

1 **Prevalence and causes of blindness and visual impairment in Kogi state, Nigeria –**

2 **Findings from a Rapid Assessment of Avoidable Blindness survey.**

3

4 Penzin Selben<sup>1</sup>, Jolley Emma<sup>2</sup>, Ogundimu Kolawole<sup>1</sup>, Mpyet Caleb<sup>3</sup>, Ibrahim

5 Nazaradden<sup>1</sup>, Owoeye Foluso<sup>4</sup>, Isiyaku Sunday<sup>1</sup>, Shu'aibu Joy<sup>1</sup>, Schmidt Elena<sup>2</sup>

6 <sup>1</sup>Sightsavers, Nigeria Country Office.

7 <sup>2</sup>Sightsavers, Haywards Heath, United Kingdom.

8 <sup>3</sup>University of Jos, Nigeria.

9 <sup>4</sup>University of Ilorin, Nigeria.

10 **Corresponding author**

11 **Selben Penzin – [spenzin@sightsavers.org](mailto:spenzin@sightsavers.org) (SP)**

12

13 **Conflicts of interest**

14 The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

15

16 **Financial support**

17 This research was supported by the Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office

18 [contract award DFID 8219].

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## 19 **Abstract**

### 20 **Purpose**

21 To determine the prevalence and causes of blindness and visual  
22 impairment among adults in Kogi, Nigeria.

### 23 **Methods**

24 A Rapid assessment of avoidable blindness (RAAB) protocol was used  
25 with additional tools measuring disability and household wealth to  
26 measure the prevalence of blindness and visual impairment (VI) and  
27 associations with sex, disability, wealth, cataract surgical coverage and its  
28 effectiveness.

### 29 **Results**

30 Age- and sex-adjusted all-cause prevalence of bilateral blindness was  
31 3.6% (95%CI 3.0-4.2%), prevalence of blindness among people living  
32 with additional, non-visual disabilities was 38.3% (95% CI 29.0-48.6%)  
33 compared to 1.6% (95%CI 1.2-2.1%;  $\chi^2 = 771.9$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) among people  
34 without additional disabilities. Cataract was the principal cause of bilateral  
35 blindness (55.3%). Cataract surgical coverage (CSC) at visual acuity (VA)  
36 3/60 was 48.0%, higher among men than women (53.7% vs 40.3%);  
37 12.0% among people with non-visual disabilities; 66.9% among people  
38 without non-visual disabilities, higher among people in the wealthiest two  
39 quintiles (41.1%) compared to the lowest three (24.3%).

40 Effective Cataract Surgical Coverage at Visual Acuity 6/60 was 31.0%,  
41 higher among males (34.9%) than females (25.5%), low among people  
42 with additional, non-visual disabilities (1.9%) compared to people with no  
43 additional disabilities (46.2%), higher among people in the wealthiest two  
44 quintiles (41.1%) compared to the poorest three (24.3%).

45 Good surgical outcome (VA>6/18) was seen in 61 eyes (52.6%) increasing  
46 to 71 (61.2%) eyes with best correction. Cost was identified as the main  
47 barrier to surgery.

#### 48 **Conclusion**

49 Findings suggest there exists inequalities in eye care with women, poorer  
50 people and people with disabilities having a lower Cataract Surgical  
51 Coverage, thereby, underscoring the importance of eye care programs to  
52 address these inequalities.

## 53 **Introduction**

54 Globally, 1.1 billion people have an untreated or preventable visual impairment (VI),  
55 including 43 million who are blind <sup>1,2</sup>. The major cause of blindness are cataract and  
56 uncorrected refractive error (URE) is the leading cause of moderate and severe VI <sup>2</sup>.  
57 The burden of eye conditions is disproportionately higher in low- and middle-income  
58 countries with an estimated 39 million (91.8%) of the 43 million blind people living in  
59 these countries <sup>2</sup>.

60 Gender disparities in blindness and VI have been noted with women accounting for  
61 55% of blindness <sup>2,3</sup>. Studies across sub-Saharan Africa show that women, the elderly,  
62 people in rural areas, and those in the poorest households are at highest risk of cataract-  
63 related blindness and VI <sup>4</sup>. Although factors like sex, economic status and disability  
64 have been identified as driving inequities, more data on the relationships between these  
65 variables is necessary <sup>5-8</sup>.

