1 Original Research Article

2 Demographic profiles of contact lens wearers and their association 3 with lens wear characteristics in Trinidad and Tobago: A 4 retrospective study

5
6 Ezinne E Ngozika^{1,3p}; Bhattarai Dipesh^{2†}; Ekemiri K Kingsley^{1,3}; Harbajan N Gabrielle^{1†}; Crooks
7 C Anesha^{1†}; Mashige P Khathutshelo^{3†}; Alex A Ilechie^{4†}; Feriel M Zereid^{5†}; Osuagwu L
8 Uchechukwu ^{6*p}

9 Affiliations:

10 ¹Optometry Unit, Department of Clinical Surgical Sciences, Faculty of Medical Sciences,
11 University of the West Indies, St Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago; ezinne.ngozi@gmail.com;
12 doctorkingsley1981@gmail.com;

13 ²School of Medicine, Faculty of Health, Deakin University, Victoria Australia.
14 dipeshbhattarai@hotmail.com.

15 ³African Vision Research Institute (AVRI), Discipline of Optometry, School of Health Sciences,
16 University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa. Mashigek@ukzn.ac.za

17 ⁴Department of Optometry and Vision Science, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana

18 Email address: alexilechie@gmail.com

⁵Department of Optometry & Vision Sciences College of Applied Medical Sciences, King Saud University, Ilesha, Saudi Arabia; drferyal@KSU.EDU.SA

^{6*}Translational Health Research Institute (THRI), School of Medicine, Western Sydney University, Campbelltown, Australia. L.Osuagwu@westernsydney.edu.au

*Corresponding Author:

Uchechukwu L Osuagwu

Translational Health Research Institute (THRI),

School of Medicine, Western Sydney University, Campbelltown, NSW 2560

Email: L.Osuagwu@westernsydney.edu.au;

Number of Tables: 1

Number of Figures: 4

^p These authors contributed equally to this work

[†] These authors also contributed equally to this work

Acknowledgments: None to acknowledge

Abstract

Purpose: Contact lenses (CL) remain a popular mode of refractive error correction globally and in the Caribbean, mostly among young people. However, no data on the characteristics of the CL

population wearers in the Caribbean is available. This study reported on the characteristics of CL wearers and the associated factors in Trinidad and Tobago (T&T).

Methods: Clinical records of 243 CL wearers attending the University of the West Indies (UWI) optometry clinic between 2017 and 2018 were reviewed. Data on their demographic profiles, CL wearing characteristics including lens type, material, purpose of wear, replacement schedule and care systems were extracted and analyzed. The associations between the demographic characteristics and CL wearing characteristics were also determined.

Results: About half of the respondents wear CL wearers and used them for various purposes such as fashion (more among those aged 18 to 30 years, 61.0%), therapeutic (more among those <18 years, 43.8%, $P = 0.001$) and refractive error correction purposes (more in those >40 years, $P = 0.001$). Females were more likely to use CLs for fashion compared with males (67.0% versus 40.7%). Age ($P < 0.0005$) and gender ($P = 0.030$) were associated with the lens materials. Those aged 18-30 years were more likely use hydrogels compared with the younger ones (64.1% versus 25.0%). Rigid gas permeable (RGP) CL use was more common in males than females (21.8% versus 10.9%, $P = 0.031$). Daily disposables were predominantly used by younger respondents (18-30 year-olds, 31.3%, $P < 0.001$) and more in females than males (66.7% vs 49.4%, $P = 0.040$).

Conclusions: Contact lens use appears be more common among younger females for fashion and older males for refractive correction. Age, gender and employment status were the main determinants of lens wear among respondents attending the university clinic in T&T.

Keywords: Contact lens; refractive error; silicone hydrogel; rigid gas permeable; demographic profile

59

60 **Introduction**

61 Contact lenses (CL) are used for the correction of refractive errors as well as fashion and
 62 therapeutic purposes [1]. It is estimated that there are over 140 million CL wearers globally [2].
 63 However, over the past decade, the CL industry has experienced advancements in terms of lens
 64 designs and materials which has influenced the choice of wear [3-5]. The use of CL has been in
 65 existence for the past two decades, with ongoing evaluation of different types of CL worn around
 66 the world, to better understand and identify some of the common factors which influence choice
 67 of wear. Global trends indicate that soft CL for daily wear are more popular, and majority of
 68 wearers were females [6-9]. In addition, an increase in silicone hydrogel CL for daily wear has
 69 been reported globally [1, 10, 11]. Rigid CL lens fitting has been shown to represent a small
 70 percentage of the market, particularly in developing countries [7, 12]. The common factors
 71 reported to affect CL wear are demographic profiles of the population, income, purpose of wear,
 72 prevailing eye condition in that area, the range of CL available, level of education of the
 73 optometrist and socio-cultural issues [8, 10, 13].

