Rapidly Progressing Glaucoma: Clinical, Structural, and Socioeconomic Drivers of Treatment Escalation

Lok Hin Lee[1], DPhil; Yangyiran Xie[1], BS; Chris Bradley[2], PhD; Jithin Yohannan[2, 3], MD, MPH

1 Vanderbilt School of Medicine, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, United States of America

2 Wilmer Eye Institute, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland, United States of America

3 Malone Center for Engineering in Healthcare, Johns Hopkins University, Maryland, United States of America

Meeting Presentation: This material has not been presented previously.

Financial Support: Supported by grants from the National Institute of Health 1K23EY032204-03 and Research to Prevent Blindness Unrestricted Grant.

Proprietary Interest Statement: Jithin Yohannan is a consultant for Abbvie, Topcon and Ivantis/Alcon. Chris Bradley is a consultant for Radius XR. The authors have no conflicting proprietary or financial interests related to this manuscript.

Running Head: Treatment Escalation for Rapidly Progressing Glaucoma

Key Words: Glaucoma, Visual Field Progression

Corresponding Author and address for reprints:

Jithin Yohannan, MD, MPH

Wilmer Eye Institute

1800 Orleans Street

Baltimore, MD 21287

jyohann1@jhmi.edu

Abbreviations and Acronyms

- ADI – Area Deprivation Index
- CI – Confidence Interval
- CPT – Current Procedural Terminology
- dB – Decibel
- ICD – International Classification of Diseases
- IOP – Intraocular Pressure
- logMAR – Logarithm of the Minimum Angle of Resolution
- MD – Mean Deviation
- MIGS – Minimally Invasive Glaucoma Surgery
- OCT – Optical Coherence Tomography
- OR – Odds Ratio
- RNFL – Retinal Nerve Fiber Layer
- SITA – Swedish Interactive Thresholding Algorithm
- SVI – Social Vulnerability Index
- VA – Visual Acuity
- VF – Visual Field
- ZIP – Zone Improvement Plan (ZIP Code)

Abstract

Purpose:

To evaluate clinical and sociodemographic factors associated with selecting treatments in glaucoma patients with rapid visual field (VF) progression.

Design:

Retrospective cohort study

Participants:

2,782 eyes from 1,812 adults with 5 or more 24-2 visual fields over five years and at least one optical coherence tomography (OCT) scan.

Methods:

Rapid progressors were defined by mean deviation (MD) slopes worse than -1 dB/year. Demographic (age, gender, race), clinical (intraocular pressure (IOP), VF metrics, OCT measures), and socioeconomic (social vulnerability index, or SVI) variables were collected. Patients were categorized based on the most intensive treatment received in the first seven years: medical management, minimally invasive procedures (e.g., minimally invasive glaucoma surgery or laser), or aggressive procedures (e.g., filtering surgery or external ciliodestruction). Logistic regression was performed to identify demographic, clinical, and socioeconomic factors associated with treatment intensity.

Main Outcome Measures:

Odds of treatment selection based on rapid VF progression

Results:

Rapid progressors had significantly higher odds of receiving aggressive procedures (odds ratio [OR] 3.83, 95% confidence interval [CI] 2.56–5.74, $p < 0.001$) and any procedure (OR 3.15, 95% CI 2.28–4.35, $p < 0.001$), yet only 23% of rapid progressors underwent aggressive procedures in the first seven years. Among rapid progressors, worse MD and smaller rim area predicted aggressive procedures and higher IOP predicted any procedure. Higher SVI was associated with a reduced likelihood of receiving minimally invasive procedures among rapid progressors (OR 0.05, 95% CI 0.00–0.76, $p = 0.031$).

Conclusion:

Although rapid progression was a strong predictor of aggressive procedures, fewer than one in four underwent aggressive IOP-lowering interventions. Baseline IOP and structural severity appeared to supersede VF progression in clinical decisions. Patients in areas of higher socioeconomic vulnerability were also less likely to receive less invasive procedures. Better integrating rates of functional decline and addressing socioeconomic barriers may help optimize care for rapidly progressing glaucoma patients.

Introduction:

Glaucoma remains one of the foremost causes of irreversible blindness worldwide and is anticipated to affect an expanding proportion of the aging population[1, 2]. Because the disease often progresses silently in its early stages, prompt detection and intervention are critical for preserving visual function and preventing long-term disability. Visual field (VF) testing is commonly employed to monitor disease progression, with the rate of change in mean deviation (MD) serving as a key measure of decline in visual function. Multiple studies suggest that approximately 5-10% of patients with glaucoma exhibit rapid progression, most commonly defined as eyes experiencing MD worsening exceeding -1 dB/year[3, 4, 5].

A variety of clinical factors have been linked to faster rates of progression. Older age, elevated intraocular pressure (IOP), worse baseline MD, disc hemorrhage, and pseudoexfoliation have all been implicated in more rapid progression[6, 7].

Beyond traditional ocular and systemic risk factors, social determinants of health have emerged as critical considerations in glaucoma care. Composite indices such as the Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) and Area Deprivation Index (ADI) incorporate multiple metrics—educational attainment, income, and housing stability, among others — have been used in previous studies on glaucoma to gauge community-level disadvantage[8, 9, 10]. Although higher levels of SVI or ADI may correlate with delayed access to treatment, more advanced disease at presentation and faster rates of glaucoma worsening[11], some studies also suggest that individuals residing in high-SVI (more disadvantaged) areas might eventually obtain more aggressive interventions, reflecting complex and sometimes counterintuitive relationships between socioeconomic status and healthcare utilization[12].

Within this complex landscape, treatment approaches can vary widely. Although aggressive procedures, such as tradition filtering surgery, has been shown to slow VF loss in glaucomatous patients[13], there remain no clear criteria for escalating beyond medical, laser, or minimally invasive surgical interventions,

103 and clinical practices differ widely. Understanding the drivers behind treatment decisions for aggressive
104 surgery versus less invasive therapies, especially for rapidly progressing patients, can, therefore, assist in
105 developing best practices and identifying ways to improve care.