66 Achieving universal eye health coverage is an integral step to achieving the Sustainable  
67 Development Goals, and Universal Health Coverage, as reducing the burden of VI will  
68 significantly improve individuals' achievements in education, work, social participation  
69 and quality of life <sup>2</sup>. The World Report on Vision describes the need for integrated  
70 person-centred eye care that adopts a health system perspective to address the  
71 significant eye health challenges facing many countries, recommending monitoring  
72 trends and evaluating progress as key actions for governments to meet their population  
73 eye health needs <sup>1</sup>.

74 Nigeria, has a population of over 200 million people in 2022, with people 50 years and  
75 over accounting for about 10%<sup>9</sup>. A national survey of VI in 2007 found the prevalence  
76 of blindness among adults aged over 40 years to be 4.2% (95%CI 3.8-4.6%)<sup>10</sup>.

77 Kogi State, in northcentral Nigeria, is home to about 4 million people<sup>9</sup>. In 2007, the  
78 prevalence of blindness in adults in this zone was 3.7% (95%CI 3.0-4.7%), prevalence  
79 of severe VI (SVI) was 1.7% (95%CI 1.2-2.5%)<sup>10</sup>. An unpublished situational analysis  
80 report in 2018 estimated the cataract surgical rate (CSR) in Kogi to be below 100 per  
81 million population. There were four ophthalmologists and one government hospital and  
82 numerous private hospitals providing routine small incision cataract surgery with  
83 intraocular lens implantation.

84 No data on eye health status, needs, or service coverage had been collected in Kogi  
85 since the 2007 national survey. In 2019, the Kogi State Ministry of Health, supported by  
86 non-governmental organisation, Sightsavers, embarked on a new eye health programme  
87 with an aim to reach the most marginalised groups. A population-based blindness and  
88 VI survey was conducted at the outset to generate data to inform programme planning  
89 and baseline data to measure progress against. This paper reports the results of the  
90 survey.

91

## 92 **Methods**

### 93 **Study design**

94 A population-based cross-sectional survey, using a standardised rapid assessment of  
95 avoidable blindness (RAAB) methodology (described elsewhere), was conducted  
96 between September 2019 and March 2020 <sup>11</sup>.

### 97 **Study population**

98 This comprised adults aged 50 years and above resident in Kogi State for at least 6  
99 months prior to the survey. Participants were recruited from 25<sup>th</sup> September 2019 to 31<sup>st</sup>  
100 March 2020.

### 101 **Sampling size and strategy**

102 Sample size was calculated using the RAAB (version 5) software package. A minimum  
103 sample size of 4,150 was determined based on an estimated blindness prevalence of  
104 3.75% <sup>10</sup>, precision of 20% within a 95% confidence interval, non-compliance rate of  
105 10% and design effect of 1.5.

106 A two-stage cluster sampling approach was adopted to select 4,150 eligible adults. First,  
107 83 clusters were selected from a list of all villages (clusters) using probability  
108 proportionate to size methodology. Secondly, 50 eligible participants were enrolled  
109 from each village.

## 110 **Study procedures**

111 The data collection teams comprised an ophthalmologist (team leader), an ophthalmic  
112 nurse and a cluster informer trained over five days by a certified RAAB trainer and  
113 passed an inter observer variation test according to RAAB guidelines before proceeding  
114 to the field.

115 Data were collected using an application on an android smartphone and uploaded to a  
116 cloud-based server. Precise location of villages (not households) was recorded using  
117 global positioning system (GPS) coordinates so that cluster level data could be visually  
118 mapped and geospatially analysed.

## 119 **Study protocols and definitions**

120 All consenting participants underwent an eye examination conducted by the  
121 ophthalmologist following the standard RAAB protocol and answered additional  
122 questions regarding disability and household wealth . Using the WHO definitions,  
123 blindness was presenting VA (PVA) in the better eye less than 3/60, severe VI (SVI)  
124 was VA better than 3/60 to less than 6/60, moderate VI (MVI) was VA 6/60 to less than  
125 6/18 <sup>12</sup>. Refractive error was PVA<6/18 improving to 6/18 with pinhole. Cataract  
126 surgical coverage (CSC) is the number of operated persons with cataract as a proportion  
127 of those needing plus who have had surgery, effective CSC is the number of operated  
128 persons with cataract and have VA  $\geq 6/18$  as a proportion of those needing plus who  
129 have had surgery, and we used the new definitions presented in 2023 <sup>13</sup>.

