.04
Age Groups	-	-	0,380	0.18

Ethnicity	-	-	0,385	0.367
Rubbing the eyes	0.63	[0.40-0.98]	-	0.043
Screen Time Use	1.06	[1.02-1.12]	-	0.01

209 *Note.* RR = Relative Risk; CI = Confidence Interval; SD = Standard Deviation

210 Considering the cut-off of -6.00D for high myopia, maximum corneal power  
 211 differed between low, with 45.1D (SD 2.00), and high myopia, with 45.7D (SD  
 212 3.00)( $p < 0.01$ ). Axial length also showed statistically significant differences between  
 213 low and high myopia: 23.58mm (SD 1.03) and 26.62mm (SD 1.01), respectively, with  
 214  $p < 0.01$ . However, we found no statistically significant difference in keratometric  
 215 keratoconus between groups ( $p = 0.56$ ). Central corneal thickness was not significantly  
 216 different between low and high myopia: 532 microns (SD 33) for low and 538 microns  
 217 (SD 56) for high myopia ( $p = 0.84$ ).

218

## 219 **Discussion**

220

221 There is limited information regarding the prevalence of myopia in Brazil and this  
 222 is the first study on myopia prevalence in southern Brazil [13,17]. Papers published  
 223 previously in other regions used different methodology (no cycloplegia; retrospective  
 224 analysis; adults included; patients from ophthalmology centers) [11,15,16]. The data

225 collected in Porto Alegre is representative of public school children from the entire  
226 country in terms of the ethnic mix, since the proportion of Caucasians and Afro-  
227 descendants is similar to the national distribution[25]. Prevalence of myopia between  
228 Caucasians and Afro-Descendants were not significantly different [9,26-28].

229

230 Environmental risk factors are known to be important in myopia development [29].  
231 An important difference between the south and the equatorial regions of Brazil is the  
232 weather. It is hot and sunny in the north and northeast for the entire year, while the  
233 south is subtropical and has four seasons. We found mean myopia was higher in the  
234 south compared to the equatorial Brazil (-2.73D in the south and -0,50D in the  
235 northeast), although both are still low [13]. Nevertheless, the difference in temperature  
236 and consequently different time of exposure to sunlight per week might influence  
237 further development of myopia in the different regions [5,13,28,30-33].

238 High levels of education are known to strongly relate to myopia [29]. Public  
239 schools in Brazil generally have unfortunately weak academic outcomes and are not  
240 demanding [35-36]. Public schools tend to have one four hour shift of classes per day  
241 with no demanding homeworks, and had no activities during the Novel Coronavirus  
242 Pandemic [38]. Nevertheless, all social classes have access to screens and the  
243 children spend most of the time indoors, using near work electronics during their spare  
244 time [39]. This might explain the apparent growing prevalence of myopia over the last  
245 decade among Brazilian school children and the higher risk of 6.5% for additional  
246 hours of near work activities reported by this study [40,41].

247 No private school children were included to avoid a possible bias, since they  
248 had access to education online during the pandemic and tend to have better quality  
249 of education overall, with more hours of schooling per day and more demanding

250 homeworks [42]. Private school children represent a small proportion of students in  
251 Brazil: 17% [36,43]. The authors plan to perform another study including private  
252 schools.

253 Exclusion of keratoconus based on careful evaluation of the corneas was  
254 performed. Keratoconus is a relatively frequent progressive bilateral ectasia that might  
255 cause blindness in adolescents and young adults, which also presents with myopia  
256 and astigmatism and might act as a confounding factor. Although keratometric  
257 keratoconus and central corneal thickness did not differ between myopia and non  
258 myopia groups in this study, rubbing the eyes increases the risk for keratoconus  
259 development [47-51] and many school children complained of itchy eyes. They were  
260 treated for different allergies (rhinitis and asthma) with oral drugs, but not with  
261 adequate eye drops.

262 Itchy eyes may also be caused by chronic dry eyes associated with excessive  
263 near work activities [40,52-56]. Proactively asking about rubbing the eyes during an  
264 ophthalmologic evaluation and informing parents and children about the risks and  
265 causes of eye rubbing should be considered as part of the eye examination routine.  
266 Besides, prescribing lubricants and antihistamine eye drops in cases of dry eyes and  
267 mild allergic conjunctivitis in children is advisable.

268 Most school children had excellent uncorrected visual acuity and the prevalence  
269 of myopia is still low in comparison to other continents, but it seems to be consistently  
270 increasing overtime [13-17]. There was an increased risk of myopia in females,  
271 previously also described in the literature [45,46]. The main possible bias of this study  
272 is the non-randomly selected sample. However, no children had previously had a  
273 vision screening and the eye exam was comprehensive with objective and subjective  
274 refraction done under cycloplegia, which performs a complete and precise evaluation.

