

# BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email [info.bmjopen@bmj.com](mailto:info.bmjopen@bmj.com)

# BMJ Open

## Comparison of medical comorbidity between primary angle closure glaucoma patients and a control cohort: A population-based study from Taiwan

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-024209
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-May-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Chen, Hsin-Yi; China Medical University, Ophthalmology Lin, Cheng-Li
Keywords:	Epidemiology < TROPICAL MEDICINE, Glaucoma < OPHTHALMOLOGY, GENERAL MEDICINE (see Internal Medicine)

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4 **Comparison of medical comorbidity between primary angle closure**  
5 **glaucoma patients and a control cohort:**  
6

7 **A population-based study from Taiwan**  
8

9  
10 Hsin-Yi Chen<sup>1,2</sup>, Cheng-Li Lin<sup>3</sup>  
11

12  
13 <sup>1</sup> School of Medicine, Medical College, China Medical University  
14

15 <sup>2</sup> Department of Ophthalmology, China Medical University Hospital  
16

17 <sup>3</sup> Management Office for Health Data, China Medical University  
18  
19  
20

21 **Running Title: Primary angle closure glaucoma, medical comorbidity**  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 \*Total word count: 2400, total number of pages: 25  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 **\* Corresponding authors**  
35

36  
37 Hsin-Yi Chen, MD, Department of Ophthalmology, China Medical University  
38

39 Hospital, Taichung, Taiwan. No. 2, Yuh-Der Road, Taichung 40447, Taiwan.  
40

41  
42  
43 Tel: 886-4-22081700 / Fax:886-4-22081700; E-mail: [hsin7850@url.com.tw](mailto:hsin7850@url.com.tw);  
44

45  
46 [glaucoma0606@gmail.com](mailto:glaucoma0606@gmail.com)  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

**Objective** To determine whether some medical comorbidities were more prevalent in primary angle closure glaucoma (PACG) patients and whether these comorbidities are associated with increased risk of PACG compared to controls.

**Methods** We included 3322 PACG subjects and randomly selected and matched 13288 subjects as the comparison cohort from the Taiwan National Health Insurance Research database (NHIRD). The univariable and multivariable unconditional logistic regression models were used to estimate the effect of comorbidities on the risk of PACG as indicated by the odds ratio (OR) with 95% confidence interval (CI).

**Results** The PACG group was composed of 61.1% female and the mean age was 65.2 ±12.7 years. The risk of PACG was greater for patients with the comorbidities of hypertension, hyperlipidemia, headaches, diabetes, liver diseases, peptic ulcers, and depression. For the male group, hypertension, headaches, diabetes, liver diseases, and depression were significantly associated with increased risk of PACG. For the female group, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, headaches, peptic ulcers, and depression were significantly associated with increased risk of PACG. For the age group younger than 64 years, patients with comorbidity of hypertension, hyperlipidemia, headaches, diabetes, renal failure, liver diseases, peptic ulcers, and depression were

1  
2  
3 significantly associated with increased risk of PACG. For the age group elder than 65  
4  
5  
6 years, patients with hypertension, hyperlipidemia, peripheral vascular disorders, and  
7  
8  
9 peptic ulcers were significantly associated with increased risk of PACG.  
10

11  
12  
13 **Conclusions** Clinicians should keep in mind that increased PACG risk in the subjects  
14  
15  
16 with hypertension, hyperlipidemia, headaches, diabetes, liver diseases, peptic ulcers,  
17  
18  
19 and depression.  
20

21  
22 **Keywords:** primary angle-closure glaucoma, medical comorbidity, Taiwan.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Article summary

### Strengths and limitations of this study

- This is the first original study on the association between medical comorbidity and primary angle closure glaucoma (PACG).
- A strength of this study is the large sample size.
- Clinicians should keep in mind that increased PACG risk in the subjects with hypertension, hyperlipidemia, headaches, diabetes, liver diseases, peptic ulcers, and depression.
- Inherent limitations from claims database, including miscoding problem and selection bias; therefore, these findings cannot be completely generalizable to all populations.

## INTRODUCTION

Primary angle-closure glaucoma (PACG) is a leading cause of blindness worldwide, especially very common in Asian country.<sup>1-3</sup> The proposed mechanism of PACG is pupillary block, with anterior lens movement as a strong contributing factor, often due to aging induced cataract formation.<sup>4,5</sup> Risk factors for PACG include aging, female gender, shallow anterior chamber and short axial length in hyperopic eye.<sup>4,5</sup> Contrary to primary open angle glaucoma (POAG), which has been well known to be associated with systemic diseases, including cardiovascular, metabolic, neurodegenerative, psychological diseases and others<sup>6-13</sup> very few studies evaluate the medical illness among the PACG subjects. A recent meta-analysis study shows that PACG affects approximately 0.75% adult Asians, increasing double per decade, and 60% of cases being female.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, it is quite meaningful to understand if some medical illness would be associated with PACG.

Here we use a nationwide dataset from Taiwan to study the prevalence of some common medical comorbidities in the PACG population. We also study if these comorbidities are associated with increased risk of PACG compared to controls. As far as we know that this is the few one using a large claims database to evaluate this important issue.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Patient and public involvement statement

1  
2  
3  
4 This work is a retrospective longitudinal case-control study from a claims database.  
5

6 Patients were not involved in the recruitment or conduct of the study.  
7  
8

### 9 **Data Source**

10 We conducted a nationwide population-based retrospective cohort study using data  
11 from the Longitudinal Health Insurance Database 2000 (LHID 2000). The LHID2000  
12 contains the enrollment and claims information of 1 million randomly sampled  
13 enrollees of the National Health Insurance (NHI) program in 2000. The NHI program  
14 provides mandatory universal health insurance to all Taiwan's 23.75 million citizens,  
15 with an enrollment rate of approximately 99%.<sup>14</sup> The LHID 2000 includes all  
16 ambulatory care, inpatient services, prescription drugs, traditional Chinese Medicine  
17 and dental services claims data. The study was approved by the Institutional Review  
18 Board (IRB) of China Medical University and Hospital (CMUH-104-REC2-115).  
19 Diseases are coded according to the International Classification of Diseases  
20 ICD-9-CM, 2001 edition.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 **Sampled Participants**

37 From LHID 2000, we identified patients aged more than 20 years with a diagnosis of  
38 primary angle closure glaucoma (PACG) (ICD-9-CM code 365.2) between 1 January  
39 2005 and 31 December 2011 as case group. The date of diagnosis of PACG was  
40 defined as the index date. We excluded patients with a history of primary open angle  
41 glaucoma (POAG) (ICD-9-CM code 365.1) diagnosed before the index date. For each  
42 PACG case, 4 insured beneficiaries with no history of glaucoma (ICD-9-CM code  
43 365), were assigned to a non-PACG control group, frequency matched with the  
44 patients in the PACG case group according to age (every 5-years), sex, and index year  
45 of PACG diagnosis and used same exclusion criteria as PACG case group.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



### **Potential co-morbidities associated with PACG**

The baseline comorbidities included hypertension (ICD-9-CM codes 401-405), ischemic heart disease (ICD-9-CM codes 410-414), hyperlipidemia (ICD-9-CM code 272), congestive heart failure (ICD-9-CM code 428), cardiac arrhythmias (ICD-9-CM codes 426, 427), peripheral vascular disorders (ICD-9-CM codes 440.2, 440.3, 440.8, 440.9, 443, 444.22, 444.8, 447.8, 447.9), stroke (ICD-9-CM codes 430-438), headaches (ICD-9-CM code 784.0), migraine (ICD-9-CM code 346), epilepsy (ICD-9-CM code 345), dementia (ICD-9-CM code 290, 294.1, 331.0), rheumatoid arthritis (ICD-9-CM code 714), systemic lupus erythematosus (ICD-9-CM code 710.0), chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (ICD-9-CM codes 491, 492, 496), asthma-(ICD-9-CM code 493), pulmonary circulation disorders (ICD-9-CM codes 415-417), diabetes (ICD-9-CM code 250), hypothyroidism (ICD-9-CM codes 243, 244), renal failure (ICD-9-CM codes 584-586), liver diseases (ICD-9-CM codes 570-573), peptic ulcers (ICD-9-CM codes 531-533), hepatitis B (ICD-9-CM codes V02.61, 070.20, 070.22, 070.30, and 070.32), tuberculosis (ICD-9-CM codes 011-018), deficiency anemias (ICD-9-CM codes 280, 281) , depression (ICD-9-CM codes 296.2, 296.3, 300.4, 311), psychosis (ICD-9-CM codes 295-299), metastatic cancer (ICD-9-CM codes 196-198), and solid tumor (ICD-9-CM codes 140-195).