130 The eye examination recorded the following data: (i) PVA measurement of each eye (all  
131 participants). (ii) Pinhole VA of each eye if PVA<6/18. (iii) Lens examination of each  
132 eye with a torch in a darkened room (all participants). (iv) Posterior-segment

133 examination with an ophthalmoscope of each eye PVA<6/18 where the principal cause  
134 cannot be attributed to refractive error, cataract, or corneal scarring. (v) Assessment of  
135 the major cause of VI of each eye PVA<6/18 and in persons where both eyes present  
136 VA<6/18 and the causes are not the same. (vi) Questions regarding where cataract  
137 surgery took place or why cataract surgery has not taken place where it is indicated.

138 Minor ocular conditions were treated by the team. Other conditions were referred to the  
139 nearest hospital.

140 Disability (reported elsewhere <sup>14</sup>) was measured using the Washington Group Short Set  
141 (WGSS) on Functioning a tool comprising six questions regarding self-reported  
142 difficulties in six domains of functioning: seeing, hearing, climbing stairs or walking,  
143 remembering or concentrating, self-care, and communication <sup>15</sup>. The severity of  
144 disability was measured on a graded scale - ‘no difficulty’, ‘some difficulty’, ‘a lot of  
145 difficulty’ and ‘cannot do at all’. Individuals reporting ‘a lot of difficulty’ or worse in at  
146 least one domain were considered to have a disability, creating a binary variable. Non-  
147 visual disability (a disability that excludes seeing difficulties) was defined as reporting  
148 ‘a lot of difficulty’ or worse in at least one domain excluding seeing.

149 The Nigeria Equity Tool (NET) <sup>16</sup>, an internationally recognised tool designed to  
150 evaluate differences between social groups was used to categorise participants into one  
151 of five quintiles according to ownership of a list of household assets, with the poorest in  
152 the bottom quintile, and the wealthiest in the top quintile. The tool allows ascertaining  
153 the relative wealth of study participants compared to the national population. For the  
154 purposes of analysis, we created a binary variable by grouping the poorest three  
155 quintiles, and the wealthiest two.



## 156 **Data management and analysis**

157 Data from the RAAB, Washington Group Short Set (WGSS) and Nigeria Equity Tool  
158 (NET) were captured on CommCare software deployed on Android-based smartphones.  
159 Each day, data were synced to the cloud, where it was downloaded and checked by a  
160 study team member. Data was analysed in two main stages. First, a standardised  
161 descriptive analysis was carried out using the RAAB software programme <sup>17</sup>. Age- and  
162 sex-adjusted prevalence was calculated for all variables of blindness and VI. Second,  
163 Stata v15 was used to conduct chi-squared tests and adjusted logistic regression models  
164 to estimate the associations between eye health outcomes, sex, relative wealth and  
165 disability <sup>18</sup>. Regression model standard errors were clustered to account for complex  
166 sample design. The level of statistical significance was calculated between variables at  
167  $p < 0.05$ .

## 168 **Ethics**

169 The survey was approved by the Health Research Ethics Committee of Kogi State  
170 Ministry of Health Nigeria and satisfied all legal and regulatory requirements pertaining  
171 to research in Kogi State before commencement of the survey. Written consent was  
172 obtained from all participants and thumb prints substituted in non-literate participants,  
173 witnessed by an independent person – not a member of the study team – before  
174 participants were enrolled into the survey.

175

## 176 Results

### 177 Participant characteristics

178 The survey examined 3,926 adults (94.7% response rate) (Table 1); 2,283 (58.2%) were  
 179 female and the sample had a higher proportion of men aged 80+ years than women; the  
 180 oldest men were slightly older on average than the oldest women. From the sample,  
 181 212 (5.4%) had a non-visual disability (5.4% of men and 5.4% of women) and 1,078  
 182 (27.5%) adults lived in households belonging to the poorest quintile.

183 Table 1: Participant characteristics

		Male		Female		Total	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Examination status of enrolled participants</b>							
	Examined	1,643	94.8	2,283	95.2	3,926	94.7
	Not examined	68	3.9	50	2.1	118	2.8
	Refused	34	1.9	39	1.6	73	1.7
	Unable to communicate	6	0.3	27	1.1	33	0.8
<b>All examined</b>		1,643	41.8	2,283	58.2	3,926	100.0

<b>Age</b> (years)	50-59	747	45.5	1,091	47.8	1,838	46.8
	60-69	502	30.6	634	27.8	1,136	28.9
	70-79	232	14.0	339	14.8	571	14.6
	80+	162	9.9	219	9.6	381	9.7
<b>Disability</b> (non-visual)	No	1,554	94.6	2,160	94.6	3,714	94.6
	Yes	89	5.4	123	5.4	212	5.4
<b>Household wealth quintile</b>	Poorest	488	29.7	590	25.8	1,078	27.5
	Q2	259	15.8	377	16.5	636	16.2
	Q3	295	18.0	506	22.2	801	20.4