106 Here, we aim to identify glaucoma patients who demonstrate rapid progression and examine the ocular,
107 clinical, and socioeconomic factors that shape treatment strategies. Specifically, we explore whether these
108 rapidly progressing individuals are likely to undergo aggressive procedures, such as filtering surgery, or
109 whether they remain on medical treatment or receive less invasive procedures. We aim to clarify the
110 underlying contributors to treatment escalation and to highlight potential gaps in care for patients who,
111 despite substantial functional decline, may not receive robust intervention.

112 Methods:

113 Study Population

114 This study was conducted in accordance with the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved
115 by the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine Institutional Review Board. As this was a
116 retrospective study using data collected in routine clinical practice, the need for informed consent was
117 waived by the Institutional Review Board.

118 We included all adult patient eyes with glaucoma or glaucoma suspect diagnosis based on ICD H40
119 diagnosis at the Wilmer Eye Institute between 2013 and 2025 with at least five years of follow-up from
120 the initial VF and at least five reliable 24-2 VFs within the first five years. All VFs were measured using
121 Swedish Interactive Thresholding Algorithm (SITA)-Standard, SITA-Fast or SITA-Faster test strategies.
122 Reliable VFs were defined as having <15% false positives and <25% false negatives where available for
123 eyes with suspect, mild, or moderate glaucoma status or <50% false negatives for eyes with severe
124 glaucoma[14].

125 Each eye was also required to have at least one reliable Zeiss Cirrus Optical Coherence Tomography
126 (OCT) scan within one year of the initial VF to evaluate the impact of OCT-derived metrics on rapid
127 progression. Reliable OCTs were defined as having a minimum signal strength of six and superior,
128 inferior, and average retinal nerve fiber layer (RNFL) thicknesses greater than 30um. RNFL thickness less
129 than 30um is likely due to errors in registration or artifact, as it is approximately three standard deviations
130 below the floor RNFL value on a Zeiss Cirrus OCT scan[15].

131 Eyes were classified as having mild, moderate, or severe glaucoma based on their initial VF using
132 Hodapp-Parish Anderson criteria for MD: mild (MD > -6dB), moderate (MD ≤ -6 dB and MD > -12 dB)
133 and severe (MD ≤ -12 dB). A linear regression model was fit to the MD values for each eye to estimate
134 the rate of MD progression. Patients were classified as rapid progressors if the rate of MD progression
135 within the first five years was less than -1 dB/year and classified as non-rapid progressors otherwise.

136 Visual acuities for patients were measured using a Snellen chart at the first visit and converted to the
137 logarithm of the minimum angle of resolution (logMAR). In line with previous literature, we converted
138 "Count Fingers" to logMAR 1.85, "Hand Motion" to logMAR 2.30, "Light Perception" to logMAR 2.70
139 and "No Light Perception" to logMAR 3.00[16].

140 Patients were classified as having received either aggressive procedures or minimally invasive procedures
141 if they had a corresponding Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) code recorded within seven years of
142 their first visual field assessment and glaucoma diagnosis. This would be during or after the period of
143 rapid progression as previously defined for all included patients. Treatment codes for aggressive
144 procedures included filtering surgeries or external ciliodestruction, whereas minimally invasive procedure
145 codes included codes which corresponded to Minimally Invasive Glaucoma Surgery (MIGS) or laser
146 procedures. Patients were assumed to be treated medically otherwise. A comprehensive list of CPT codes
147 for aggressive and minimally invasive procedures is provided in online-only supplemental material.

148 **Socioeconomic Vulnerability Index**

149 We used the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease
150 Registry Social Vulnerability Index 2022 to estimate social vulnerability. This dataset provides an
151 estimation of the overall socioeconomic vulnerability index (SVI) at a census tract level based on 1)
152 socioeconomic status, 2) household characteristics, 3) racial and minority status, and 4) housing type and
153 transportation. SVI ranges from 0 to 1 with a higher value representing a higher level (worse) of
154 socioeconomic vulnerability. Patient ZIP codes were mapped to census tracts using the U.S. Department
155 of Housing and Urban Development's ZIP Code Crosswalk Files to assign an SVI to each patient

156 **Descriptive Statistical Analysis**

157 First, we assessed whether there were any statistically significant differences between rapid progressors
158 and non-rapid progressors for age, gender, SVI, race, and a variety of baseline measures from the first
159 clinical visit, including MD, average RNFL thickness, cup-to-disc ratio, rim area, intraocular pressure,
160 and visual acuity. The Wilcoxon rank sum test was used for continuous variables — all the continuous
161 variables violated assumptions of normality ($p < 0.05$) based on a Shapiro-Wilk test — while the Chi-
162 squared test was used for categorical variables.

163 We then structured our analysis to compare treatment patterns across two key dimensions: (1) progression
164 status (rapid vs. non-rapid progressors), and (2) treatment intensities (aggressive, minimally invasive or
165 medical) to create six distinct clinical groups for comparison (all possible combinations of progression
166 status and treatment intensity). We used the Kruskal-Wallis test for continuous variables and the Chi-
167 squared test used for categorical variables to assess differences across all six clinical groups. If any
168 significant differences were found, post-hoc pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni correction were
169 performed to determine which groups maintained significant differences.

170 **Modelling the impact of clinical, demographic and SVI variables on procedure selection**

We utilized a multivariable logistic regression model to assess the extent to which clinical and demographic variables predict the likelihood of receiving aggressive procedures, minimally invasive procedures, or "any procedure" (i.e., aggressive or minimally invasive procedures). Separate analyses were conducted for rapid and non-rapid progressors to identify factors significantly associated with procedure selection decisions in each group. A sensitivity analysis was performed across all models by varying the intervention timeframe, adjusting the time frame for treatment receipt from seven years to alternative thresholds of three and five years. All statistical analysis was conducted using Python 3.9.0 with the Statsmodels 0.14.4 and Scipy 1.14.1 libraries.

Results:

Table 1. Demographics.