### **Statistical analysis**

The baseline characteristics, and comorbidities of the PACG case group and non-PACG control group were compared. Chi-square test and t-test were used to test the difference of categorical and continuous variables, respectively, between the two groups. The univariable and multivariable unconditional logistic regression models

1  
2  
3  
4 were used to estimate the effect of comorbidities on the risk of PACG as indicated by  
5  
6 the odds ratio (OR) with 95% confidence interval (CI). All analyses were performed  
7  
8 using SAS software version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Carey, NC) and the significance  
9  
10 level was set at 0.05 for the two-tailed tests.  
11  
12  
13

## 14 15 **RESULTS**

16  
17 A total of 3322 PACG cases were eligible for the study, and 13288 subjects frequency  
18  
19 matched according to sex, and age were selected as the control group (**Table 1**). The  
20  
21 PACG group was composed of 61.1% female and 57.6% were elder than 65 years of  
22  
23 age. The mean age of the study patients was  $65.2 \pm 12.7$  years for the PACG group and  
24  
25  $64.8 \pm 13.0$  years for the controls. Compared to the controls, PACG patients were  
26  
27 significantly higher prevalence of hypertension, ischemic heart disease,  
28  
29 hyperlipidemia, cardiac arrhythmias, peripheral vascular disorders, headaches,  
30  
31 chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, asthma, diabetes, renal failure, liver diseases,  
32  
33 peptic ulcers, hepatitis B, depression, and solid tumor ( $p < 0.05$ ).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 **Table 2** shows the crude and adjusted ORs for the model fitted to examine the  
44  
45 association between potential risk factors and the risk of PACG. In the multivariate  
46  
47 model, the risk of PACG was greater for patients with the comorbidities of  
48  
49 hypertension, hyperlipidemia, headaches, diabetes, liver diseases, peptic ulcers, and  
50  
51 depression. For the male group, hypertension, headaches, diabetes, liver diseases, and  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 depression were significant associated with increasing PACG risk (**Table 3**). For the  
5  
6 female group, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, headaches, peptic ulcers, and depression  
7  
8 were significant associated with increasing PACG risk were significant associated  
9  
10 with increasing PACG risk. For the age group younger than 64 years, patients with  
11  
12 comorbidity of hypertension, hyperlipidemia, headaches, diabetes, renal failure, liver  
13  
14 diseases, peptic ulcers, and depression were significant associated with increasing  
15  
16 PACG risk (**Table 4**). For the age group elder than 65 years, patients with  
17  
18 hypertension, hyperlipidemia, peripheral vascular disorders, and peptic ulcers were  
19  
20 significantly associated with increasing PACG risk.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

## 30 **DISCUSSION**

31 This study, in which data from 3322 PACG cases were analyzed, found that 60.6 % of  
32  
33 them had hypertension and 41.8 % of them had hyperlipidemia and 42.4 % of them  
34  
35 had headache and peptic ulcer. When compared to the controls , PACG patients had a  
36  
37 significantly higher prevalence of hypertension, ischemic heart disease,  
38  
39 hyperlipidemia, cardiac arrhythmias, peripheral vascular disorders, headaches,  
40  
41 chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, asthma, diabetes, renal failure, liver diseases,  
42  
43 peptic ulcers, hepatitis B, depression, and solid tumor ( $p<0.05$ ). Further analysis  
44  
45 shows that the risk of PACG was only greater for patients with the comorbidities of  
46  
47 hypertension, hyperlipidemia, headaches, diabetes, liver diseases, peptic ulcers, and  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 depression in the multivariate model. Furthermore, for the female group, patients with  
5  
6 hypertension, hyperlipidemia, headaches, peptic ulcers, and depression were  
7  
8 significantly associated with increased PACG risk. The same risk factors for both  
9  
10 genders are hypertension, headache and depression.  
11  
12  
13

14  
15 Our study is the few one which discussed the medical comorbidity in a large  
16  
17 PACG cohort. Potential explanations about the strong relationship between the above  
18  
19 7 medical illness and the risk of PACG should be mentioned as below.  
20  
21  
22

### 23 **Pathogenetic mechanisms of PACG**

24  
25  
26 PACG has its characteristic anatomy features and unique pathological process,  
27  
28 including a crowded anterior segment and narrow anterior chamber angle.<sup>15</sup> The  
29  
30 progression that the anterior chamber angle develops from narrow to become closed is  
31  
32 quite complicated and involves many different factors. The role of cataract formation  
33  
34 in the development of PACG has been well described.<sup>5,6,15</sup>  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

### 40 **Association between hypertension, hyperlipidemia and diabetes and PACG**

41  
42  
43 In one Korean epidemiological study, hypercholesterolemia, hypertension, and  
44  
45 diabetes mellitus (DM) were independent risk factors for development of any  
46  
47 cataract.<sup>16</sup> Also in one study that the authors show that metabolic syndrome and its  
48  
49 components appear to be associated with age-related cataract only among Korean  
50  
51 women.<sup>17</sup> We believe that the potential reasons for hypertension, diabetes and  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 hyperlipidemia in the risk of PACG from our result could be attributed to the  
5  
6 increased risk of cataract. Further longitudinal observational study should be needed  
7  
8  
9 to address this issue.  
10

### 11 **Association between depression and PACG**

12  
13  
14  
15 It has been well known that antidepressant agents with anticholinergic effect associate  
16  
17 with increased risk of PACG.<sup>18-20</sup> Furthermore, studies have provided evidence of a  
18  
19 significant positive association between antidepressants use and risk of cataract.<sup>5</sup>  
20  
21  
22  
23 Therefore, our results support again that that depression is a significant risk factor for  
24  
25  
26 PACG.  
27

### 28 **Association between liver disease and PACG**

29  
30  
31  
32 One recent study also from Taiwan reported that HCV infection, even without the  
33  
34 complication of cirrhosis, is associated with an increased risk of cataract.<sup>21</sup> Another  
35  
36 study from Korean reports that HBV and HCV infection was significantly associated  
37  
38 with cataract.<sup>22</sup> We think the strong association between liver disease and the risk of  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 PACG might be the increased risk of cataract in liver disease patients. However,  
44  
45  
46 further study is needed to further elucidate this interesting result.  
47

### 48 **Association between headache and PACG**

49  
50  
51  
52 PACG patients used to complain of headache which is caused by increased intraocular  
53  
54 pressure.<sup>23,24</sup> It is not uncommon that PACG patients would seek for medical help  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3  
4 due to headache before PACG was diagnosed. From our result, we found that  
5  
6  
7 headache is the risk factor for PACG, which reminds the clinicians of the potential  
8  
9  
10 risk of glaucoma in headache patients.