	Q4	314	19.1	506	22.2	820	20.9
	Wealthiest	287	17.5	304	13.3	591	15.1

184

185 **Prevalence of VI**

186 Adjusted for age and sex, the all-cause prevalence of bilateral blindness was 3.6% (95%  
 187 CI 3.0-4.2%), higher among men (4.1%, 95% CI 3.1-5.2%) than women (3.0%, 95% CI  
 188 2.4-3.9%), the difference not being statistically significant (Table 2). With best  
 189 correction, the adjusted prevalence was 3.3% (95% CI 2.7-4.1%). Prevalence of  
 190 presenting SVI was 2.0% (2.1% for men and 2.0% for women) and MVI 8.5% (8.8%  
 191 for men and 8.1% for women).

192 Adjusted for age and sex, the prevalence of all cause bilateral blindness among people  
 193 living with additional, non-visual disabilities was 38.3% (95% CI 29.0-48.6%)  
 194 compared to 1.6% (95%CI 1.2-2.1%;  $\chi^2 = 771.9$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) among people without  
 195 additional disabilities. Prevalence of SVI and MVI was estimated at 5.5% and 13.5%,  
 196 respectively compared to 1.8 % and 8.2% among people without additional disabilities.

197 In general, bilateral blindness did not differ by household wealth quintile. However, the  
 198 prevalence of VI at all levels was slightly higher among participants in the poorest three  
 199 quintiles compared to the wealthiest two quintiles.

200 Table 2: Age and sex adjusted prevalence of all cause bilateral presenting blindness,  
 201 SVI and MVI (adjusted to population)

	<b>Blind</b>	<b>Severe VI</b>	<b>Moderate VI</b>
	<b>% [95% CI]</b>	<b>% [95% CI]</b>	<b>% [95% CI]</b>
<b>Total</b>	3.6 [3.0-4.2]	2.0 [1.5-2.5]	8.5 [7.2-9.8]
<b>Age group: 50-59 years</b>	0.9 [0.5-1.5]	0.5 [0.3-0.9]	3.5 [2.5-5.0]
60-69 years	2.6 [1.8-3.7]	1.8 [1.1-2.8]	7.3 [5.4-9.8]
70-79 years	4.3 [2.6-6.9]	3.4 [2.1-5.3]	12.8 [10.1-16.2]
80+	16.6 [13.3-20.4]	7.6 [5.2-11.0]	27.5 [23.8-31.6]
<b>Sex: Male</b>	4.1 [3.1-5.0]	2.1 [1.4-2.8]	8.8 [6.9-10.6]
Female	3.0 [2.3-3.8]	2.0 [1.3-2.6]	8.1 [6.6-9.6]
<b>Disability (non-visual): No</b>	1.6 [1.2-2.1]	1.8 [1.4-2.4]	8.2 [6.9-9.7]
Yes	38.3 [29.0-48.6]	5.5 [3.1-9.4]	13.5 [10.0-18.0]

<b>Household wealth quintile:</b>	3.8 [3.0-4.8]	2.3 [1.8-3.0]	9.0 [7.5-10.8]
Poorest three quintiles			
Wealthiest two quintiles	2.9 [2.1-3.9]	1.5 [0.9-2.4]	7.3 [5.6-9.3]

202

203

204

205 **Causes of VI**

206 Cataract was the principal cause of bilateral blindness (73; 55.3% of all bilaterally blind  
 207 people), glaucoma the second most important (43; 32.6%), and non-trachoma corneal  
 208 opacities the third cause (7; 5.3%).

209 Cataract was the most important cause of SVI with 52 people (57.5% of all SVI cases),  
 210 followed by glaucoma and uncorrected refractive errors affecting eight people each  
 211 (10.4% each).

212 Uncorrected refractive error was the most important cause of MVI, affecting 174 people  
 213 (53.4% of all MVI cases), followed by cataract (118; 36.2%) and glaucoma (18; 5.5%).