-		Rapid Progressors (n = 192, 6.9% of all eyes)				Non-Rapid Progressors (n = 2590, 93.1% of all eyes)				P-Value (Comparison between overall rapid and non-rapid progressors)	P-Value (Comparison between treatment groups)
	Overall	All Treatments	Aggressive Procedure	Minimally Invasive Procedure	Medical Treatment	All Treatments	Aggressive Procedure	Minimally Invasive Procedure	Medical Treatment		
Patients (# eyes)	2782	192 (100%)	44 (22.9%)	36 (18.8%)	112 (58.3%)	2590 (100%)	152 (5.9%)	286 (11.0%)	2152 (83.1%)		
Biological sex, n (%)										0.69	0.58
Female	1509 (54.2%)	101 (52.6%)	20 (45.5%)	16 (44.4%)	65 (58.0%)	1408 (54.4%)	82 (53.9%)	151 (52.8%)	1175 (54.6%)		
Male	1273 (45.8%)	91 (47.4%)	24 (54.5%)	20 (55.6%)	47 (42.0%)	1182 (45.6%)	70 (46.1%)	135 (47.2%)	977 (45.4%)		
Age, (years)	64.00 [56.00, 71.00]	67.00 [57.00, 73.25]	71.00 [63.00, 74.00]	67.00 [61.75, 74.25]	65.00 [55.75, 72.25]	64.00 [56.00, 71.00]	66.00 [59.00, 72.25]	66.50 [60.00, 71.00]	64.00 [56.00, 71.00]	0.01	0.00
Race, n (%)										0.30	0.06
Asian	213 (7.7%)	14 (7.3%)	4 (9.1%)	3 (8.3%)	7 (6.2%)	199 (7.7%)	9 (5.9%)	18 (6.3%)	172 (8.0%)		
Black or African American	906 (32.6%)	78 (40.6%)	16 (36.4%)	8 (22.2%)	54 (48.2%)	828 (32.0%)	55 (36.2%)	77 (26.9%)	696 (32.3%)		
White or Caucasian	1521 (54.7%)	92 (47.9%)	24 (54.5%)	23 (63.9%)	45 (40.2%)	1429 (55.2%)	77 (50.7%)	174 (60.8%)	1178 (54.7%)		
Other	101 (3.6%)	6 (3.1%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (5.6%)	4 (3.6%)	95 (3.7%)	8 (5.3%)	9 (3.1%)	78 (3.6%)		
American Indian/Alaska Native	6 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.7%)	4 (0.2%)		
Other Pacific Islander	8 (0.3%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	7 (0.3%)	2 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (0.2%)		
Not Disclosed/Unknown	27 (1.0%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	26 (1.0%)	1 (0.7%)	6 (2.1%)	19 (0.9%)		
SVI	0.34 [0.22, 0.50]	0.36 [0.23, 0.50]	0.37 [0.22, 0.57]	0.30 [0.21, 0.42]	0.36 [0.25, 0.51]	0.34 [0.22, 0.50]	0.42 [0.23, 0.54]	0.32 [0.20, 0.47]	0.33 [0.22, 0.50]	0.32	0.10
VF Characteristics											
MD at Baseline	-2.60 [-5.48, -0.79]	-4.36 [-8.63, -2.04]	-7.93 [-12.02, -4.21]	-3.59 [-7.58, -2.31]	-3.83 [-6.68, -1.60]	-2.52 [-5.31, -0.73]	-6.02 [-12.06, -2.67]	-2.70 [-5.39, -0.83]	-2.33 [-4.92, -0.64]	0	0
Slope of MD	-0.04 [-0.36, 0.26]	-1.41 [-1.97, -1.16]	-1.48 [-1.90, -1.17]	-1.34 [-1.68, -1.16]	-1.43 [-1.99, -1.17]	0.00 [-0.28, 0.28]	-0.20 [-0.50, 0.19]	-0.03 [-0.40, 0.24]	0.02 [-0.25, 0.30]	0	0
Number of Visits in five year duration	6.00 [5.00, 7.00]	6.00 [5.00, 8.00]	6.00 [5.75, 8.00]	6.00 [5.00, 8.25]	6.00 [5.00, 8.00]	6.00 [5.00, 7.00]	6.00 [5.00, 8.00]	6.00 [5.00, 7.00]	6.00 [5.00, 7.00]	0	0
Clinical Characteristics											
IOP (mmHg)	17.00 [14.00–20.00]	17.00 [14.00–21.00]	17.00 [13.75–22.00]	17.00 [14.00–22.00]	16.00 [14.00–20.00]	17.00 [14.00–20.00]	18.00 [15.00–22.00]	18.00 [15.00–22.00]	17.00 [14.00–20.00]	0.89	0
Visual Acuity (logMAR)	0.10 [0.00–0.18]	0.14 [0.10–0.30]	0.18 [0.10–0.42]	0.10 [0.00–0.30]	0.18 [0.10–0.30]	0.10 [0.00–0.18]	0.10 [0.00–0.30]	0.10 [0.00–0.18]	0.10 [0.00–0.18]	0	0
Glaucoma Severity										0	0
Mild Glaucoma	2170 (78.0%)	121 (63.0%)	18 (40.9%)	24 (66.7%)	79 (70.5%)	2049 (79.1%)	76 (50.0%)	231 (80.8%)	1742 (80.9%)		
Moderate Glaucoma	396 (14.2%)	46 (24.0%)	15 (34.1%)	8 (22.2%)	23 (20.5%)	350 (13.5%)	36 (23.7%)	38 (13.3%)	276 (12.8%)		
Severe Glaucoma	216 (7.8%)	25 (13.0%)	11 (25.0%)	4 (11.1%)	10 (8.9%)	191 (7.4%)	40 (26.3%)	17 (5.9%)	134 (6.2%)		
OCT Characteristics											
Average RNFL Thickness (μm)	78.55 [69.02, 87.05]	74.56 [63.48, 84.25]	68.93 [56.93, 81.10]	65.94 [59.91, 77.04]	78.38 [69.75, 85.59]	78.78 [69.46, 87.40]	68.72 [60.84, 79.30]	75.00 [66.96, 82.41]	79.68 [70.83, 88.37]	0	0
Average Cup Disc Ratio	0.67 [0.57, 0.74]	0.71 [0.59, 0.79]	0.76 [0.63, 0.79]	0.73 [0.66, 0.80]	0.69 [0.57, 0.77]	0.66 [0.56, 0.74]	0.73 [0.62, 0.81]	0.67 [0.57, 0.73]	0.66 [0.56, 0.73]	0	0
RIM Area (mm^2)	1.01 [0.83, 1.21]	0.94 [0.74, 1.19]	0.81 [0.60, 1.03]	0.86 [0.68, 0.98]	1.05 [0.81, 1.30]	1.01 [0.84, 1.21]	0.80 [0.67, 1.10]	0.97 [0.81, 1.14]	1.03 [0.85, 1.23]	0.05	0

*Continuous variables are presented as median [IQR].