### 11 **Association between peptic ulcers and PACG**

12  
13  
14  
15 To our knowledge, no previous study has reported the presence or absence of an  
16  
17  
18 association between peptic ulcers and PACG. We speculate that Histamine 2 receptor  
19  
20  
21 antagonist which was widely used in peptic ulcer treatment might induce or  
22  
23  
24 precipitate angle-closure glaucoma.<sup>25</sup> Further longitudinal study is mandatory in this  
25  
26  
27 interesting topics.

28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Despite these promising results, our study had certain limitations. First,  
glaucoma and medical comorbidity were defined entirely on the basis of claims data  
(ICD-9-CM codes assigned by clinicians).<sup>20</sup> This approach should be less accurate  
than diagnosing personally through a standardized procedure.<sup>20</sup> The second limitation  
was a selection bias.<sup>20</sup> Because the NHI database only comprises data of patients who  
have received treatment, patients who have received no treatment for glaucoma or any  
of these medial disease might have been recruited in the comparison cohort. Third,  
despite the large sample, the study cohort comprised Taiwanese patients. Therefore,  
these findings cannot be completely generalizable to other populations. Nevertheless,  
our study has the following strengths. First, the strength of the database is excellent

1  
2  
3 because of the large sample randomization.<sup>20</sup> We could follow patient cases over time  
4  
5  
6 to assess the relationship between medical illness and the subsequent onset of PACG.  
7  
8  
9 Second, the database includes data of people with diverse sociodemographic profiles,  
10  
11  
12 unlike some smaller studies that recruited patients from specific regions and thus lack  
13  
14  
15 in representativeness.  
16

17  
18 In conclusion, our population-based study by using the NHIRD revealed that the  
19  
20 risk of PACG was greater for patients with the comorbidities of hypertension,  
21  
22 hyperlipidemia, headaches, diabetes, liver diseases, peptic ulcers, and depression.  
23  
24  
25 Clinicians should keep in mind when meeting patients with these diseases.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 **Contributors** H Y Chen: conception and design, acquisition of data, analysis and  
5  
6 interpretation of data, drafting of the manuscript, critical revision of the manuscript  
7  
8 for important intellectual content, obtaining funding; C L Lin: statistical expertise,  
9  
10 conception and design, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual  
11  
12 content.  
13  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 **Competing interests** None declared.  
19

20  
21 **Funding** This study was supported in part by the Taiwan Ministry of Health and  
22  
23 Welfare Clinical Trial and Research Center of Excellence  
24  
25 (MOHW105-TDU-B-212-133019); China Medical University Hospital, Academia  
26  
27 Sinica Taiwan Biobank Stroke Biosignature Project (BM10501010037); NRPB Stroke  
28  
29 Clinical Trial Consortium (MOST 104-2325-B-039 -005); Tseng-Lien Lin Foundation,  
30  
31 Taichung, Taiwan; Taiwan Brain Disease Foundation, Taipei, Taiwan; Katsuzo and  
32  
33 Kiyo Aoshima Memorial Funds, Japan; and CMU under the Aim for Top University  
34  
35 Plan of the Ministry of Education, Taiwan. The funders had no role in study design,  
36  
37 data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. No  
38  
39 additional external funding received for this study.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 **Data sharing statement** No additional data available.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57



**References:**

1. Chen HY, Huang ML, Tsai YY, et al. Comparing glaucomatous optic neuropathy in primary open angle and primary angle closure glaucoma eyes by scanning laser polarimetry-variable corneal compensation. *J Glaucoma*. 2008 ;17:105-10.
2. Chan EW, Li X, Tham YC, et al. Glaucoma in Asia: regional prevalence variations and future projections. *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2016 ;100 :78-85.
3. Vijaya L, George R, Arvind H, et al. Prevalence of primary angle-closure disease in an urban south Indian population and comparison with a rural population. The Chennai Glaucoma Study. *Ophthalmology*. 2008 ;115:655-60.
4. Cheng JW, Zong Y, Zeng YY, et al. The prevalence of primary angle closure glaucoma in adult Asians: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2014 ;9:e103222.
5. Wright C, Tawfik MA, Waisbourd M, et al. Primary angle-closure glaucoma: an update. *Acta Ophthalmol*. 2015 Jun 27.
6. Trikha S, Perera SA, Husain R, et al. The role of lens extraction in the current management of primary angle-closure glaucoma. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol*. 2015 ;26:128-34.
7. Pache M, Flammer J. A sick eye in a sick body? Systemic findings in patients

- 1  
2  
3  
4 with primary open-angle glaucoma. *Surv Ophthalmol* 2006;51:179–212.  
5  
6  
7 8. Bayer AU, Ferrari F, Erb C. High occurrence rate of glaucoma among patients  
8  
9 with Alzheimer's disease. *Eur Neurol* 2002; 47:165–8.  
10  
11  
12 9. Skalicky S, Goldberg I. Depression and quality of life in patients with glaucoma:  
13  
14 a cross-sectional analysis using the Geriatric Depression Scale-15, assessment of  
15  
16 function related to vision, and the Glaucoma Quality of Life-15. *J Glaucoma*  
17  
18 2008;17:546–51.  
19  
20  
21 10. Chen HY, Chang YC, Lin CC, et al. Obstructive sleep apnea patients having  
22  
23 surgery are less associated with glaucoma. *J. Ophthalmol.* 2014; 2014:838912.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 11. Lin HC, Chien CW, Hu CC, et al. Comparison of comorbid conditions between  
29  
30 open-angle glaucoma patients and a control cohort: a case-control study.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- with primary open-angle glaucoma. *Surv Ophthalmol* 2006;51:179–212.
  8. Bayer AU, Ferrari F, Erb C. High occurrence rate of glaucoma among patients with Alzheimer's disease. *Eur Neurol* 2002; 47:165–8.
  9. Skalicky S, Goldberg I. Depression and quality of life in patients with glaucoma: a cross-sectional analysis using the Geriatric Depression Scale-15, assessment of function related to vision, and the Glaucoma Quality of Life-15. *J Glaucoma* 2008;17:546–51.
  10. Chen HY, Chang YC, Lin CC, et al. Obstructive sleep apnea patients having surgery are less associated with glaucoma. *J. Ophthalmol.* 2014; 2014:838912.
  11. Lin HC, Chien CW, Hu CC, et al. Comparison of comorbid conditions between open-angle glaucoma patients and a control cohort: a case-control study. *Ophthalmology.* 2010 ;117:2088-95.
  12. Gordon MO, Beiser JA, Brandt JD, et al. Ocular Hypertension Treatment Study Group. The Ocular Hypertension Treatment Study: baseline factors that predict the onset of primary open angle glaucoma. *Arch Ophthalmol* 2002;120:714–20.
  13. Newman-Casey PA, Talwar N, Nan B, et al. The relationship between components of metabolic syndrome and open-angle glaucoma. *Ophthalmology.* 2011;118:1318-26.
  14. Database NHIR. Taiwan, <http://nhird.nhri.org.tw/en/Background.html> (cited in