214 Table 3: Main causes of bilateral visual impairment

	Blindness		Severe visual impairment		Moderate visual impairment	
	n	%	n	%	n	%

Unoperated cataract	73	55.3	52	67.5	118	36.2
Glaucoma	43	32.6	8	10.4	18	5.5
Non-trachoma corneal opacity	7	5.3	1	1.3	2	0.6
Phthisis	1	0.8	0	-	0	-
Cataract surgical complications	1	0.8	5	6.5	4	1.2
Uncorrected refractive errors	0	-	8	10.4	174	53.4
Other	7	5.3	3	3.9	10	3.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>100.0</b>

215

## 216 Coverage of cataract services

217 Age and sex adjusted cataract surgical coverage (CSC) at the 3/60 level was 48.0%,  
 218 higher among men than women (53.7% vs 40.3%). Among people with non-visual  
 219 disabilities, CSC was 12.0% compared with 66.9% among people without non-visual  
 220 disabilities. CSC was also higher among people living in households in the wealthiest  
 221 two quintiles (41.1%) compared to the lowest three (24.3%).

222 Effective CSC at the 6/60 level was 31.0% overall, and higher among males (34.9%)  
 223 than females (25.5%) and was extremely low among people with additional, non-visual  
 224 disabilities (1.9%) compared to people with no additional disabilities (46.2%). It was  
 225 also higher among people living in households belonging to the wealthiest two quintiles  
 226 (41.1%) compared to the poorest three (24.3%).

227 Table 4: Cataract surgical coverage and effective cataract surgical coverage (eyes)  
228 adjusted for age and sex (percentage)

	VA<3/60	VA<6/60	VA<6/18
<b>Cataract surgical coverage (eyes)</b>			
<b>Overall</b>	48.0	36.7	22.5
<b>Sex: Male</b>	53.7	40.4	25.5
Female	40.3	31.5	18.2
<b>Disability (non-visual): No</b>	66.9	47.9	27.0
Yes	12.0	11.5	8.1
<b>Household wealth: poorest three quintiles</b>	39.4	27.6	16.5
Wealthiest three quintiles	61.2	53.9	35.0
<b>Effective cataract surgical coverage (eyes)</b>			
<b>Overall</b>	31.0	24.2	14.8



<b>Sex: Male</b>	34.9	26.8	17.2
Female	25.5	20.4	11.4
<b>Disability (non-visual): No</b>	46.2	33.5	18.8
Yes	1.9	3.1	2.2
<b>Household wealth: poorest three quintiles</b>	24.3	17.3	10.6
Wealthiest two quintiles	41.1	37.0	23.6

229

230 Using presenting visual acuity (PVA), of the 116 eyes operated on for cataract, 61  
 231 (52.6%) had good outcome (VA>6/18) increasing to 71 (61.2%) with best correction;  
 232 16.4% were borderline, and 25.9% were (VA<6/60) even with pinhole correction (data  
 233 not shown). Surgical complications were identified as the most common cause of the 36  
 234 poor visual outcomes in operated eyes (n=21, 58.3%), followed by selection (n=7) and  
 235 sequelae (n=6). Both surgical complications (42.1%) and lack of spectacles (36.8%)  
 236 were important causes of borderline outcomes.

237 **Barriers to cataract surgery**

238 More than 40% of people with untreated bilateral cataracts cited cost as the main barrier  
 239 to surgery; 36.7% did not feel they needed the operation; and 8.5% were afraid to have  
 240 surgery. People with cataracts in one eye mostly described not feeling the need as the  
 241 reason for not being operated (56.7%), followed by cost (27.1%). There was little  
 242 difference between how men and women reported barriers to surgery.

243 Table 5: Barriers to cataract surgery.

	Male		Female		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Bilateral (BCVA&lt;6/60) due to cataract</b>						
Cost	33	43.3	45	40.2	78	41.5
Need not felt	27	35.5	42	37.5	69	36.7
Fear	7	9.2	9	8.0	16	8.5
Unaware treatment is possible	4	5.3	3	2.7	7	3.7
Cannot access treatment	0	0.0	7	6.3	7	3.7
Treatment denied by provider	4	5.3	2	1.8	6	3.2
Local reason	1	1.3	4	3.6	5	2.7
Total	76	100.0	112	100.0	188	100.0

<b>Unilateral (BCVA&lt;6/60) due to cataract</b>						
Need not felt	119	56.7	125	54.3	244	55.5
Cost	57	27.1	79	34.3	136	30.9
Fear	14	6.7	12	5.2	26	5.9
Unaware treatment is possible	11	5.2	2	0.9	13	3.0
Local reason	3	1.4	8	3.5	11	2.5
Treatment denied by provider	4	1.9	2	0.9	6	1.4
Cannot access treatment	2	1.0	2	0.9	4	0.9
Total	210	100.0	230	100.0	440	100.0

244

## 245 **Discussion**

246 The prevalence of blindness among persons 50 years and over was found to be 3.6%,  
 247 almost unchanged from that reported in this part of Nigeria at 3.7% in 2007, suggesting  
 248 that the point prevalence of blindness has not changed over the past 13 years <sup>10</sup>. The  
 249 prevalence of blindness was lower among females (3.0%, 95% CI 2.4-3.9) than males  
 250 (4.1%, 95% CI 3.1-5.2) in this study, different from many other settings <sup>19,20</sup>.