A total of 2,782 eyes from 1,812 patients were included in this study. Table 1 lists key demographic and clinical characteristics of rapid (n = 192 eyes, 6.9%) and non-rapid progressors (n = 2,590 eyes, 93.1%) stratified by treatment received in the first seven years.

We first examined differences in demographic and social vulnerability characteristics between rapid and non-rapid glaucoma progressors, emphasizing factors potentially influencing treatment decisions (Table 1). Rapid progressors were older than non-rapid progressors (median 67 [57–73] vs 64 [56–71] years, $p = 0.01$). No significant differences emerged in biological sex ($p = 0.69$), racial distribution ($p = 0.30$), or Social Vulnerability Index (SVI, $p = 0.32$) (see Table 1 for full details).

Regarding baseline clinical characteristics, rapid progressors demonstrated significantly worse glaucoma severity distribution ($p < 0.001$), characterized by greater proportions of moderate (24.0% vs. 13.5%) and severe glaucoma cases (13.0% vs. 7.4%). Rapid progressors and non-rapid progressors had the same median number of visits (6.0), though the distribution was significantly different ($p < 0.001$). Subsequent analysis of the distributions shows that the non-rapid progressor group had a more pronounced tail than the rapid-progressor group (higher kurtosis), reflecting more outliers in visit frequencies. Additionally, rapid progressors had significantly worse baseline visual field mean deviation (MD: -4.36 vs. -2.52 dB, $p < 0.001$), poorer visual acuity (logMAR: 0.14 vs. 0.10, $p < 0.001$), and worse optical coherence tomography (OCT) measures, including thinner retinal nerve fiber layer (RNFL) thickness (74.6 µm vs. 78.8 µm, $p < 0.001$) and larger cup-to-disc ratios (0.71 vs. 0.66, $p < 0.001$). No significant differences were identified in intraocular pressure at first clinic visit (IOP) (see Table 1 for full details).

When we examined differences between the six progression-treatments groups (rapid/non-rapid progressors and by treatment type), we found significant differences in all measured variables except biological sex ($p=0.58$), race ($p = 0.06$), and SVI ($p=0.10$). Subsequent pairwise analyses identified significant differences in MD slope for each treatment type between rapid vs. non-rapid progressors (all $p<0.001$). Treatment patterns followed disease severity at initial presentation. Rapid progressors receiving

aggressive procedures had significantly worse baseline MD (−7.93 [−12.02, −4.21] dB) compared to all other groups (range of medians: −2.33 to −6.02 dB, all $p < 0.001$). Among non-rapid progressors, those with a worse baseline MD were more likely to receive aggressive procedures ($p < 0.001$). Rapid progressors managed medically required significantly more follow-up visits than non-rapid medical patients ($p < 0.001$), indicating closer monitoring despite conservative management. Similarly, among non-rapid progressors, patients receiving aggressive procedures attended more visits compared to minimally invasive or medical groups (both $p \leq 0.020$). Rapid progressors who received aggressive procedures had significantly worse visual acuity (logMAR 0.31 vs. 0.14; $p=0.004$) and thinner RNFL thickness (medians 68.93 µm vs. 79.68 µm; $p \leq 0.003$) compared to non-rapid progressors who received minimally invasive procedures or medical treatment, highlighting worse baseline visual impairment and structural damage. Likewise, among non-rapid progressors, aggressive procedures remained associated with poorer visual acuity and thinner RNFL compared with minimally invasive or medical treatments (all $p < 0.001$), indicating that initial severity is associated with aggressive procedures regardless of rapid progression status.

Table 2. Logistic regression for predictors of intervention (aggressive procedures, minimally invasive procedures, or any procedure) in all patients.

Variable	Aggressive Procedures Odds Ratio (95% CI)	P-value	Minimally Invasive Procedures Odds Ratio (95% CI)	P-value	Any Procedure Odds Ratio (95% CI)	P-value
Age (per 1 year increase)	1.01 (1.00–1.02)	0.206	1.02 (1.01–1.03)	0.000*	1.02 (1.01–1.03)	0.000*
Gender (Male vs. Female)	0.96 (0.70–1.31)	0.805	0.99 (0.78–1.25)	0.909	0.97 (0.80–1.19)	0.799
Race (Asian vs. White)	0.91 (0.48–1.72)	0.777	0.93 (0.57–1.52)	0.766	0.88 (0.58–1.33)	0.534
Race (Black or African American vs. White)	1.07 (0.72–1.59)	0.730	0.85 (0.62–1.16)	0.298	0.91 (0.70–1.18)	0.455
Race (Other vs. White)	1.13 (0.51–2.49)	0.757	1.00 (0.52–1.94)	0.994	1.02 (0.60–1.76)	0.936
SVI (per unit increase)	1.63 (0.66–4.04)	0.292	0.65 (0.31–1.35)	0.246	0.91 (0.50–1.67)	0.768