74 Trinidad and Tobago (T&T) is a small twin Island republic state in the Caribbean [14] with
 75 a population of 1.4 million people and is regarded as the power house of the English speaking
 76 Caribbean due to its large natural oil and gas reserves [15]. It has only one optometry school which
 77 is located at the University of the West Indies, Saint Augustine campus and started in 2011. Prior
 78 to 2009, most optometrists in T&T were foreign trained (UK, USA, Nigeria, and South Africa)
 79 because there was no optometry training institution in the country and across the Caribbean region.
 80 To meet the growing demand for eye care services by increasing the number of optometrists in the

region, the first Bachelor of Science programme in Optometry was started in T&T at the University of the West Indies and this training brought a lot of changes in optometry profession across the Caribbean [16].

CL practice in T&T has evolved over the last decades following the emergence of the optometry programme and together with some other countries in the Caribbean including Barbados, Guyana, Saint Lucia and Jamaica, the country has benefitted enormously from this Programme [16] with increase in the optometry manpower. The increase in the number of optometry graduate from the University of West Indies led to the expansion of optometry practice with many of the optometrists embarking on different areas of interests including CL practice. This is possibly due to a high demand for CL wear in private practices as a result of the improvement in the socio-economic condition of many in the country.

Contact lens practice in Trinidad and Tobago is regulated by the Trinidad and Tobago Optometrists Association (TTOA) [17]. Optometrists and Ophthalmologists are the only professionals permitted to prescribe CL for the management of refractive error, keratoconus and anisometropia in Trinidad and Tobago. The use of fashion CL is not regulated as individuals are free to purchase them from beauty parlor, over-the-counter pharmacy shops, online and even supermarkets. Most of the big CL companies such as Johnson and Johnson, Acuvue, Bausch and Lomb have their representatives in the country making various CLs readily available.

CL are gaining popularity worldwide as an alternative to spectacles for the correction of refractive errors and across different countries, their usage vary with various demographic characteristics [5, 6, 8, 9]. Approximately 7.2%, 12.0%, 14.6% and 14.7% adult CL usage rates were reported in the UK, Norway, Japan and the USA respectively [11]. Unlike the neighboring countries like the United states, there is a paucity of published data on CL use across the Caribbean

and the characteristics of lens wearers in T&T remain unknown. Considering the growing popularity of CL use and the fact that demographic profile of lens wearers and associated factors might vary between countries due to the variations in socioeconomic factors, more studies are needed to provide an insight into CL wear in different countries including T&T. The information will aid eye care practitioners and lens manufacturers in T&T to understand the local CL market to assess demand, growth in relation to other countries. The aim of this study was to determine the demographic characteristic of CL wearers and associated factors among respondents who attended a university optometry clinic in T&T. This will provide data for comparison with the global findings.

Materials and Methods

Study setting

This study was carried out at the University of the West Indies (UWI) optometry clinic situated in Couva, an urban town (48,858 in 2011 census) in west-central Trinidad, south of Port of Spain and Chaguanas [18]. It is the capital and main urban centre of Couva–Tabaquite–Talparo located directly adjacent to the Venezuelan state of Monagas [18]. It is the fourth least populated city in Trinidad and has very few optometry clinics. Most (80%) of the optometry practices in Trinidad are situated in Port of Spain, which is the nation capital, and it can be assumed that most contact lens wearers live there.

The UWI optometry clinic in Trinidad and Tobago provides optometry training and services to the general public. It is well equipped and has a highly qualified academic staff

complement. CL practice including fitting and prescribing CL for keratoconus management is among the eye care services provided.

Ethical considerations

Approval to conduct the study was obtained from the University of the West Indies, St Augustine campus, Research and Ethics Committee (registration number: CREC.SA.0037/09/2019). Permission to assess patients' case files was obtained from the university optometry unit Coordinator and the study followed the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki.

Study design

This was a retrospective study of patients prescribed with contact lens at the UWI optometry clinic from January 2017 to December 2018. The records of all patients prescribed with contact lens were retrieved and reviewed.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

All patients prescribed with contact lens at UWI optometry clinic were included. The study included all patients prescribed with contact lens at the clinic from January 2017 to December 2018. All patients who wore contact lens prescribed outside UWI optometry clinic and those whose contact lenses prescriptions were obtained outside UWI or could not be verified, were excluded.