- 2015).
15. Sun X, Dai Y, Chen Y, et al. Primary angle closure glaucoma: What we know and what we don't know. *Prog Retin Eye Res.* 2017;57:26-45.
  16. Rim TH, Kim MH, Kim WC, et al. Cataract subtype risk factors identified from the Korea National Health and Nutrition Examination survey 2008-2010. *BMC Ophthalmol.* 2014;14:4.
  17. Park YH, Shin JA, Han K, et al. Gender difference in the association of metabolic syndrome and its components with age-related cataract: the Korea National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2008-2010. *PLoS One.* 2014; 9:e85068.
  18. Chou PH, Chu CS, Chen YH, et al. Antidepressants and risk of cataract development: A population-based, nested case-control study. *J Affect Disord.* 2017;215:237-44.
  19. Fu Y, Dai Q, Zhu L, et al. Antidepressants use and risk of cataract development: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Ophthalmol.* 2018 ;18:31.
  20. Chen HY, Lin CL, Lai SW, et al. Association of selective serotonin reuptake Inhibitor use and acute angle-closure glaucoma. *J Clin Psychiatry.* 2016 ;77: e692-6.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 21. Lin SY, Lin CL, Ju SW, et al. Increasing risk of cataract in HCV patients  
5  
6 receiving anti-HCV therapy: A nationwide cohort study. *PLoS One*.  
7  
8  
9 2017;12:e0173125.  
10  
11  
12  
13 22. Park S, Choi N-K Hepatitis virus infection and age-related cataract . *Sci Rep*.  
14  
15  
16 2017; 7: 13089.  
17  
18  
19  
20 23. Neshar R, Mimouni MD, Khoury S, et al. Delayed diagnosis of subacute angle  
21  
22 closure glaucoma in patients presenting with headaches. *Acta Neurol Belg*.  
23  
24 2014 ;114:269-72.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30 24. Neshar R, Epstein E, Stern Y , et al. Headaches as the main presenting symptom  
31  
32 of subacute angle closure glaucoma. *Headache*. 2005 ;45:172-6.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37 25. Tripathi RC<sup>1</sup>, Tripathi BJ, Haggerty C. Drug-induced glaucomas: mechanism and  
38  
39 management. *Drug Saf*. 2003;26:749-67.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1. Demographic comparison between PACG cases and controls**

	PACG Cases		Controls		p-value
	N= 3322		N= 13288		
	n	(%)	n	(%)	
Sex					0.99
female	2031	61.1	8124	61.1	
male	5164	38.9	1291	38.9	
Age group (years)					0.99
20-49	398	12.0	1592	12.0	
50-64	1011	30.4	4044	30.4	
≥65	1913	57.6	7652	57.6	
Age (year), mean (SD) †	65.2	12.7	64.8	13.0	0.10
Comorbidity					
Hypertension	2025	60.6	6896	51.9	<0.001
Ischemic heart disease	1097	33.0	3561	26.8	<0.001
Hyperlipidemia	1389	41.8	4399	33.1	<0.001
Congestive heart failure	213	6.41	849	6.39	0.96
Cardiac arrhythmias	540	16.3	1826	13.7	<0.001
Peripheral vascular disorders	201	6.05	571	4.30	<0.001
Stroke	246	7.41	994	7.48	0.88
Headaches	1407	42.4	4772	35.9	<0.001
Migraine	125	3.76	456	3.43	0.35
Epilepsy	30	0.90	144	1.08	0.36
Dementia	110	3.31	448	3.37	0.86
Rheumatoid arthritis	11	0.33	45	0.34	0.95
Systemic lupus erythematosus	3	0.09	8	0.06	0.55
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	675	20.3	2343	17.6	<0.001
Asthma	418	12.6	1455	11.0	0.008
Pulmonary circulation disorders	26	0.78	85	0.64	0.37
Diabetes	710	21.4	2148	16.2	<0.001
Hypothyroidism	36	1.08	110	0.83	0.16
Renal failure	448	13.5	1435	10.8	<0.001
Liver diseases	898	27.0	2775	20.9	<0.001
Peptic ulcers	1409	42.4	4503	33.9	<0.001

1						
2						
3	Hepatitis B	182	5.48	610	4.59	0.03
4	Tuberculosis	86	2.59	294	2.21	0.19
5	Deficiency anemia	114	3.43	381	2.87	0.09
6	Depression	328	9.87	922	6.94	<0.001
7	Psychosis	153	4.61	518	3.90	0.06
8	Metastatic cancer	1	0.03	2	0.02	0.56
9	Solid tumor	190	5.72	630	4.74	0.02

13 Data are presented as the number of subjects in each group, with percentages given in  
14 parentheses.

15 Chi-square test; † t-test

For peer review only

**Table 2. Odds ratio and 95% confidence interval of PACG associated with comorbidities**

Variable	Crude		Adjusted <sup>†</sup>	
	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)
Comorbidity				
Hypertension	1.45	(1.34, 1.56)***	1.18	(1.08, 1.29)***
Ischemic heart disease	1.35	(1.24, 1.46)***	1.05	(0.95, 1.15)
Hyperlipidemia	1.45	(1.34, 1.57)***	1.19	(1.09, 1.29)***
Congestive heart failure	1.00	(0.86, 1.17)	-	-
Cardiac arrhythmias	1.22	(1.10, 1.35)***	0.98	(0.88, 1.10)
Peripheral vascular disorders	1.44	(1.22, 1.69)***	1.14	(0.97, 1.36)
Stroke	0.98	(0.86, 1.14)	-	-
Headaches	1.31	(1.21, 1.42)***	1.17	(1.08, 1.26)***
Migraine	1.10	(0.90, 1.35)	-	-
Epilepsy	0.83	(0.56, 1.24)	-	-
Dementia	0.98	(0.79, 1.21)	-	-
Rheumatoid arthritis	0.98	(0.51, 1.89)	-	-
Systemic lupus erythematosus	1.50	(0.40, 5.66)	-	-
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	1.19	(1.08, 1.31)***	0.99	(0.89, 1.11)
Asthma	1.17	(1.04, 1.32)***	0.99	(0.88, 1.13)
Pulmonary circulation disorders	1.23	(0.79, 1.90)	-	-
Diabetes	1.41	(1.28, 1.55)***	1.16	(1.05, 1.29)**
Hypothyroidism	1.31	(0.90, 1.92)	-	-
Renal failure	1.29	(1.15, 1.44)***	1.03	(0.91, 1.16)
Liver diseases	1.40	(1.29, 1.53)***	1.15	(1.05, 1.27)**
Peptic ulcers	1.44	(1.33, 1.55)***	1.22	(1.13, 1.33)***
Hepatitis B	1.21	(1.02, 1.43)*	1.04	(0.87, 1.24)
Tuberculosis	1.18	(0.92, 1.50)	-	-
Deficiency anemia	1.20	(0.97, 1.49)	-	-
Depression	1.47	(1.29, 1.68)***	1.22	(1.07, 1.40)**
Psychosis	1.19	(0.99, 1.43)	-	-
Metastatic cancer	2.01	(0.18, 22.1)	-	-
Solid tumor	1.22	(1.03, 1.44)*	1.13	(0.96, 1.34)

Abbreviations: odds ratio (OR); confidence interval (CI)

<sup>†</sup>Covariables which were significantly associated with risk of PACG in univariable unconditional logistic regression model were further analyzed by multivariable unconditional logistic regression model.