251 We had expected a higher blindness prevalence as we are not aware of any past or  
 252 current major blindness prevention initiatives in this state specifically targeting women.  
 253 With an average CSR of 317 per million population per year in Nigeria <sup>21</sup>, many people

254 cannot access the few surgical sites in the state capital. Furthermore, the Nigerian  
255 population is aging and projected to reach 26 million in 2050 from 9 million reported in  
256 2016 <sup>22</sup>, the prevalence of blindness was expected to increase. Higher prevalence  
257 estimates were found in other parts of Nigeria and other Sub-Saharan African countries  
258 in more recent surveys: Plateau State 4.2% <sup>23</sup>, Katsina State 5.3% <sup>20</sup>, and lower levels in  
259 Sokoto State 1.9% <sup>19</sup>.

260 As the major cause of blindness across Sub-Saharan Africa continues to be cataract <sup>2,24</sup>,  
261 our findings in Kogi State are consistent. Cataract surgical coverage for persons in our  
262 study was relatively lower (48.0%) than in other parts of Nigeria like Sokoto where in  
263 2016 the CSC for persons was reported at 67.3% and shows that only half of people  
264 with an operable cataract had been operated on <sup>19,25</sup>. The Sokoto study did in fact show  
265 how in a ten-year period the CSC increased from 9% to 67% and prevalence of  
266 blindness reduced from 11.6% to 6.8% largely because of improved availability of  
267 human resources for cataract services. Availability of ophthalmologists as an indicator  
268 of the capacity of services meeting eye health needs has been shown to not be a strong  
269 predictor to the volume of cataract surgery and blindness prevalence elsewhere <sup>19,26</sup>.

270 It is possible that people travel to the neighbouring Kwara State, known to have good  
271 eye services, to have their surgery. Given that eye camps are intermittent, some people  
272 may stay long periods of time with only one eye operated on particularly considering  
273 the significant direct and indirect costs of a second eye surgery. Also, a person  
274 bilaterally blind from cataracts might not feel compelled to operate the other eye if  
275 he/she sees well with the other earlier operated eye. Conversely, if the initial surgery  
276 had a poor outcome, the individual may have a risk adverse attitude to future surgery.  
277 Similarly, to other studies in sub-Saharan Africa, we found that women were more

278 disadvantaged in accessing cataract services compared to men. The CSC for women in  
279 our study was 12% lower (42.1%) compared to men (54.9%). Gender inequalities in  
280 accessing cataract services are well known and have been documented in multiple  
281 settings <sup>6, 19, 27, 28</sup>. In Nigeria, gender differences were documented in the Nigeria  
282 Blindness Survey, Plateau, and Sokoto states <sup>10, 19, 23</sup>.

283 Effective CSC provides additional quantitative information on the proportion of  
284 operated individuals achieving good vision after surgery. In this study was found to be  
285 31.0% overall, and significantly lower among women, poorer people, and those with  
286 additional, non-visual disabilities. Closing the gap in surgical coverage for females  
287 should be a deliberate attempt for all surgical service providers to ensure equity in  
288 attaining UHC.

289 The cataract surgical outcome (CSO) in this study identified the proportion of eyes with  
290 good VA following cataract surgery was 52.6% and increased to 61.2% with pinhole.  
291 The best corrected CSO is higher than what was recorded for the northcentral zone in  
292 the Nigeria Blindness Survey (54.9%) and slightly lower than in Sokoto State (69%) <sup>10</sup>,  
293 <sup>19</sup>. The proportion of eyes with poor outcome following cataract surgery remains high in  
294 comparison with the Nigeria Blindness survey and may be attributed to surgical  
295 complications as recorded in this study. Quality surgical procedures such as biometry  
296 and appropriate intraocular lens power determination may not be available and could  
297 account for the leap in presenting versus best corrected visual outcome following  
298 surgery. In planning for more cataract surgeries, it is important to ensure quality and  
299 better outcomes.