Data collection procedure

Data collection involved the use of a data extraction sheet to obtain information on the demographic profile of each patient fitted and CL wearing history and characteristics. These were

based on a review of previous studies [1, 6, 7] and included lens type, purpose of wear (fashion, refractive correction and therapeutic/cosmesis) [9, 13, 19] lens material (hydrogel, silicon hydrogel and rigid gas permeable), habitual lens replacement schedule (daily disposable, weekly disposable, monthly disposable and yearly disposable) [1], lens wear modality (fulltime wear was considered as ≥ 8 hrs per day and seven days a week and part time as < 8 hrs per day) [7], and care systems advised for each patient, over a two-year period.

Statistical analysis

Data were analysed using the IBM Statistical package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 27 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, USA). Descriptive statistics were computed for all variables after the data had been screened and the assessed for normality of distribution. Continuous and discrete variables were analysed using student *t* test for means and Pearson's Chi-square test for proportions, respectively.

Results

Demographics of contact lens wearers

Table 1 presents the demographic profiles and CL-related characteristics. Two hundred and forty three patients were prescribed with CL at the UWI optometry clinic from January 2017 to December 2018. Their mean age was 29.7 ± 12.7 years (range 4-73 years), and the majority (59.7%) were in the 18 to 30 years age group. Almost two-thirds (64.2%) were females and 54.4% were from urban areas. About half (51.4%) were unemployed and these were mostly young people (64.8% were aged 18-30 years).

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of the participants and CL-related variables ($n = 243$ unless otherwise specified).

Variables	Number of participants (n)	Percentage (%)
Year		
2017	101	41.6
2018	142	58.4
Demography		
Age category		
<18 years	16	6.6
18 - 30 years	145	59.7
31 - 40 years	38	15.6
>40 years	44	18.1
Gender		
Male	87	35.8
Female	156	64.2
Residency (n = 240)		
Rural	107	44.6
Urban	133	55.4
Occupation		

Employed	118	48.6
Unemployed	125	51.4
Purpose of CL wear (n= 226)		
Fashion	130	57.5
Refractive error	66	29.2
Correction		
Therapeutic	30	13.3
CL types		
Soft spherical	93	38.3
Soft toric	90	37.0
Soft multifocal	24	9.9
CL material		
Hydrogel	129	53.1
Silicon hydrogel	78	32.1
Rigid Gas permeable	36	14.8
Habitual CL replacement schedule		
Daily disposable	147	60.5
Biweekly disposable	22	9.1
Monthly disposable	38	15.6

Yearly disposable	36	14.8
CL care system		
Multipurpose solution	59	24.3
Boston solution	34	14.0
None (not recorded)	150	61.7
CL wear modality (n = 200)		
Part time (<8hrs/day)	80	40
Full time (≥8hrs/day)	120	60

CL=contact lens, wear modality

Contact lens wear profile

The main reason for CL wear was cosmesis (53.5%) followed by refractive correction (27.2%) (Table 1). More than two-thirds (38.3%) wore soft spherical or soft lenses (37%). For more than half of the wearers, their CLs materials was polymer-hydrogel (53.1%) and 32.1% wore silicone-hydrogel lenses while (14.8%) wore RGP lenses. Most (60.5%) wore daily disposable CLs and 15.6% wore monthly disposables.

Most (61%) record cards did not reflect the type of lens system used. About one-quarter (24.3%) used multipurpose solution and 14% used Boston solution. The mean number of the daily hours and the average number of days the wearers used their lenses were recorded as 7.8 (SD, 3.1;

range 1.5-18 hours) per day and for about 4 days per week. Majority (60%) wore CL for more than 16 hours per day and 44.45% wore them more than 4 days a week.

Association between demographic variables and the purpose of wear

Figure 1 shows the results for the purpose of CL wear by a) age group and b) gender. Chi-square analysis showed that the purpose of CLs wear differed between age groups ($p = 0.001$) and gender of the respondents ($p = 0.001$). Compared with other age groups, those in the 18 to 30 years age group were more likely to wear fashion CLs (61.0%) whereas therapeutic purposes were the main reason for CL use among those younger than 18 years (43.8%, $P = 0.001$). In contrast, CL wearers older than 40 years (35.9%) were more likely to use CLs for refractive error correction compared to younger wearers (<18 years, 12.5%, $P = 0.001$).