**Table 3. Odds ratio and 95% confidence interval of PACG associated with comorbidities By sex**

Variable	Male				Female			
	Crude		Adjusted <sup>†</sup>		Crude		Adjusted <sup>†</sup>	
	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)
Comorbidity								
Hypertension	1.60	(1.41, 1.81)***	1.25	(1.08, 1.44)**	1.36	(1.23, 1.50)***	1.14	(1.02, 1.28)*
Ischemic heart disease	1.43	(1.25, 1.63)***	1.06	(0.90, 1.23)	1.30	(1.17, 1.44)***	1.03	(0.91, 1.17)
Hyperlipidemia	1.54	(1.35, 1.75)***	1.13	(0.98, 1.31)	1.41	(1.28, 1.56)***	1.22	(1.09, 1.37)***
Congestive heart failure	1.15	(0.91, 1.46)	-	-	0.91	(0.74, 1.12)	-	-
Cardiac arrhythmias	1.24	(1.05, 1.48)***	0.94	(0.78, 1.14)	1.20	(1.06, 1.37)***	1.00	(0.87, 1.16)
Peripheral vascular disorders	1.52	(1.17, 1.98)***	1.14	(0.87, 1.50)	1.38	(1.12, 1.71)***	1.15	(0.93, 1.43)
Stroke	1.10	(0.89, 1.36)	-	-	0.90	(0.74, 1.10)	-	-
Headaches	1.35	(1.19, 1.55)***	1.17	(1.02, 1.34)*	1.30	(1.18, 1.44)***	1.18	(1.06, 1.30)**
Migraine	1.09	(0.70, 1.70)	-	-	1.10	(0.88, 1.39)	-	-
Epilepsy	0.91	(0.50, 1.67)	-	-	0.78	(0.46, 1.31)	-	-
Dementia	1.04	(0.74, 1.45)	-	-	0.95	(0.72, 1.25)	-	-
Rheumatoid arthritis	2.01	(0.37, 11.0)	-	-	0.88	(0.43, 1.81)	-	-
Systemic lupus erythematosus	4.00	(0.25, 64.0)	-	-	1.15	(0.24, 5.52)	-	-
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	1.34	(1.17, 1.54)***	1.07	(0.91, 1.26)	1.07	(0.94, 1.23)	-	-
Asthma	1.30	(1.08, 1.56)***	1.04	(0.85, 1.28)	1.10	(0.95, 1.28)	-	-
Pulmonary circulation disorders	1.07	(0.49, 2.34)	-	-	1.31	(0.77, 2.24)	-	-



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

Diabetes	1.67 (1.44, 1.94)***	1.34 (1.14, 1.58)***	1.26 (1.11, 1.42)***	1.06 (0.92, 1.21)
Hypothyroidism	1.18 (0.43, 3.20)	-	1.34 (0.89, 2.01)	-
Renal failure	1.46 (1.23, 1.73)***	1.11 (0.93, 1.33)	1.17 (1.00, 1.36)*	0.95 (0.81, 1.12)
Liver diseases	1.57 (1.37, 1.80)***	1.30 (1.12, 1.50)***	1.30 (1.16, 1.46)***	1.07 (0.95, 1.21)
Peptic ulcers	1.40 (1.24, 1.59)***	1.12 (0.98, 1.29)	1.46 (1.32, 1.61)***	1.28 (1.15, 1.43)***
Hepatitis B	1.25 (0.97, 1.61)	-	1.17 (0.93, 1.47)	-
Tuberculosis	1.29 (0.95, 1.75)	-	1.02 (0.68, 1.52)	-
Deficiency anemia	1.48 (0.99, 2.20)	-	1.12 (0.87, 1.44)	-
Depression	1.67 (1.31, 2.13)***	1.36 (1.06, 1.75)*	1.40 (1.20, 1.64)***	1.18 (1.01, 1.39)*
Psychosis	1.13 (0.81, 1.59)	-	1.22 (0.98, 1.52)	-
Metastatic cancer	-	-	-	-
Solid tumor	1.23 (0.93, 1.61)	-	1.22 (0.98, 1.50)	-

Abbreviations: odds ratio (OR); confidence interval (CI)

†Covariables which were significantly associated with risk of PACG in univariable unconditional logistic regression model were further analyzed by multivariable unconditional logistic regression model.

**Table 4. Odds ratio and 95% confidence interval of PACG associated with comorbidities By age**

Variable	Age $\leq 64$				Age $\geq 65$			
	Crude		Adjusted <sup>†</sup>		Crude		Adjusted <sup>†</sup>	
	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)
<b>Comorbidity</b>								
Hypertension	1.77	(1.57, 2.00)***	1.26	(1.09, 1.45)**	1.35	(1.20, 1.51)***	1.18	(1.04, 1.33)**
Ischemic heart disease	1.79	(1.54, 2.08)***	1.14	(0.95, 1.36)	1.23	(0.11, 1.36)***	1.05	(0.93, 1.18)
Hyperlipidemia	1.81	(1.60, 2.06)***	1.26	(1.08, 1.45)**	1.28	(1.15, 1.41)***	1.13	(1.01, 1.26)*
Congestive heart failure	1.75	(1.24, 2.48)***	1.00	(0.69, 1.45)	0.89	(0.74, 1.06)	-	-
Cardiac arrhythmias	1.49	(1.22, 1.83)***	1.03	(0.82, 1.28)	1.14	(1.01, 1.29)*	1.00	(0.87, 1.14)
Peripheral vascular disorders	1.65	(1.14, 2.40)***	1.02	(0.69, 1.51)	1.40	(1.16, 1.68)***	1.23	(1.01, 1.48)*
Stroke	1.40	(0.99, 1.96)	-	-	0.92	(0.78, 1.08)	-	-
Headaches	1.48	(1.31, 1.67)***	1.21	(1.07, 1.38)**	1.20	(1.09, 1.33)***	1.11	(1.00, 1.23)
Migraine	1.13	(0.83, 1.52)	-	-	1.08	(0.83, 1.42)	-	-
Epilepsy	1.17	(0.61, 2.24)	-	-	0.70	(0.42, 1.15)	-	-
Dementia	2.46	(1.16, 5.21)***	1.72	(0.79, 3.74)	0.92	(0.73, 1.15)	-	-
Rheumatoid arthritis	1.26	(0.50, 3.17)	-	-	0.77	(0.30, 2.00)	-	-
Systemic lupus erythematosus	2.01	(0.18, 22.1)	-	-	1.33	(0.27, 6.61)	-	-
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	1.60	(1.33, 1.93)***	1.18	(0.96, 1.45)	1.09	(0.97, 1.22)	-	-
Asthma	1.42	(1.15, 1.76)***	1.00	(0.79, 1.25)	1.08	(0.94, 1.25)	-	-

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

Pulmonary circulation disorders	1.72 (0.66, 4.48)	-	-	1.13 (0.69, 1.86)	-	-
Diabetes	1.92 (1.63, 2.25)***	1.34 (1.12, 1.61)**	1.21 (1.08, 1.37)**	1.08 (0.96, 1.22)		
Hypothyroidism	1.28 (0.71, 2.30)	-	-	1.34 (0.81, 2.19)	-	-
Renal failure	1.82 (1.48, 2.24)***	1.26 (1.01, 1.57)*	1.13 (0.99, 1.30)	-	-	
Liver diseases	1.64 (1.43, 1.87)***	1.18 (1.02, 1.37)*	1.26 (1.13, 1.42)***	1.08 (0.96, 1.22)		
Peptic ulcers	1.70 (1.50, 1.92)***	1.31 (1.15, 1.50)***	1.32 (1.19, 1.45)***	1.18 (1.06, 1.32)**		
Hepatitis B	1.06 (0.83, 1.35)	-	-	1.37 (1.08, 1.73)***	1.20 (0.94, 1.53)	
Tuberculosis	1.08 (0.64, 1.82)	-	-	1.21 (0.92, 1.59)	-	-
Deficiency anemia	1.36 (0.95, 1.92)	-	-	1.13 (0.86, 1.47)	-	-
Depression	1.78 (1.45, 2.20)***	1.33 (1.06, 1.66)*	1.31 (1.10, 1.55)**	1.14 (0.96, 1.36)		
Psychosis	1.27 (0.95, 1.69)	-	-	1.14 (0.90, 1.45)	-	-
Metastatic cancer	-	-	-	-	-	-
Solid tumor	1.16 (0.83, 1.60)	-	-	1.25 (1.02, 1.51)*	1.21 (1.00, 1.48)	

Abbreviations: odds ratio (OR); confidence interval (CI)

†Covariables which were significantly associated with risk of PACG in univariable unconditional logistic regression model were further analyzed by multivariable unconditional logistic regression model.

## STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation	Reported on Page No.
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	2,3
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2,3
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6,7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6,7
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6,7
		(b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	6,7
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6,7
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	6,7
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	6
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	7,8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	6-8
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	6-8
		(d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods	6-8

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

taking account of sampling strategy  

---

(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses

8

Continued on next page

For peer review only

<b>Results</b>			<b>Reported on Page No.</b>
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	8
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	8
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	x
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	8
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	8
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	8
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	8,9
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	8,9
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	8,9
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	8,9
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	8,9
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	8,9
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	8,9
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	9,10
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	10-12
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	10-12
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	11-12
<b>Other information</b>			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	14

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

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

# BMJ Open

## Comparison of medical comorbidity between primary angle closure glaucoma patients and a control cohort: A population-based study from Taiwan

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-024209.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	12-Nov-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Chen, Hsin-Yi; China Medical University, Ophthalmology Lin, Cheng-Li; China Medical University, Management Office for Health Data
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Ophthalmology
Keywords:	Epidemiology < TROPICAL MEDICINE, Glaucoma < OPHTHALMOLOGY, primary angle-closure glaucoma

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4 **Comparison of medical comorbidity between primary angle-closure**  
5 **glaucoma patients and a control cohort: A population-based study**  
6 **from Taiwan**  
7  
8

9  
10 Hsin-Yi Chen<sup>1,2</sup>, Cheng-Li Lin<sup>3</sup>  
11

12  
13 <sup>1</sup> School of Medicine, Medical College, China Medical University  
14

15 <sup>2</sup> Department of Ophthalmology, China Medical University Hospital  
16

17 <sup>3</sup> Management Office for Health Data, China Medical University  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 **Running Title: Primary angle closure glaucoma, medical comorbidity**  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

\*Total word count: 2131 , total number of pages: 25

**\* Corresponding authors**

Hsin-Yi Chen, MD, Department of Ophthalmology, China Medical University

Hospital, Taichung, Taiwan. No. 2, Yuh-Der Road, Taichung 40447, Taiwan.

Tel: 886-4-22081700 / Fax:886-4-22081700; E-mail: hsin7850@url.com.tw;

glaucoma0606@gmail.com



## Abstract

**Objective** To determine the prevalence and risk of systemic comorbidities in primary angle-closure glaucoma in Taiwan population.

**Methods** We included 3322 PACG subjects and randomly selected patients without PACG from the Taiwan National Health Insurance Research Database and frequency matched four of them (n = 13288) to each PACG patient, based on age and sex. The univariable and multivariable unconditional logistic regression models were used to estimate the effect of comorbidities on the risk of PACG as indicated by the odds ratio with 95% confidence interval.

**Results** The mean age of the PACG group was  $65.2 \pm 12.7$  years, and 61.1% of the patients were female. Compared with the controls, the PACG patients exhibited significantly higher prevalence of hypertension (60.6%), ischemic heart disease (33.0%), hyperlipidemia (41.8%), cardiac arrhythmias (16.3%), peripheral vascular disorders (6.05%), headaches (42.4%), chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (20.3%), asthma (12.6%), diabetes (21.4%), renal failure (13.5%), liver diseases (27.0%), peptic ulcers (42.4%), hepatitis B (5.48%), depression (9.87%), solid tumor (5.72%), and cataract (62.9%). The risk of PACG was greater for patients with the comorbidities of hyperlipidemia, headaches, liver diseases, peptic ulcers, and cataract. For the male

1  
2  
3  
4 group, diabetes, liver diseases, and cataract were associated with increasing PACG risk.  
5  
6

7 For the female group, hyperlipidemia, headaches, peptic ulcers, and cataract were  
8  
9 associated with increasing PACG risk. For the age group of 64 years and younger,  
10  
11 patients with comorbidities of hyperlipidemia, peptic ulcers, and cataract were  
12  
13 associated with increasing PACG risk. For the age group of 65 years and older, patients  
14  
15 with cataract were associated with increasing PACG risk.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 **Conclusions** Clinicians should be aware of slightly increased PACG risk in the subjects  
24  
25 with the medical comorbidities of hyperlipidemia, headaches, liver diseases, and peptic  
26  
27 ulcers. However, cataract is the strongest risk factor of PACG.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 **Keywords:** primary angle-closure glaucoma, medical comorbidity, cataract, Taiwan.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Article summary

### Strengths and limitations of this study

- This is the first original study on the association between medical comorbidity and primary angle-closure glaucoma.
- A strength of this study is the large sample size.
- Clinicians should be aware of slightly increased PACG risk in the subjects with hyperlipidemia, headaches, liver diseases, and peptic ulcers.
- Cataract is the strongest risk factor of PACG in any age group and gender.
- This study has inherent limitations from the claims database, including miscoding and selection bias; the findings are thus not generalizable to all populations.

## INTRODUCTION

Primary angle-closure glaucoma (PACG) is a leading cause of blindness worldwide; it is especially common in Asian countries.<sup>1-3</sup> A recent meta-analysis study shows that PACG affects approximately 0.75% of adult Asians, and this percentage doubles every decade; 60% of cases are in females.<sup>4</sup> The proposed mechanism of PACG is pupillary block, with anterior lens movement as a strong contributing factor, often due to aging-induced cataract formation.<sup>4,5</sup> Risk factors for PACG are aging, female gender, shallow anterior chamber, and short axial length in hyperopic eye.<sup>4,5</sup> Contrary to primary open angle glaucoma (POAG)—which has been associated with systemic diseases, including cardiovascular, metabolic, neurodegenerative, psychological diseases, and others<sup>6-13</sup>—few studies have evaluated medical illness among PACG subjects. Age is the main factor contributing to the coexisting of systemic comorbidities and cataract formation. Therefore, whether some medical illness and cataract are associated with PACG warrants study.

Here, we use a nationwide dataset from Taiwan to determine the prevalence of some common medical comorbidities in the PACG population. We also study whether these comorbidities are associated with the increased risk of PACG compared with controls. This is the first original study using a large claims database to evaluate this important topic.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

## **Patient and public involvement statement**

This work is a retrospective longitudinal case–control study from a claims database.

Patients were not involved in the recruitment or conduct of the study.

## **Data Source**

We conducted a nationwide population-based retrospective cohort study using data from the Longitudinal Health Insurance Database 2000 (LHID 2000). The LHID 2000 contains the enrollment and claims information of 1 million randomly sampled enrollees of the National Health Insurance (NHI) program in 2000. The NHI program provides mandatory universal health insurance to Taiwan's 23.75 million citizens and residents, with an enrollment rate of approximately 99%.<sup>14</sup> The LHID 2000 includes all ambulatory care, inpatient services, prescription drugs, traditional Chinese Medicine, and dental services claims data. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of China Medical University and Hospital (CMUH-104-REC2-115). Diseases are coded according to the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM), 2001 edition.