300 This study identified cost as a major barrier to cataract surgery for those with bilateral  
301 cataracts. This is a significant challenge for patients as the average cost of cataract

302 surgery per eye is 45,000 Naira (\$64) whereas the minimum wage is 30,000 Naira (\$42)  
303 <sup>29</sup>. Health insurance schemes have a low coverage with less than 5% of the working  
304 population enrolled in these schemes from 2005-2021, necessitating a high proportion  
305 of out-of-pocket payments for surgical services <sup>30</sup>. For those with unilateral cataracts, no  
306 felt need was the biggest factor possibly because they still had unilateral functional  
307 vision. This is not different from the findings of other surveys in similar settings <sup>20, 31</sup>.

### 308 **Strengths and Weaknesses**

309 The survey response rate was high with 94.7%. Several reasons for this include the  
310 survey being conducted in the dry season when most farming activities were inactive,  
311 advance party information to the communities through the local cluster guides, and the  
312 survey team paying additional visits to absent enrolees. Women were more represented  
313 in the sample than men particularly in the younger age group 50-69 years. This may be  
314 related to the fact that there are marginally more women than men in the population  
315 within that age group, and this evens out in older ages. As such age- and sex-adjusted  
316 prevalence were reported. Also, this being partly a productive age group, it is possible  
317 that many men were out searching for jobs in the daytime.

318 As the RAAB tool is designed to identify avoidable blindness and coverage of cataract  
319 surgical services, it may have underestimated the burden of blindness and visual  
320 impairment due to posterior segment diseases such as glaucoma, diabetic retinopathy  
321 and age-related macular degeneration due to limitations in the diagnostic accuracy of  
322 the tool. Therefore, results must be interpreted with caution.

## 323 **Conclusions**

324 This study has provided baseline information needed to set up an inclusive eye health  
325 program in Kogi State. The prevalence of blindness has remained relatively stable since  
326 the last survey in 2007 and the causes are mostly avoidable. The study has provided  
327 added information on the likely role that gender plays in the gaps in cataract surgical  
328 services and the burden of blindness among people with disabilities.

329

## 330 **Acknowledgements**

331 We acknowledge the members of the survey teams from Kogi State Ministry of Health  
332 and the Federal Medical Centre, Lokoja, the field assistants and participants who  
333 willingly consented to be examined.

## 334 References

- 335 1. World Health Organization. World report on vision. Geneva2019.
- 336 2. Burton MJ, Ramke J, Marques AP, et al. The Lancet Global Health Commission  
337 on Global Eye Health: vision beyond 2020. *The Lancet Global Health*.  
338 2021;9:e489-e551.
- 339 3. Prasad M, Malhotra S, Kalaivani M, Vashist P, Gupta SK. Gender differences in  
340 blindness, cataract blindness and cataract surgical coverage in India: a  
341 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2020;104:220-224.
- 342 4. Lewallen S, Courtright P. Gender and use of cataract surgical services in  
343 developing countries. *Bull. World Health Organ*. 2002;80:300-303.
- 344 5. Mailu EW, Virendrakumar B, Bechange S, Jolley E, Schmidt E. Factors  
345 associated with the uptake of cataract surgery and interventions to improve  
346 uptake in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review. *PLoS One*.  
347 2020;15:e0235699.
- 348 6. Jolley E, Buttan S, Engels T, et al. Prevalence of Visual Impairment and  
349 Coverage of Cataract Surgical Services: Associations with Sex, Disability, and  
350 Economic Status in Five Diverse Sites. *Ophthalmic Epidemiol*. 2020:1-9.
- 351 7. Ramke J, Petkovic J, Welch V, et al. Interventions to improve access to cataract  
352 surgical services and their impact on equity in low- and middle-income  
353 countries. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2017.
- 354 8. Aboobaker S, Courtright P. Barriers to cataract surgery in Africa: a systematic  
355 review. *Middle East Afr. J. Ophthalmol*. 2016;23:145.
- 356 9. Federal Government of Nigeria. Nigeria Population Projections and  
357 Demographic Indicators – National and States.: Nigeria Population Commission.  
358 ; 2020.
- 359 10. Kyari F, Gudlavalleti MV, Sivsubramaniam S, et al. Prevalence of blindness and  
360 visual impairment in Nigeria: The national blindness and visual impairment  
361 survey. *Investigative ophthalmology & visual science*. 2009;50:2033-2039.
- 362 11. Kuper H, Polack S, Limburg H. Rapid assessment of avoidable blindness.  
363 *Community Eye Health*. 2006;19:68-69.
- 364 12. World Health Organisation (WHO). ICD-11 for Mortality and Morbidity  
365 Statistics2018.
- 366 13. Keel S, Müller A, Block S, et al. Keeping an eye on eye care: monitoring  
367 progress towards effective coverage. *The Lancet Global Health*. 2021;9:e1460-  
368 e1464.
- 369 14. Gascoyne B, Jolley E, Penzin S, Ogundimu K, Owoeye F, Schmidt E. Vision  
370 impairment and self-reported anxiety and depression in older adults in Nigeria:  
371 evidence from a cross-sectional survey in Kogi State. *International Health*.  
372 2022;14:i9-i16.
- 373 15. Madans JH, Loeb ME, Altman BM. Measuring disability and monitoring the  
374 UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: the work of the  
375 Washington Group on Disability Statistics. *BMC Public Health*. 2011;11:S4.
- 376 16. Metrics for Management. Nigeria Equity Tool2015.
- 377 17. Tax Software & Health Information Services. RAAB v.5.0. 5.0  
378 ed2015:developed in Visual FoxPro v. 9.0.
- 379 18. Statacorp LLC. Stata. 15.1 ed2018.