Rapid Progressor Status	3.83 (2.56–5.74)	0.000*	1.82 (1.22–2.71)	0.003*	3.15 (2.28–4.35)	0.000*
MD at First Visit (per dB decrease)	1.10 (1.06–1.12)	0.000*	0.95 (0.93-0.99)	0.004*	1.03 (1.00–1.05)	0.024*
IOP (per mmHg increase)	1.04 (1.01–1.07)	0.008*	1.06 (1.04–1.08)	0.000*	1.06 (1.04–1.08)	0.000*
VA (per unit logMAR increase)	1.73 (1.03–2.92)	0.04*	0.63 (0.34–1.15)	0.134	1.08 (0.70–1.67)	0.719
Average Cup Disc Ratio (per unit increase)	0.60 (0.13–2.75)	0.507	0.66 (0.23–1.86)	0.427	0.60 (0.24–1.48)	0.265
Average RNFL Thickness (per µm increase)	0.99 (0.98–1.01)	0.227	0.98 (0.97–0.99)	0.000*	0.98 (0.97–0.99)	0.000*
Rim Area (per mm² increase)	0.25 (0.10–0.60)	0.002*	0.55 (0.29–1.04)	0.067	0.36 (0.21–0.63)	0.000*

* Females serve as the reference group for gender, and white patients serve as the reference group for race. All procedure groups are compared with those not in the procedure as a reference group. Asterisks indicate statistically significant p-values ($p < 0.05$)

Next, we assessed which demographic, clinical, and socioeconomic factors were associated with different intervention types (aggressive, minimally invasive, or any procedure) using logistic regression, first across all patients (Table 2), then rapid progressors (Table 3), and finally non-rapid progressors (Table 4).

In the overall patient cohort (Table 2), demographic and socioeconomic factors played only a minor role in surgical decision-making. Gender, race, and Social Vulnerability Index were not statistically associated with any category of intervention (all $p > 0.05$). Age exerted a small yet significant effect as each additional year increased the odds of undergoing a minimally invasive procedure by 2% (odds ratio [OR]: 1.02 per year, 95% confidence interval [CI] 1.01–1.03, $p < 0.001$) and the odds of receiving any procedure by the same margin (OR: 1.02 per year, 95% CI: 1.01–1.03, $p < 0.001$), but had no impact on aggressive surgery ($p = 0.206$).

Among clinical predictors, rapid progression strongly increased the odds of receiving aggressive procedures (OR 3.83, 95 % CI 2.56–5.74, $p < 0.001$), minimally invasive surgery (OR 1.82, 95 % CI 1.22–2.71, $p = 0.003$) and any procedure (OR 3.15, 95 % CI 2.28–4.35, $p < 0.001$). Worse visual field damage at baseline, as indicated by more negative MD, also predicted aggressive procedures (OR 1.10,

95 % CI 1.06–1.12, $p < 0.001$) and any procedure (OR 1.03, 95 % CI 1.00–1.05, $p = 0.024$) but decreased the odds of minimally invasive surgery (OR 0.95, 95 % CI 0.93–0.99, $p = 0.004$), suggesting that eyes with milder functional damage are preferentially offered lower-risk MIGS. Elevated intraocular pressure (IOP) at the first clinical visit was a consistent predictor across all intervention types—aggressive (OR: 1.04 per mmHg increase, 95 % CI: 1.01–1.07, $p = 0.008$), minimally invasive (OR: 1.06 per mmHg increase, 95 % CI: 1.04–1.08, $p < 0.001$), and any procedure (OR: 1.06 per mmHg increase, 95 % CI: 1.04–1.08, $p < 0.001$). Worse visual acuity (higher logMAR) significantly increased the likelihood of aggressive interventions (OR: 1.73 per unit increase, 95 % CI: 1.03–2.92, $p = 0.040$). On structural evaluation, thinner average retinal nerve fiber layer (RNFL) thickness was significantly associated with greater use of minimally invasive procedures and with any procedure (OR 0.98 per µm, 95 % CI 0.97–0.99, $p < 0.001$ for both). Larger rim area were significantly associated with lower odds of aggressive procedures (OR: 0.25 per mm^2 increase, 95% CI: 0.10–0.60, $p = 0.002$) and any procedure (OR 0.36 per mm^2 increase, 95% CI 0.21–0.63, $p < 0.001$). Average cup-to-disc ratio did not significantly influence procedural likelihood.

Table 3. Logistic regression for predictors of intervention (aggressive procedures, minimally invasive procedures, or any procedure) in rapid progressors.

Variable	Aggressive Procedures Odds Ratio (95% CI)	P-value	Minimally Invasive Procedures Odds Ratio (95% CI)	P-value	Any Procedure Odds Ratio (95% CI)	P-value
Age (per 1 year increase)	1.02 (0.99–1.06)	0.201	1.00 (0.96–1.03)	0.882	1.01 (0.98–1.04)	0.515
Gender (Male vs. Female)	1.51 (0.72–3.20)	0.276	1.70 (0.75–3.87)	0.204	1.94 (0.99–3.80)	0.054
Race (Asian vs. White)	1.51 (0.39–5.88)	0.553	0.82 (0.19–3.53)	0.786	1.08 (0.31–3.76)	0.91
Race (Black or African American vs. White)	0.79 (0.30–2.06)	0.633	0.49 (0.17–1.38)	0.176	0.55 (0.24–1.25)	0.151
Race (Other vs. White)	0.00 (0.00–inf)	0.995	1.35 (0.21–8.75)	0.756	0.50 (0.08–3.20)	0.461
SVI (per unit increase)	1.99 (0.19–20.29)	0.563	0.05 (0.00–0.76)	0.031*	0.25 (0.03–1.92)	0.182
MD at First Visit (per dB decrease)	1.10 (1.02–1.18)	0.015*	0.93 (0.85–1.03)	0.159	1.04 (0.97–1.11)	0.215
IOP (per mmHg increase)	1.03 (0.96–1.11)	0.383	1.08 (0.99–1.17)	0.077	1.07 (1.00–1.14)	0.036*

VA (per unit logMAR increase)	1.61 (0.54–4.81)	0.39	0.35 (0.05–2.24)	0.265	0.97 (0.33–2.82)	0.952
Average Cup Disc Ratio (per unit increase)	0.37 (0.01–19.06)	0.618	6.85 (0.06–754.67)	0.422	1.28 (0.04–39.98)	0.888
Average RNFL Thickness (per µm increase)	1.02 (0.98–1.05)	0.334	0.99 (0.95–1.02)	0.506	1.01 (0.98–1.03)	0.71
Rim Area (per mm² increase)	0.14 (0.02–1.16)	0.069	0.29 (0.03–2.77)	0.285	0.10 (0.02–0.62)	0.013*