## **Sampled Participants**

From the LHID 2000, we identified patients aged more than 20 years with a diagnosis of PACG (ICD-9-CM code 365.2) between January 1, 2005, and December 31, 2011 as the case group. The diagnosis of PACG was based on definitions agreed on by the World Glaucoma Association.<sup>15</sup> The date of diagnosis of PACG was defined as the index date. We excluded patients with a history of POAG (ICD-9-CM code 365.1) diagnosed before the index date. Secondary, juvenile, and congenital glaucoma were also excluded. For each PACG case, four insured beneficiaries with no history of glaucoma (ICD-9-CM code 365) were assigned to a non-PACG control group,

1  
2  
3 frequency matched to the patients in the PACG case group according to age (every 5  
4 years), sex, and index year of PACG diagnosis; the same exclusion criteria used for the  
5  
6  
7  
8 PACG case group was applied.  
9

### 10 11 **Common medical comorbidity**

12  
13 The comorbidities were hypertension (ICD-9-CM codes 401–405), ischemic heart  
14 disease (ICD-9-CM codes 410–414), hyperlipidemia (ICD-9-CM code 272), congestive  
15 heart failure (ICD-9-CM code 428), cardiac arrhythmias (ICD-9-CM codes 426 and  
16 427), peripheral vascular disorders (ICD-9-CM codes 440.2, 440.3, 440.8, 440.9, 443,  
17 444.22, 444.8, 447.8, and 447.9), stroke (ICD-9-CM codes 430–438), headaches (ICD-  
18 9-CM code 784.0), migraine (ICD-9-CM code 346), epilepsy (ICD-9-CM code 345),  
19 dementia (ICD-9-CM code 290, 294.1, and 331.0), rheumatoid arthritis (ICD-9-CM  
20 code 714), systemic lupus erythematosus (ICD-9-CM code 710.0), chronic obstructive  
21 pulmonary disease (ICD-9-CM codes 491, 492, and 496), asthma (ICD-9-CM code  
22 493), pulmonary circulation disorders (ICD-9-CM codes 415–417), diabetes (ICD-9-  
23 CM code 250), hypothyroidism (ICD-9-CM codes 243 and 244), renal failure (ICD-9-  
24 CM codes 584–586), liver diseases (ICD-9-CM codes 570–573), peptic ulcers (ICD-9-  
25 CM codes 531–533), hepatitis B (ICD-9-CM codes V02.61, 070.20, 070.22, 070.30,  
26 and 070.32), tuberculosis (ICD-9-CM codes 011–018), deficiency anemias (ICD-9-CM  
27 codes 280, and 281), depression (ICD-9-CM codes 296.2, 296.3, 300.4, and 311),  
28 psychosis (ICD-9-CM codes 295–299), metastatic cancer (ICD-9-CM codes 196–198),  
29 solid tumor (ICD-9-CM codes 140–195), and cataract (ICD-9-CM code 366).  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

### 53 **Statistical analysis**

54  
55  
56 The baseline characteristics and comorbidities of the PACG case group and non-PACG  
57 control group were compared. Chi squared test and *t* test were used to evaluate the  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 difference of categorical and continuous variables, respectively, between the two  
5  
6  
7 groups. Univariable and multivariable unconditional logistic regression models were  
8  
9  
10 used to estimate the effect of comorbidities on the risk of PACG as indicated by the  
11  
12  
13 odds ratio (OR) with 95% confidence interval (CI). All analyses were performed using  
14  
15  
16 SAS software version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Carey, NC), and the significance level  
17  
18  
19 was set at 0.05 for the two-tailed tests.  
20  
21

## 22 RESULTS

23  
24  
25 A total of 3322 PACG cases met the study criteria, and 13288 subjects were matched  
26  
27  
28 according to sex and age to form the control group (**Table 1**). The PACG group  
29  
30  
31 comprised 61.1% women, and 57.6% were older than 65 years. The mean age was 65.2  
32  
33  
34  $\pm 12.7$  years in the PACG group and  $64.8 \pm 13.0$  years in the control group. Compared  
35  
36  
37 with the controls, PACG patients have significantly higher prevalence of hypertension,  
38  
39  
40 ischemic heart disease, hyperlipidemia, cardiac arrhythmias, peripheral vascular  
41  
42  
43 disorders, headaches, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, asthma, diabetes, renal  
44  
45  
46 failure, liver diseases, peptic ulcers, hepatitis B, depression, solid tumor, and cataract  
47  
48  
49 ( $p < 0.05$ ).  
50  
51

52 The crude and adjusted ORs for the model were fitted to examine the association  
53  
54  
55 between medical comorbidities and the risk of PACG (**Table 2**). In the multivariate  
56  
57  
58 model, the risk of PACG was greater for patients with the comorbidities of  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 hyperlipidemia (ORs: 1.11), headaches (ORs: 1.13), liver diseases (ORs: 1.14), peptic  
5  
6  
7 ulcers (ORs: 1.10), and cataract (ORs: 3.80). For the male group, diabetes (ORs: 1.19),  
8  
9  
10 liver diseases (ORs: 1.29), and cataract (ORs: 4.30) were significantly associated with  
11  
12  
13 increasing PACG risk (**Table 3**). For the female group, hyperlipidemia (ORs: 1.13),  
14  
15  
16 headaches (ORs: 1.15), peptic ulcers (ORs: 1.14), and cataract (ORs: 3.54) were  
17  
18  
19 significantly associated with increasing PACG risk. For the age group of 64 years and  
20  
21  
22 younger, patients with comorbidity of hyperlipidemia (ORs: 1.20), peptic ulcers (ORs:  
23  
24  
25 1.21), and cataract (ORs: 5.91) were significantly associated with increasing PACG risk  
26  
27  
28 (**Table 4**). For the age group of 65 years and older, patients with cataract were  
29  
30  
31 significantly associated with increasing PACG risk (ORs: 5.07).  
32  
33

## 34 35 **DISCUSSION**

36  
37 Among the 3322 PACG patients, 41.8 % had hyperlipidemia, 42.4 % had headache and  
38  
39  
40 peptic ulcer, and 62.9% had cataract. The risk of PACG was greater for patients with  
41  
42  
43 the comorbidities of hyperlipidemia, headaches, liver diseases, peptic ulcers, and  
44  
45  
46 cataract. For the male group, diabetes, liver diseases, and cataract were significantly  
47  
48  
49 associated with increasing PACG risk. For the female group, hyperlipidemia,  
50  
51  
52 headaches, peptic ulcers, and cataract were significantly associated with increasing  
53  
54  
55 PACG risk. For both the genders, cataract was the same and strongest risk factor for  
56  
57  
58 PACG development (ORs: 4.30 for the male group; ORs: 3.54 for the female group).  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4       Regarding the effect of age on the risk of PACG, we subclassified the study groups  
5  
6  
7 into two. Interesting results were obtained; patients with comorbidity of hyperlipidemia,  
8  
9  
10 peptic ulcers, and cataract were associated with increasing PACG risk in the age group  
11  
12  
13 of 64 years and younger. However, for the age group of 65 years and older, cataract  
14  
15  
16 was the only factor for the increased risk of PACG. Cataract was the same and strongest  
17  
18  
19 risk factor for PACG onset for both the age groups (ORs: 5.91 for the age group younger  
20  
21  
22 than 65 years; ORs :5.07 for the age group older than 65 years).  
23  
24

25       Our study is the first one that discussed the medical comorbidity in a large PACG  
26  
27  
28 cohort using a large claims database. Potential explanations about the strong  
29  
30  
31 relationship between some medical illness and the risk of PACG should be mentioned  
32  
33  
34 as below.  
35  
36