- 380 19. Muhammad N, Adamu MD, Caleb M, et al. Changing patterns of cataract  
381 services in North-West Nigeria: 2005–2016. *PLOS ONE*. 2017;12:e0183421.
- 382 20. Taryam MO, Rabi MM, Muhammad N, Oladigbolu K, Abdurrahman H.  
383 Prevalence and causes of blindness and visual impairment; and cataract surgical  
384 services in Katsina state of Nigeria. *British Journal of Ophthalmology*.  
385 2019;bjophthalmol-2019-314572.
- 386 21. International Agency for the Prevention of Blindness (IAPB). Vision Atlas.  
387 Country Map & Estimates of Vision Loss; Nigeria. 2023.
- 388 22. Akintayo-Usman NO, Usman SO. Comparative analysis of ageing in Nigeria  
389 and United Kingdom using life course approach: the implication for the Nursing  
390 profession in Nigeria. *Pan Afr Med J*. 2021;38:411.
- 391 23. Mpyet CO, P; Adenuga, O; Velle, L; Nyonyes A. 2010;9(5):401-406.  
392 Prevalence and Causes of Blindness and Visual Impairment in Plateau State,  
393 Nigeria. *TAF Preventive medicine bulletin*. 2010;9:401-406.
- 394 24. Flaxman SR, Bourne RR, Resnikoff S, et al. Global causes of blindness and  
395 distance vision impairment 1990–2020: a systematic review and meta-analysis.  
396 *Lancet Glob Health*. 2017;5:e1221-e1234.
- 397 25. Ramke J, Gilbert CE, Lee AC, Ackland P, Limburg H, Foster A. Effective  
398 cataract surgical coverage: An indicator for measuring quality-of-care in the  
399 context of Universal Health Coverage. *PLoS One*. 2017;12:e0172342.
- 400 26. Resnikoff S, Lansingh VC, Washburn L, et al. Estimated number of  
401 ophthalmologists worldwide (International Council of Ophthalmology update):  
402 will we meet the needs? *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2020;104:588-592.
- 403 27. Lindfield R, Griffiths U, Bozzani F, Mumba M, Munsanje J. A Rapid  
404 Assessment of Avoidable Blindness in Southern Zambia. *PLoS One*.  
405 2012;7:e38483.
- 406 28. Jolley E, Cumaio M, Vilanculos A, et al. Changes in Eye Health and Service  
407 Coverage in Nampula, Mozambique between 2011 and 2018. *Ophthalmic  
408 Epidemiology*. 2021:1-9.
- 409 29. Statista. Nigeria: minimum wage 2018-20222022.
- 410 30. Alawode GO, Adewole DA. Assessment of the design and implementation  
411 challenges of the National Health Insurance Scheme in Nigeria: a qualitative  
412 study among sub-national level actors, healthcare and insurance providers. *BMC  
413 Public Health*. 2021;21:124.
- 414 31. AlSawahli H, McCormick I, Mpyet CD, Ezzelarab G, Shalaby M. Population-  
415 based rapid assessment of avoidable blindness survey in Sohag governorate in  
416 Egypt. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10:e036337.
- 417