* Females serve as the reference group for gender, and white patients serve as the reference group for race. All procedure groups are compared with those not in the procedure as a reference group. Asterisks indicate statistically significant p-values ($p < 0.05$)

Among rapid progressors (Table 3), we found that key predictors from the overall patient cohort largely remained consistent except for SVI. Elevated IOP at the first clinical visit continued to significantly increase the likelihood of receiving any procedure (OR 1.07 per mmHg increase, 95% CI: [1.00, 1.14], $p < 0.05$). Worse initial MD significantly correlated with higher odds of aggressive procedures (OR 1.10 per dB decrease, 95% CI: 1.02–1.18, $p = 0.015$). Larger rim area significantly reduced the odds of any procedure (OR 0.10 per mm² increase, 95% CI 0.02–0.62, $p = 0.013$) and demonstrated a similar, though non-significant, trend for aggressive surgery (OR 0.14 per mm² increase, 95% CI 0.02-1.16, $p = 0.069$).

A novel and clinically important finding was that higher SVI significantly reduced the likelihood of minimally invasive procedures (OR 0.05 per unit increase, 95% CI: 0.00–0.76, $p = 0.031$), suggesting socioeconomic factors might limit access to minimally invasive options among rapid progressors. Higher SVI also tended to be associated with aggressive procedures in this cohort, although this did not reach statistical significance (OR 1.99 per unit increase, 95% CI: 0.19–20.29, $p = 0.563$). Demographic factors such as age, sex, and race, as well as baseline visual acuity and average cup-to-disc ratio did not reach statistical significance.

Table 4. Logistic regression for predictors of intervention (aggressive procedures, minimally invasive procedures, or any procedure) in non-rapid progressors.

Variable	Aggressive Procedures Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Aggressive Procedures P-value	Minimally Invasive Procedures Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Minimally Invasive Procedures P-value	Any Procedure Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Any Procedure P-value

Age (per 1 year increase)	1.01 (0.99–1.02)	0.407	1.02 (1.01–1.04)	0.000*	1.02 (1.01–1.03)	0.000*
Gender (Male vs. Female)	0.89 (0.63–1.25)	0.49	0.95 (0.74–1.23)	0.706	0.92 (0.74–1.14)	0.453
Race (Asian vs. White)	0.78 (0.37–1.64)	0.519	0.93 (0.55–1.57)	0.773	0.84 (0.53–1.31)	0.431
Race (Black or African American vs. White)	1.14 (0.74–1.77)	0.543	0.86 (0.62–1.20)	0.391	0.95 (0.72–1.25)	0.692
Race (Other vs. White)	1.39 (0.62–3.10)	0.419	0.94 (0.46–1.94)	0.874	1.10 (0.63–1.94)	0.733
SVI (per unit increase)	1.50 (0.56–4.07)	0.422	0.78 (0.36–1.67)	0.518	0.97 (0.51–1.83)	0.913
MD at First Visit (per dB decrease)	1.10 (1.06-1.12)	0.000*	0.96 (0.93-0.99)	0.011*	1.02 (1.00-1.05)	0.045*
IOP (per mmHg increase)	1.04 (1.01–1.07)	0.008*	1.06 (1.04–1.09)	0.000*	1.06 (1.04–1.08)	0.000*
VA (per unit logMAR increase)	1.73 (0.94–3.20)	0.079	0.73 (0.38–1.43)	0.365	1.13 (0.70–1.82)	0.616
Average Cup Disc Ratio (per unit increase)	0.69 (0.13–3.70)	0.662	0.60 (0.21–1.75)	0.351	0.60 (0.23–1.54)	0.289
Average RNFL Thickness (per µm increase)	0.98 (0.97–1.00)	0.073	0.98 (0.96–0.99)	0.000*	0.98 (0.97–0.99)	0.000*
Rim Area (per mm² increase)	0.30 (0.11–0.79)	0.015*	0.61 (0.31–1.20)	0.151	0.44 (0.25–0.78)	0.005*

* Females serve as the reference group for gender, and white patients serve as the reference group for race. All procedure groups are compared with those not in the procedure as a reference group. Asterisks indicate statistically significant p-values ($p < 0.05$).

Among non-rapid progressors (Table 4), predictors of intervention were also similar to the overall cohort but varied in magnitude. Age was significantly associated with higher odds of minimally invasive procedures (OR 1.02 per year, 95% CI 1.01–1.04, $p < 0.001$) and any procedure (OR 1.02 per year, 95% CI 1.01–1.03, $p < 0.001$). Worse baseline MD (more negative) was significantly associated with greater odds of aggressive procedures (OR 1.10 per dB decrease, 95 % CI 1.06–1.12, $p < 0.001$) and of any procedure (OR 1.02, 95 % CI 1.00–1.05, $p = 0.045$), while modestly lowering the odds of minimally invasive surgery (OR 0.96, 95 % CI 0.93–0.99, $p = 0.011$). Higher initial IOP significantly predicted intervention, increasing the odds of aggressive (OR 1.04 per mmHg, 95% CI 1.01–1.07, $p = 0.008$), minimally invasive (OR 1.06, 95% CI 1.04–1.09, $p < 0.001$), and any procedure (OR 1.06, 95% CI 1.04–1.08, $p < 0.001$). Thinner retinal nerve fiber layer thickness was significantly associated with higher odds

of minimally invasive (OR 0.98 per μm, 95% CI 0.96–0.99, $p < 0.001$) and any procedure (OR 0.98, 95% CI 0.97–0.99, $p < 0.001$). No significant differences were observed for sex, race, SVI, baseline visual acuity, and average cup-to-disc ratio.

Sensitivity Analysis

When shortening the timeframe for treatment after initial clinical diagnosis from seven years to five and three years, some predictors changed in their statistical significance. Age was a significant predictor in the seven-year analysis for minimally invasive procedures and any procedure (e.g., seven-year odds ratio = 1.02, $p < 0.001$). However, they often lost statistical significance in the three-year models (e.g., any procedure three-year odds ratio = 1.02, $p = 0.06$).