A higher percentage of females (67.0% versus 40.7%) wore CL for fashion reasons whereas more males than females (39.5% versus 23.4%) used CLs for refractive error correction ($P = 0.001$).

Association between demographic variables and the CLs material

Age and gender were significantly associated with lens materials worn (both P -values <0.05) (Figure 2). Participants between the ages of 18 and 30 years were more likely to be prescribed hydrogel CLs compared with teenagers (less than 18 years) (64.1% versus 25.0%, $P < 0.001$) and older adults (more than 40 years) (34.1%, $P < 0.001$), who were more likely to be prescribed silicon hydrogel CL. There was a significant association between CL material and gender, and 58.3% of females compared with 43.7% of males were prescribed hydrogel CLs ($P = 0.031$). No other significant association was found between the material prescribed and other demographic variables.

Association between demographic variables and the replacement schedule (wearing regimen) of CLs

Age and gender were associated with the CL wear regimen ($P < 0.001$) (Figure 3). A higher proportion of those below 18 years of age used monthly disposable CLs (43.8%) compared with other age groups (43.8% versus maximum of 29.5% among those aged more than 40 years, respectively, $P < 0.001$). Compared with other age groups, teenagers were less likely to use daily disposable CLs, which was rather more commonly used by females than males (66.7% versus 49.4%). By contrast, males were more likely to use extended wear CLs (yearly disposables, 21.8% versus 10.9%, $P = 0.040$) than females.

Association between demographic variables and the modality of wear

The modality of wear (full time or part time wear) was not dependent on the age group ($P=0.068$) and gender ($P=0.718$). However, in those older than 18 years, there was a tendency for more wearers to use their lenses for eight or more hours each day (46.2% in the <18 years age group compared with 55.4%, 75% and 70.6% in the 18-30, 31-40, >40 years age groups, respectively). Majority of those who were employed wore their lenses for about eight or more daily hours compared with those who were unemployed at the time of this study (68.0% versus 52.4%, $P = 0.030$).

Association of lens care system and wearing modality

Figure 4 shows the distribution of the CLs by wearing modality. Many (71.8%) silicone hydrogel and 2.3% of hydrogel wearers used multipurpose solutions to care for their lenses while 94.4% of RGP CL wearers used the Boston solution. There was a significant association between

the lens care systems and the contact lens wear regimen/replacement schedules ($P<0.0005$). All CL wearers who were prescribed weekly replacement lenses used multipurpose solution. However, lens care system used by some monthly replacements (2.6%) and twice more of the yearly replacement CL wearers (5.6%) were not recorded in their files at the time of the review.

Discussion

This retrospective study investigated the characteristics of CL wearers and their association with lens characteristics in a clinic population in T&T over two years. The study found that CLs wearers were mostly young, unemployed females who lived in the urban areas of T&T. Soft, polymer-hydrogel and daily disposable CLs were the most frequently used CL types, materials and wearing regimen, respectively among the respondents. Although most respondents were full time lens wearers, fashion was cited as the main reason for lens wear.

The findings that most CL wearers were females and used them for fashion reasons are consistent with previous studies and this can be attributed to the perception that CLs are used for fashions [4, 6, 8]. The fact that daily disposable CLs were more common among females than males suggests that females may be prioritizing their expenditure on facial fashions than males since wear of daily disposable lenses is a more expensive option than extended wear lenses [12]. Similarly, cost of daily disposable lenses may explain the finding that daily disposable CLs was not the lens of choice for teenagers.

The majority of older respondents (> 40 years) used CLs for refractive error correction, which is consistent with trends observed in the USA where the use of CLs for presbyopia

correction is on the rise [11]. This may be due to the advancement of contact lens materials [4] and better understanding of the relationship between the corneal surface and the prescribed CL materials [3]. In contrast, younger patients showed a preference for fashion CLs use, however, 64.8% were unemployed compared with only 13.2% of those aged 31-40 years who also had more people using. While the use of CLs for fashion purpose among young people in this review is high, there is a tendency for increased ocular complications in this age group due to poor compliance [9]. There is need for targeted contact lens education either in form of booklet or media campaign to encourage proper lens hygiene and improve compliance [20].

Previous studies have shown that CL related complications including discomfort were higher among presbyopes than non-presbyopes [13, 19] while young lens wearers showed poorer care/compliance than their older counterparts [9]. In a study done by Young et al., they reported that silicone-hydrogel CLs provided better comfort than the hydrogel CLs, especially in the adverse environment [21]. These may explain the preference to fit most teenagers and presbyopes with silicon-hydrogel CL material compared with most adults aged between 18 and 40 years, who were fitted with hydrogel CLs material in this study.