275 Further studies understanding the prevalence of myopia in other parts of Brazil  
276 and other Latin American countries, and the factors associated with it are needed.  
277 Public health initiatives that aim to prevent myopia from increasing further and protect  
278 our future adult generations from vision permanent impairment must be taken into  
279 consideration.

## 280 Acknowledgements

281  
282 The authors acknowledge Hospital de Clínicas Central Administration and Outpatient  
283 Coordination, the employees and staff members of Ophthalmology of Hospital de  
284 Clínicas de Porto Alegre, the financial support of FIPE (Fundo de Incentivo à Pesquisa  
285 do Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre), the Biostatistics of GPPG (Grupo de  
286 Pesquisa e Pós-Graduação do Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre), the medical  
287 students, residents and fellows of Ophthalmology from all facilities, the Public Ministry  
288 of Porto Alegre and Viamão, Sorigs (Sociedade de Oftalmologia do Rio Grande do  
289 Sul) and the International Myopia Institute. Their support was essential for collecting  
290 data during the Coronavirus Pandemic and for helping to disseminate Brazilian myopia  
291 prevalence to the world in the International Myopia Conference 2022.

## 292 293 Authors Contributions

294  
295 **Patricia Ioschpe:** Conceptualization (lead); data curation (lead); formal analysis  
296 (lead); investigation (lead); methodology (lead); project administration (lead);  
297 supervision (lead); writing – original draft (lead); writing – review and editing (lead).  
298 **Raquel de Maman:** data curation (equal); formal analysis (equal); writing – original  
299 draft (equal). **Arthur Lengler:** data curation (equal); formal analysis (equal); writing –  
300 original draft (equal). **Maria Antônia Arteche:** data curation (equal), **Marina Pieta:**  
301 data curation (equal). **Gabriel Leivas:** data curation (equal); formal analysis (equal).

302 **Rafael Carloto**: data curation (equal); formal analysis (equal). **Diane Marinho**:  
303 Conceptualization (supporting); data curation (equal). **Márcia Tartarella**:  
304 Conceptualization (supporting). **Helena Pakter**: data curation (supporting), **Caroline**  
305 **Fabris**: data curation (supporting). **Terla Castro**: data curation (supporting).  
306 **Fernando Kronbauer**: data curation (supporting). **Carina Colossi**: data curation  
307 (supporting). **Monica Jong**: writing – review and editing (supporting). **Serge**  
308 **Resnikoff** writing – review and editing (supporting).

309

310 Conflicts of interest:

311 The authors report no conflicts of interest.

312

313 Bibliography:

314

315 1. The impact of myopia and high myopia: report of the Joint World Health  
316 Organization – Brien Holden Vision Institute [Internet]. Global Scientific Meeting  
317 on Myopia, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 16–18 March  
318 2015. 2 [cited 2022 May 21]. Available from: [https://myopiainstitute.org/wp-](https://myopiainstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Myopia_report_020517.pdf)  
319 [content/uploads/2020/10/Myopia\\_report\\_020517.pdf](https://myopiainstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Myopia_report_020517.pdf)

320

321 2. Németh J, Tapasztó B, Aclimandos WA, *et al.* Update and guidance on  
322 management of myopia. European Society of Ophthalmology in cooperation  
323 with International Myopia Institute. *Eur J Ophthalmol.* 2021 May;31(3):853-883.

324



- 325 3. Holden BA, Fricke TR, Wilson DA, et al. Global Prevalence of Myopia and High  
326 Myopia and Temporal Trends from 2000 through 2050. *Ophthalmology*. 2016  
327 May;123(5):1036-42.
- 328
- 329 4. Ohno-Matsui K, Lai TY, Lai CC, Cheung CM. Updates of pathologic myopia.  
330 *Prog Retin Eye Res*. 2016 May;52:156-87.
- 331
- 332 5. Sankaridurg P, Tahhan N, Kandel H, et al. Impact of Myopia. *Invest*  
333 *Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2021 Apr 28;62(5):2
- 334
- 335 6. Dolgin E. The myopia boom. *Nature*. 2015 Mar 19;519(7543):276-8.
- 336
- 337 7. Recko M, Stahl ED. Childhood myopia: epidemiology, risk factors, and  
338 prevention. *Mo Med*. 2015 Mar-Apr;112(2):116-21.
- 339
- 340 8. Morgan IG, French AN, Ashby RS, Guo X, Ding X, He M, Rose KA. The  
341 epidemics of myopia: Aetiology and prevention. *Prog Retin Eye Res*. 2018  
342 Jan;62:134-149.
- 343
- 344 9. Wu PC, Huang HM, Yu HJ, Fang PC, Chen CT. Epidemiology of Myopia. *Asia*  
345 *Pac J Ophthalmol (Phila)*. 2016 Nov/Dec;5(6):386-393.
- 346