In contrast, elevated baseline IOP showed a consistent positive association with the likelihood of aggressive, minimally invasive, and any procedures. For example, each additional mmHg of IOP increased the odds of aggressive procedures by roughly 4–5% in both 3-year (OR = 1.05, $p = 0.006$) and 5-year models (OR = 1.05, $p < 0.001$), and maintained similar associations at 7 years (OR = 1.04, $p = 0.008$). Therefore, despite narrowing the treatment window, baseline IOP and key functional and structural measures of disease severity (worse MD, smaller rim area) remained the most robust predictors of both early and later interventions.

Finally, the primary predictors of aggressive procedures, particularly disease severity, remained consistent across all models and stayed statistically significant across all timeframes. For instance, a better mean deviation at the first visit continued to be a strong predictor of lower odds of aggressive procedures (e.g., OR = 1.09, 95% CI: 1.05–1.12 at 3 years; OR = 1.09, 95% CI: 1.05–1.12 at 5 years; OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 1.06–1.12 at 7 years, all $p < 0.001$). Similarly, the optic disc rim area consistently demonstrated large effect sizes for predicting aggressive procedures (e.g., OR ≈ 0.16–0.25 across models, $p < 0.004$), indicating that patients with smaller rim areas were more likely to undergo early and more invasive procedures.

309 ## Discussion

310 In this study, we evaluated the clinical and socioeconomic determinants of treatment decisions in
311 glaucoma patients with different visual field progression rates. Despite finding that rapid progression was
312 associated with greater odds of receiving either aggressive procedures (OR 3.83) or any procedure
313 (OR 3.15), only 42% of rapidly progressive patients underwent any non-medical procedure, of which 23%
314 were aggressive IOP lowering procedures within seven years of their initial visit. Among patients who
315 progressed rapidly, higher baseline intraocular pressures increased the odds of any procedure, while
316 worse functional or structural parameters increased the overall likelihood of aggressive procedures.
317 Furthermore, a higher social vulnerability index was associated with a lower likelihood of receiving less
318 aggressive therapy, which highlights the potential role of socioeconomic factors in shaping treatment
319 decisions.

320 While previous studies[3,4] have reported a 5-12% rapid progression in glaucomatous patients, to our
321 knowledge, this is the first study that specifically reports treatment patterns in rapid progressors and how
322 these may vary from non-rapid progressors. In our cohort of 2,782 eyes from 1,812 patients, only 23% of
323 rapidly progressing eyes ultimately underwent aggressive procedures within seven years of diagnosis. We
324 also found that there was no significant pairwise difference for MD slope between treatment groups for
325 rapid progressors – in other words, if there was a faster rate of MD worsening was not associated with
326 more aggressive treatment within the rapid progressor cohort. This relatively low percentage and similar
327 MD slopes between treatment categories for rapid progressors is clinically significant and may not be
328 intuitive, as rapid progression typically raises clinical concerns warranting aggressive interventions to
329 preserve visual function. Potential reasons for this observed gap include clinician reliance on baseline
330 disease severity markers (e.g., intraocular pressure, structural OCT findings) over functional progression
331 rates, patient hesitancy, or refusal of invasive procedures, perceived surgical risks, socioeconomic barriers
332 limiting access to interventions, or clinician preference for conservative management due to concerns

333 about complications. Specifically, in the overall cohort and rapid progressors, eyes with a higher IOP,
334 worse MD, smaller optic disc rim area or thinner RNFL at presentation were significantly more likely to
335 undergo aggressive procedures or any procedure. When we restricted the analysis to rapid progressors
336 alone, the association between structural and functional damage as a predictor of aggressive procedures
337 remained robust. Our data suggest that rapid progression, as defined retrospectively from at least five VF
338 tests, may not always align with initial clinical impressions or decisions which may be based on baseline
339 disease severity or IOP. Since clinicians may not have access to longitudinal VF progression data when
340 initially deciding on treatment escalation, our results underscore the potential value of incorporating
341 standardized and timely measures of VF loss rate earlier in clinical decision-making processes to better
342 identify and manage patients who may rapidly progress or incorporating models which can forecast rapid
343 progression risk from early data points[17, 18]. This observation highlights a potential gap in aggressive
344 intervention among patients demonstrating rapid functional decline, as most rapidly progressing patients
345 did not receive definitive aggressive procedures. Future studies could prospectively assess how earlier
346 identification and consideration of rapid VF progression rates could influence treatment escalation
347 decisions in clinical practice.

348 Across the rapid progressor population, patients with worse (higher) SVI who were rapid progressors had
349 a markedly reduced likelihood of receiving minimally invasive procedures (OR = 0.05, p = 0.031). This
350 may reflect more advanced disease at presentation or reduced access to healthcare in earlier stages. Prior
351 research has consistently found that higher neighborhood-level socioeconomic strongly correlates with
352 delayed diagnosis or inconsistent follow-up, which may lead to more urgent need for definitive
353 procedures once severe damage is detected[8, 9, 10, 12]. Although we adjusted our analysis for baseline disease
354 severity, our results also highlight a significant association between socioeconomic vulnerability and the
355 types of glaucoma interventions patients received, underscoring potential disparities in access or
356 utilization of different treatment modalities. This suggests potential unmeasured confounding variables,
357 from disease severity factors associated with SVI as well as a possible direct causal impact of SVI on

358 treatment selection. These findings align with previous literature demonstrating disparities in access to
359 minimally invasive procedures among different demographic groups[19].

360 In contrast with previous literature, we find that demographic characteristics beyond age do not shape
361 treatment approaches[8,12,20]. We find that an increase in age was associated with a higher odds of
362 minimally invasive procedures (OR = 1.02 per year, $p < 0.001$) or any procedure (OR = 1.02, $p < 0.001$).
363 However, neither gender nor race showed an independent relationship with treatment selection. This
364 divergence from earlier work may reflect our adjustment for socioeconomic vulnerability using SVI, a
365 determinant that previous analyses did not include.