Limitations and strengths

The following limitations should be considered in the interpretation of the study findings and when comparing this study to previous or future studies. First, the CL wearers from a University clinic in Trinidad and Tobago reported in this study do not represent all CL wearers in Trinidad and Tobago since the data was collected from one clinic. Second, as with all questionnaire-based studies, this study could not expand some questions which would have provided a clearer understanding of the individual's CL wear and care habits. Third, without

directly observing the CL wearers, the researchers could not verify the participant responses. In addition, incomplete documentation common in retrospective studies was another limitation. For example, the type of lens care system used was not recorded for majority of the patients in this study. Despite the limitations, our study provided baseline data on the demographical profile of CL in T&T and could be used for comparison across the Caribbean in future studies. Although, our study sample may be biased towards clinic population it reflected the small population of the island (1.399 million) and greater than the sample size used in similar studies elsewhere including Ghana [8], Australia [22], Malaysia [23], Maldives [24], Saudi Arabia [25], South Africa [26], and Jordan [27]. Further studies on CL use in the Caribbean including the investigation of other factors such as types of refractive error, knowledge and attitude of lens wearers and hygiene are warranted.

Conclusions

This study found that about one in every two respondents attending the optometry clinic in T&T used CLs with young adults aged 18-30 years, and females more likely to use them for fashion and older males for correction of refractive errors. Age, gender and employment status were the main determinants of lens wear among respondents in this study.

References

1. Gammoh Y, Abdu M. Contact lens procurement and usage habits among adults in Sudan. PLoS One. 2021;16(5):e0251987. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0251987

- 285 2. Dumbleton K, Caffery B, Dogru M, Hickson-Curran S, Kern J, Kojima T, et al. The TFOS International
286 Workshop on Contact Lens Discomfort: report of the subcommittee on epidemiology. Invest ophthalmol
287 Vis Sci 2013;54(11):TFOS20-TFOS36.
- 288 3. Stapleton F, Tan J. Impact of contact lens material, design, and fitting on discomfort. Eye Contact
289 Lens. 2017;43(1):32-39. doi: 10.1097/ICL.0000000000000318.
- 290 4. Musgrave CSA, Fang F. Contact lens materials: a materials science perspective. Materials
291 2019;12(2):261. doi: 10.3390/ma12020261
- 292 5. Corbin GS, Bennett L, Espejo L, Carducci S, Sacco A, Hannigan R, et al. A multicenter investigation
293 of OPTI-FREE® RepleniSH® multi-purpose disinfecting solution impact on soft contact lens patient comfort.
294 Clin Ophthalmol. 2010;4:47-57. doi: 10.2147/opth.s7498
- 295 6. Abahussin M, AlAnazi M, Ogbuehi KC, Osuagwu UL. Prevalence, use and sale of contact lenses in
296 Saudi Arabia: survey on university women and non-ophthalmic stores. Cont Lens Anterior Eye.
297 2014;37(3):185-90. doi: 10.1016/j.clae.2013.10.001.
- 298 7. Lee Y, Lim C-W, Saw S-M, Koh D. The prevalence and pattern of contact lens use in a Singapore
299 community. CLAO. 2000;26(1):21-5.
- 300 8. Ocansey S, Ovenseri Ogbomo G, Abu EK, Morny EKA, Adjei-Boye O. Profile, knowledge, and
301 attitude of contact lens users regarding contact lens wear in Ghana. Cont Lens Anterior Eye
302 2019;42(2):170-7. doi: 10.1016/j.clae.2018.10.012.
- 303 9. Li W, Sun X, Wang Z, Zhang Y. A survey of contact lens-related complications in a tertiary hospital
304 in China. Cont Anterior Eye 2018;41(2):201-4. doi: 10.1016/j.clae.2017.10.007.
- 305 10. Morgan PB, Efron N, Helland M, et al. Global trends in prescribing contact lenses for extended
306 wear. Cont Lens Anterior Eye 2011;34(1):32-5. doi: 10.1016/j.clae.2010.06.007.
- 307 11. Efron N, Nichols JJ, Woods CA, Morgan PB. Trends in US contact lens prescribing 2002 to 2014.
308 Optom Vis Sci 2015;92(7):758-67. doi: 10.1097/OPX.0000000000000623.