- 347 10. Wolffsohn JS, Flitcroft DI, Gifford KL, et al. IMI - Myopia Control Reports  
348 Overview and Introduction. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2019 Feb 28;60(3):M1-  
349 M19.
- 350
- 351 11. Grzybowski A, Kanclerz P, Tsubota K, Lanca C, Saw SM. A review on the  
352 epidemiology of myopia in school children worldwide. *BMC Ophthalmol*. 2020  
353 Jan 14;20(1):27.
- 354
- 355 12. Ang, Saini. Updates on Myopia. *Springer*, Singapore; 2020. p 27-48.
- 356
- 357 13. Yotsukura E, Torii H, Ozawa H, et al. Axial Length and Prevalence of Myopia  
358 among Schoolchildren in the Equatorial Region of Brazil. *J Clin Med*. 2020 Dec  
359 31;10(1):115.
- 360
- 361 14. Lira RP, Arieta CE, Passos TH, et al. Distribution of Ocular Component  
362 Measures and Refraction in Brazilian School Children. *Ophthalmic Epidemiol*.  
363 2017 Feb;24(1):29-35.
- 364
- 365 15. Garcia CA, Oréface F, Nobre GF, Souza Dde B, Rocha ML, Vianna RN.  
366 Prevalence of refractive errors in students in Northeastern Brazil. *Arq Bras*  
367 *Oftalmol*. 2005 May-Jun;68(3):321-5.
- 368
- 369 16. Vilar MC, Abrahão MM, Mendanha Dde A, et al. Increased prevalence of  
370 myopia in an ophthalmologic hospital in Goiânia – Goiás. *Rev Bras Oftalmol*.  
371 2016 sep-oct; 75(5): 356-9. <https://doi.org/10.5935/0034-7280.20160071>

372

373 17. Costa DR, Debert I, Sussana FN, Falabreti JG, Polati M, Júnior RS. Vision for  
374 the Future Project: Screening impact on the prevention and treatment of visual  
375 impairments in public school children in São Paulo City, Brazil. *Clinics*. 2021;76:  
376 e3062 <https://doi.org/10.6061/clinics/2021/e3062>

377

378 18. Yang M, Luensmann D, Fonn D, et al. Myopia prevalence in Canadian school  
379 children: a pilot study. *Eye (Lond)*. 2018 Jun;32(6):1042-1047.

380

381 19. Borges R, Mancuso A, Camey S, et al. Power and Sample Size for Health  
382 Researchers: a tool for calculating sample size and statistical power designed  
383 for health researchers. *Clin. biomed. res*. 2021; 40(4): 247-253, 2020. ilus.

384

385 20. Flitcroft DI, He M, Jonas JB, et al. IMI - Defining and Classifying Myopia: A  
386 Proposed Set of Standards for Clinical and Epidemiologic Studies. *Invest*  
387 *Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2019 Feb 28;60(3):M20-M30.

388

389 21. Harrington SC, Stack J, Saunders K, O'Dwyer V. Refractive error and visual  
390 impairment in Ireland schoolchildren. *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2019 Aug;103(8):1112-  
391 1118.

392

393 22. Castagno VD, Fassa AG, Carret ML, Vilela MA, Meucci RD. Hyperopia: a  
394 meta-analysis of prevalence and a review of associated factors among school-  
395 aged children. *BMC Ophthalmol*. 2014 Dec 23;14:163.