366 There are several limitations to this study. This was a retrospective, single-center study in an academic
367 setting, which may limit the generalizability of the results to other practice environments or diverse
368 patient populations. Treatment decisions and outcomes were drawn from clinical data analyzed
369 retrospectively, and unmeasured confounders such as patient preferences, medication adherence, and
370 clinician and clinic-specific practice patterns may have influenced both the selection of therapy and
371 observed progression rates, especially when considering the effect of socioeconomic status. We also
372 relied on administrative CPT and ICD-10 codes to capture both procedures and diagnoses, which may
373 have possible misclassifications, and repeated interventions in the seven-year follow-up period post initial
374 diagnoses were not explicitly accounted for. Furthermore, the SVI used in this study provides a census-
375 tract level estimate of socioeconomic status which is necessarily a coarse measure, and may therefore not
376 have fully encapsulated the individual level social determinants of health that can affect treatment access
377 and decision-making. Finally, our inclusion criteria of requiring at least five reliable visual fields within
378 five years and one reliable OCT within one year of first visual field may have excluded patients with
379 more severe disease, limited follow-up or suboptimal testing, which may have introduced selection bias
380 into our results, as such patients may have rapidly progressed had they not had a procedure earlier in their
381 disease course.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study demonstrates that although rapid visual field progression was associated with greater likelihood of receiving aggressive or minimally invasive treatments, fewer than one in four rapidly progressing eyes received aggressive intervention within seven years of initial presentation. Furthermore, our data suggest that socioeconomic factors play a pivotal role, especially in the reduced uptake of minimally invasive treatment in rapidly progressing patients with a worse SVI, highlighting the need to address disparities in healthcare access and utilization. Future research efforts should focus on refining risk stratification tools, potentially integrating the current or forecasted rate of VF progression more prominently into treatment algorithms and mitigating socioeconomic barriers so we can optimize outcomes for patients with rapidly progressing glaucoma.

400

401 ## References

402 1. Quigley HA, Broman AT. The number of people with glaucoma worldwide in 2010 and 2020. *Br*
403 *J Ophthalmol.* 2006;90(3):262-267.
404 2. Tham Y-C, Li X, Wong TY, Quigley HA, Aung T, Cheng C-Y. Global prevalence of glaucoma
405 and projections of glaucoma burden through 2040. *Ophthalmology.* 2014;121(11):2081-2090.
406 3. Jackson AB, Martin KR, Coote MA, et al. Fast progressors in glaucoma: prevalence based on
407 global and central visual field loss. *Ophthalmology.* 2023;130(5):462-468.
408 4. Huang X, Poursoroush A, Sun J, et al. Identifying factors associated with fast visual field
409 progression in patients with ocular hypertension based on unsupervised machine learning. *J*
410 *Glaucoma.* 2024;33(11):815-822.
411 5. Chauhan BC, Garway-Heath DF, Goñi FJ, et al. Practical recommendations for measuring rates
412 of visual field change in glaucoma. *Br J Ophthalmol.* 2008;92(4):569-573.
413 6. Kim JH, Rabiolo A, Morales E, et al. Risk factors for fast visual field progression in glaucoma.
414 *Am J Ophthalmol.* 2019;207:268-278.
415 7. Prata TS, De Moraes CGV, Teng CC, et al. Factors affecting rates of visual field progression in
416 glaucoma patients with optic disc hemorrhage. *Ophthalmology.* 2010;117(1):24-29.
417 8. Shaheen A, Medeiros FA, Swaminathan SS. Association between greater social vulnerability and
418 delayed glaucoma surgery. *Am J Ophthalmol.* 2024;268:123-135.
419 9. Tseng VL, Kitayama K, Yu F, Coleman AL. Disparities in glaucoma surgery: a review of current
420 evidence and future directions for improvement. *Transl Vis Sci Technol.* 2023;12(9):2.
421 10. Tseng VL, Kitayama K, Yu F, Pan D, Coleman AL. Social vulnerability, prevalence of glaucoma,
422 and incidence of glaucoma surgery in the California Medicare population. *Ophthalmol*
423 *Glaucoma.* 2023;6(6):616-625.

11. Almidani L, Bradley C, Herbert P, et al. The impact of social vulnerability on structural and functional glaucoma severity, worsening, and variability. *Ophthalmol Glaucoma.* 2024;7(4):380-390.
12. Musa I, Bansal S, Kaleem MA. Barriers to care in the treatment of glaucoma: socioeconomic elements that impact the diagnosis, treatment, and outcomes in glaucoma patients. *Curr Ophthalmol Rep.* 2022;10(3):85-90.
13. Folgar FA, De Moraes CGV, Prata TS, et al. Glaucoma surgery decreases the rates of localized and global visual field progression. *Am J Ophthalmol.* 2010;149(2):258-264.
14. Yohannan J, Cheng M, Da J, et al. Evidence-based criteria for determining peripapillary OCT reliability. *Ophthalmology.* 2020;127(2):167-176.
15. Yohannan J, Wang J, Brown J, et al. Evidence-based criteria for assessment of visual field reliability. *Ophthalmology.* 2017;124(11):1612-1620.
16. Schulze-Bonsel, K., Feltgen, N., Burau, H., Hansen, L., & Bach, M. (2006). Visual acuities "hand motion" and "counting fingers" can be quantified with the freiburg visual acuity test. *Investigative ophthalmology & visual science*, *47*(3), 1236-1240.
17. Herbert P, Hou K, Bradley C, et al. Forecasting risk of future rapid glaucoma worsening using early visual field, OCT, and clinical data. *Ophthalmol Glaucoma.* 2023;6(5):466-473.
18. Shuldiner SR, Boland MV, Ramulu PY, et al. Predicting eyes at risk for rapid glaucoma progression based on an initial visual field test using machine learning. *PLoS One.* 2021;16(4):e0249856.
19. Vasu P, Hall RP, Wagner IV, et al. Racial disparities in microinvasive glaucoma surgery for management of primary open-angle glaucoma: a propensity-matched cohort study. *Am J Ophthalmol.* 2025;271:96-103.
20. Allison K, Hodges B, Shahid MM, Feng C. Racial and gender disparities for glaucoma treatment rates in Upstate New York. *J Clin Med.* 2024;13(23):7225.