- 309 12. Morgan PB, Efron N, Woods CA, Consortium ICLPS. Determinants of the frequency of contact lens
310 wear. *Eye contact lens* 2013;39(3):200-4. doi: 10.1097/ICL.0b013e31827a7ad3.
- 311 13. Chalmers RL, Hunt C, Hickson-Curran S, Young G. Struggle with hydrogel CL wear increases with
312 age in young adults. *Cont Lens Anterior Eye* 2009;32(3):113-9. doi: 10.1016/j.clae.2008.12.001.
- 313 14. Mahabir B. as the twin island republican state in the Caribbean, trinidad and tobago is noted for
314 its many attributes including carnival, calypso, its multi. *Indian Diaspora in the Caribbean: History, Culture,
315 and Identity* 2012:113.
- 316 15. Trinidad And Tobago Population 2021 (Live) United States2021 [Available from:
317 <https://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/trinidad-and-tobago-population>.
- 318 16. Wang-Harris S. Optometric Education in Trinidad and Tobago: Developing a New Program in the
319 West Indies. *Optom Edu.* 2013;39(1).
- 320 17. TTOA. Trinidad & Tobago Optometrists Association Tunapuna, Trinidad, West Indies 2017
321 [Available from: <https://www.ttoptom.com/about>.
- 322 18. Digital legislative library. In: Affairs MotAGaL, editor. Port of Spain Trinidad, West Indies:
323 Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago; 2021.
- 324 19. Lorente-Velázquez A, García-Montero M, Gómez-Sanz FJ, Del Viejo LR, Hernández-Verdejo JL,
325 Madrid-Costa D. Comparison of the impact of nesofilcon A hydrogel contact lens on the ocular surface
326 and the comfort of presbyopic and non-presbyopic wearers. *Int J Ophthalmol.* 2019;12(4):640-646. doi:
327 10.18240/ijo.2019.04.19
- 328 20. Falahati-Marvast F, Alipour F, Farokhzadian J, Ahmadian L. Determining the information needs of
329 contact lens wearers for better education and more support: a qualitative study. *BMC ophthalmol*
330 2021;21(1):1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12886-021-02085-0>
- 331 21. Young G. Exploring the relationship between materials and ocular comfort and health. *Contact*
332 *Lens Spectr* 2007:37-40.

- 333
- 334 22. Wu Y, Carnt N, Stapleton F. Contact lens user profile, attitudes and level of compliance to lens care.
- 335 Cont Lens Anterior Eye 2010; 33(4):183–188. doi: 10.1016/j.clae.2010.02.002.
- 336 23. Bhandari M, Hung PR. Habits of contact lens wearers toward lens care in Malaysia. Med J Malaysia
- 337 2012; 67(3):274–277.
- 338 24. Gyawali R, Nestha Mohamed F, Bist J, Kandel H, Marasini S, et al. Compliance and hygiene behaviour
- 339 among soft contact lens wearers in the Maldives. Clin Exp Optom. 2014; 97(1):43–47. doi:
- 340 10.1111/cxo.12069.
- 341 **25.** Boqursain SK, Al-Hussain AS, Mubarak AAA, Al-Bujays DS, Al-Mustahi M. The attitude and awareness
- 342 of contact lens use among medical students of King Faisal University, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia. J Family Med
- 343 Prim Care 2021; 10(10):3765–3771. doi: 10.4103/jfmpc.jfmpc_707_21.
- 344 26. Khoza N, Moodley T, Sokhulu S, Sotyana NO, Suliman A, Hansraj R, et al. Knowledge, attitudes and
- 345 practices of contact lens use in a South African adolescent population. Afr Health Sci. 2020 Jun;20(2):768–
- 346 774. doi: 10.4314/ahs.v20i2.29. PMID: 33163042; PMCID: PMC7609115.
- 347 27. Bakkar MM, Alzghoul EA. Assessment of compliance with contact lens wear and care among university-
- 348 based population in Jordan. Contact Lens and Anterior Eye 2020; 43(4):395–401. doi:
- 349 10.1016/j.clae.2020.02.020.

350

351

352

353

356 **Figure legends**

357 Figure 1: Distribution of purpose of contact lens wear by: (a) age group and (b), gender of wearers

358 Figure 2: Distribution of purpose of contact lens materials by: (a) age group and (b), gender of
359 wearers

360 Figure 3: Distribution of contact lens wear regimen/replacement schedule *by: (a) age group and*
361 *(b), gender of wearers*

362 Figure 4: Distribution of contact lens care systems by wear modality

363

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4