396

- 397 23. O'Donoghue L, Breslin KM, Saunders KJ. The Changing Profile of Astigmatism  
398 in Childhood: The NICER Study. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2015  
399 May;56(5):2917-25.  
400
- 401 24. Belin MW, Jang HS, Borgstrom M. Keratoconus: Diagnosis and Staging. *Cornea.*  
402 2022 Jan 1;41(1):1-11.  
403
- 404 25. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística (IBGE) [Internet] 2012-2019.  
405 [updated 2022; cited 2022 Jan 24]. Available from:  
406 [https://educa.ibge.gov.br/jovens/conheca-o-brasil/populacao/18319-cor-ou-](https://educa.ibge.gov.br/jovens/conheca-o-brasil/populacao/18319-cor-ou-raca.html)  
407 [raca.html](https://educa.ibge.gov.br/jovens/conheca-o-brasil/populacao/18319-cor-ou-raca.html)  
408
- 409 26. Pan CW, Ramamurthy D, Saw SM. Worldwide prevalence and risk factors for  
410 myopia. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt.* 2012 Jan;32(1):3-16.  
411
- 412 27. Morgan IG, French AN, Ashby RS, et al. The epidemics of myopia: Aetiology and  
413 prevention. *Prog Retin Eye Res.* 2018 Jan;62:134-149.  
414
- 415 28. He M, Xiang F, Zeng Y, et al. Effect of Time Spent Outdoors at School on the  
416 Development of Myopia Among Children in China: A Randomized Clinical Trial.  
417 *JAMA.* 2015 Sep 15;314(11):1142-8.  
418
- 419 29. Wolffsohn JS, Jong M, Smith EL 3r, et al. IMI 2021 Reports and Digest -  
420 Reflections on the Implications for Clinical Practice. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.*

- 421           2021 Apr 28;62(5):1. doi: 10.1167/iov.62.5.1. PMID: 33909037; PMCID:  
422           PMC8083124.
- 423
- 424           30. Ramamurthy D, Lin Chua SY, Saw SM. A review of environmental risk factors for  
425           myopia during early life, childhood and adolescence. *Clin Exp Optom*. 2015  
426           Nov;98(6):497-506.
- 427
- 428           31. Bremond-Gignac D. Myopie de l'enfant [Myopia in children]. *Med Sci (Paris)*.  
429           2020 Aug-Sep;36(8-9):763-768.
- 430
- 431           32. Cooper J, Tkatchenko AV. A Review of Current Concepts of the Etiology and  
432           Treatment of Myopia. *Eye Contact Lens*. 2018 Jul;44(4):231-247.
- 433
- 434           33. Jones-Jordan LA, Sinnott LT, Chu RH, et al. Myopia Progression as a Function  
435           of Sex, Age, and Ethnicity. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2021 Aug 2;62(10):36.
- 436
- 437           34. Mountjoy E, Davies NM, Plotnikov D, et al. Education and myopia: assessing  
438           the direction of causality by mendelian randomisation. *BMJ*. 2018 Jun  
439           6;361:k2022. doi: 10.1136/bmj.k2022. Erratum in: *BMJ*. 2018 Jul 4;362:k2932.
- 440
- 441           35. Education Policy Outlook Brasil [Internet] 2022. [updated 2022, cited 2022 jun  
442           22]. Available from:[https://www.oecd.org/education/policy-outlook/country-](https://www.oecd.org/education/policy-outlook/country-profile-Brazil-2021-INT-PT.pdf)  
443           profile-Brazil-2021-INT-PT.pdf (pg 35-40)
- 444

- 445 36. Portal da Transparência Brasil [Internet] 2022. [updated 2022; cited 2022 jun  
446 22]. Available from: [https://www.portaltransparencia.gov.br/funcoes/12-  
447 educacao?ano=2022](https://www.portaltransparencia.gov.br/funcoes/12-educacao?ano=2022)  
448
- 449 37. Associação Brasileira de Recursos Humanos (ABRH) 2017 [Internet]: [cited  
450 2022 jun 22]. Available from: [http://www.abrhce.com.br/brasil-ocupa-60a-  
451 posicao-em-ranking-de-educacao-em-lista-com-76-paises](http://www.abrhce.com.br/brasil-ocupa-60a-posicao-em-ranking-de-educacao-em-lista-com-76-paises).  
452
- 453 38. Ministério da Educação (MEC) [Internet] [updated 2022, cited 2022 jun 22].  
454 Available from: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/component/tags/tag/jornada-escolar>  
455
- 456 39. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística (IBGE) [Internet] 2018-2019.  
457 [updated 2020; cited 2022 jun 22]. Available from:  
458 [https://educa.ibge.gov.br/jovens/materias-especiais/20787-uso-de-internet-  
459 televisao-e-celular-no-brasil.html](https://educa.ibge.gov.br/jovens/materias-especiais/20787-uso-de-internet-televisao-e-celular-no-brasil.html)  
460
- 461 40. Huang HM, Chang DS, Wu PC. The Association between Near Work Activities and  
462 Myopia in Children-A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *PLoS One*. 2015 Oct  
463 20;10(10):e0140419.  
464
- 465 41. Agência Brasil [Internet] 2018-2019. [updated 2020; cited 2022 jun 22].  
466 Available from:[https://agenciabrasil.ebc.com.br/educacao/noticia/2021-  
467 04/mais-de-5-milhoes-de-criancas-e-adolescentes-ficaram-sem-aulas-em-  
468 2020](https://agenciabrasil.ebc.com.br/educacao/noticia/2021-04/mais-de-5-milhoes-de-criancas-e-adolescentes-ficaram-sem-aulas-em-2020)  
469

- 470 42. Sampaio B, Guimarães J. Diferenças entre ensino público e privado no Brasil.  
471 Econ. Apl. 2009 May; 13 (1).  
472
- 473 43. Ministério da Educação (MEC) Censo Escolar 2021 [Internet]. [updated 2022;  
474 cited 2022 jun 22]. Available from:  
475 [https://download.inep.gov.br/censo\\_escolar/resultados/2021/apresentacao\\_co](https://download.inep.gov.br/censo_escolar/resultados/2021/apresentacao_coletiva.pdf)  
476 [letiva.pdf](https://download.inep.gov.br/censo_escolar/resultados/2021/apresentacao_coletiva.pdf).  
477
- 478 44. Yotsukura E, Torii H, Inokuchi M, et al. Prevalence of Myopia and Association of  
479 Myopia With Environmental Factors Among Schoolchildren in Japan. *JAMA*  
480 *Ophthalmol*. 2019 Nov 1;137(11):1233-1239.  
481
- 482 45. Rudnicka AR, Kapetanakis VV, Wathern AK, et al. Global variations and time  
483 trends in the prevalence of childhood myopia, a systematic review and  
484 quantitative meta-analysis: implications for aetiology and early prevention. *Br J*  
485 *Ophthalmol*. 2016 Jul;100(7):882-890.  
486
- 487 46. Ludwig CA, Boucher N, Saroj N, Moshfeghi DM. Differences in anterior  
488 peripheral pathologic myopia and macular pathologic myopia by age and  
489 gender. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol*. 2021 Nov;259(11):3511-3513.  
490
- 491 47. Sahebjada S, Al-Mahrouqi HH, Moshegov S, et al. Eye rubbing in the aetiology  
492 of keratoconus: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp*  
493 *Ophthalmol*. 2021 Aug;259(8):2057-2067.  
494

- 495 48. Najmi H, Mobarki Y, Mania K, et al. The correlation between keratoconus and  
496 eye rubbing: a review. *Int J Ophthalmol*. 2019 Nov 18;12(11):1775-1781.  
497
- 498 49. Ahuja P, Dadachanji Z, Shetty R, et al. Relevance of IgE, allergy and eye  
499 rubbing in the pathogenesis and management of Keratoconus. *Indian J*  
500 *Ophthalmol*. 2020 Oct;68(10):2067-2074.  
501
- 502 50. Chervenkov J, Hawkes E, Ortiz G, Horney D, Nanavaty MA. A randomized,  
503 fellow eye, comparison of keratometry, aberrometry, tear film, axial length and  
504 the anterior chamber depth after eye rubbing in non-keratoconic eyes. *Eye Vis*  
505 *(Lond)*. 2017 Aug 14;4:19.  
506
- 507 51. Hashemi H, Heydarian S, Hooshmand E. The Prevalence and Risk Factors for  
508 Keratoconus: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Cornea*. 2020  
509 Feb;39(2):263-270.  
510
- 511 52. Yotsukura E, Torii H, Inokuchi M, et al. Current Prevalence of Myopia and  
512 Association of Myopia With Environmental Factors Among Schoolchildren in  
513 Japan. *JAMA Ophthalmol*. 2019 Nov 1;137(11):1233-1239.  
514
- 515 53. Karakus S, Mathews PM, Agrawal D, Henrich C, Ramulu PY, Akpek EK. Impact of  
516 Dry Eye on Prolonged Reading. *Optom Vis Sci*. 2018 Dec;95(12):1105-1113.  
517
- 518 54. Karakus S, Agrawal D, Hindman HB, Henrich C, Ramulu PY, Akpek EK. Effects of  
519 Prolonged Reading on Dry Eye. *Ophthalmology*. 2018 Oct;125(10):1500-1505.



520

521 55. Mathews PM, Ramulu PY, Swenor BS, Utine CA, Rubin GS, Akpek EK. Functional  
522 impairment of reading in patients with dry eye. *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2017  
523 Apr;101(4):481-486.

524

525 56. Hom MM, Nguyen AL, Bielory L. Allergic conjunctivitis and dry eye syndrome.  
526 *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol*. 2012 Mar;108(3):163-6.

527

528

529

530

531