### 37 **Pathogenetic mechanisms of PACG and association between cataract and PACG**

38  
39  
40 Our study reveals that cataract is the strongest risk factor for PACG in any age group  
41  
42  
43 and gender compared with other medical comorbidity. PACG has its characteristic  
44  
45  
46 anatomy features and unique pathological process, including a crowded anterior  
47  
48  
49 segment and narrow anterior chamber angle.<sup>15</sup> The lens is considered to play a crucial  
50  
51  
52 role in the pathogenesis of PACG either because of an increase in its thickness or a  
53  
54  
55 more anterior position resulting in angle crowding and a greater predisposition to  
56  
57  
58 pupillary block.<sup>5,6,15,16</sup> Furthermore, the lens thickness increases with age and makes  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 the narrow anterior chamber angle even more crowded, which might be why most  
5  
6  
7 PACG occurs in patients older than 40 years.<sup>15,16</sup> Our study result supports that ocular  
8  
9  
10 anatomical factor plays a more important role in the pathogenesis of PACG than any  
11  
12  
13 other medical comorbidities in Taiwan Chinese population.  
14  
15

### 16 **Association between hyperlipidemia and diabetes and PACG**

17  
18  
19 In one Korean epidemiological study, hypercholesterolemia, hypertension, and diabetes  
20  
21  
22 mellitus were independent risk factors for the development of any cataract.<sup>17</sup> Moreover,  
23  
24  
25 in one study, the authors demonstrated that metabolic syndrome and its components are  
26  
27  
28 associated with age-related cataract only among Korean women.<sup>18</sup> We believe that the  
29  
30  
31 potential reasons for diabetes and hyperlipidemia in the risk of PACG from our result  
32  
33  
34 could be attributed to the increased risk of cataract. Further, longitudinal observational  
35  
36  
37 study is needed to address this issue.  
38  
39

### 40 **Association between liver disease and PACG**

41  
42  
43 One recent study from Taiwan reported that hepatitis C infection, even without the  
44  
45  
46 complication of cirrhosis, is associated with an increased risk of cataract.<sup>19</sup> Another  
47  
48  
49 study from Korean reported that hepatitis B and hepatitis C infection were significantly  
50  
51  
52 associated with cataract.<sup>20</sup> The strong association between liver disease and the risk of  
53  
54  
55 PACG might increase the risk of cataract in liver disease patients. However, further  
56  
57  
58 study is needed to elucidate this interesting result.  
59  
60

### **Association between headache and PACG**

PACG patients complain of headache caused by increased intraocular pressure.<sup>21,22</sup>

PACG patients seek medical help due to headache before the diagnosis of PACG. Our results indicate that headache is associated with higher risk for PACG. Headache may be a symptom of PACG missed by the physician. Therefore, clinicians should consider the possibility of PACG in patients with headache.

### **Association between peptic ulcers and PACG**

No previous study has reported the presence or absence of an association between peptic ulcers and PACG. We speculate that Histamine 2 receptor antagonist that was widely used in peptic ulcer treatment might induce or precipitate PACG.<sup>23</sup> Further longitudinal study is mandatory in this interesting topic.

Despite these promising results, our study had certain limitations. First, glaucoma and medical comorbidity were defined entirely on the basis of claims data (ICD-9-CM codes assigned by clinicians).<sup>21</sup> This approach is less accurate than diagnosing personally through a standardized procedure.<sup>21</sup> The second limitation is selection bias.<sup>21</sup> Because the NHI database only comprises data of patients who have received treatment, patients who have received no treatment for glaucoma or any of these medial disease might have been recruited in the comparison cohort. Third, despite the large sample, the study cohort comprised Taiwanese patients. Therefore, these findings cannot be

1  
2  
3  
4 generalized to other populations. Nevertheless, our study has the following strengths.  
5  
6

7 First, the strength of the database is excellent because of the large sample  
8  
9  
10 randomization.<sup>21</sup> We could follow patient cases over time to assess the relationship  
11  
12  
13 between medical illness and the subsequent onset of PACG. Second, the database  
14  
15  
16 includes data of people with diverse sociodemographic profiles, unlike some smaller  
17  
18  
19 studies that recruited patients from specific regions and thus lack in representativeness.  
20  
21

22 In conclusion, our population-based study using the NHIRD revealed that the  
23  
24  
25 PACG risk is strongest in cataract patients and is slightly higher in patients with medical  
26  
27  
28 comorbidities of hyperlipidemia, headaches, liver diseases, and peptic ulcers.  
29  
30  
31 Clinicians should be aware of these findings when encountering patients with these  
32  
33  
34 diseases.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 **Contributors** H Y Chen: conception and design, acquisition of data, analysis and  
5  
6  
7 interpretation of data, drafting of the manuscript, critical revision of the manuscript  
8  
9  
10 for important intellectual content, obtaining funding; C L Lin: statistical expertise,  
11  
12  
13 conception and design, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual  
14  
15  
16 content.

17  
18  
19 **Competing interests** None declared.

20  
21  
22 **Funding** This work was supported by grants from the Ministry of Health and Welfare, Taiwan  
23  
24 (MOHW107-TDU-B-212-123004), China Medical University Hospital, Academia Sinica  
25  
26 Stroke Biosignature Project (BM10701010021), MOST Clinical Trial Consortium for  
27  
28 Stroke (MOST 107-2321-B-039 -004-), Tseng-Lien Lin Foundation, Taichung, Taiwan, and  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Katsuzo and Kiyo Aoshima Memorial Funds, Japan.

37 **Data sharing statement** No additional data available.

**References:**

1. Chen HY, Huang ML, Tsai YY, et al. Comparing glaucomatous optic neuropathy in primary open angle and primary angle closure glaucoma eyes by scanning laser polarimetry-variable corneal compensation. *J Glaucoma*. 2008 ;17:105-10.
2. Chan EW, Li X, Tham YC, et al. Glaucoma in Asia: regional prevalence variations and future projections. *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2016 ;100 :78-85.
3. Vijaya L, George R, Arvind H, et al. Prevalence of primary angle-closure disease in an urban south Indian population and comparison with a rural population. The Chennai Glaucoma Study. *Ophthalmology*. 2008 ;115:655-60.
4. Cheng JW, Zong Y, Zeng YY, et al. The prevalence of primary angle closure glaucoma in adult Asians: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2014 ;9:e103222.
5. Wright C, Tawfik MA, Waisbourd M, et al. Primary angle-closure glaucoma: an update. *Acta Ophthalmol*. 2015 Jun 27.
6. Trikha S, Perera SA, Husain R, et al. The role of lens extraction in the current management of primary angle-closure glaucoma. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol*. 2015 ;26:128-34.
7. Pache M, Flammer J. A sick eye in a sick body? Systemic findings in patients with

- 1  
2  
3  
4 primary open-angle glaucoma. *Surv Ophthalmol* 2006;51:179–212.  
5  
6  
7 8. Bayer AU, Ferrari F, Erb C. High occurrence rate of glaucoma among patients  
8  
9  
10 with Alzheimer's disease. *Eur Neurol* 2002; 47:165–8.  
11  
12  
13 9. Skalicky S, Goldberg I. Depression and quality of life in patients with glaucoma:  
14  
15  
16 a cross-sectional analysis using the Geriatric Depression Scale-15, assessment of  
17  
18  
19 function related to vision, and the Glaucoma Quality of Life-15. *J Glaucoma*  
20  
21  
22 2008;17:546–51.  
23  
24  
25 10. Chen HY, Chang YC, Lin CC, et al. Obstructive sleep apnea patients having  
26  
27  
28 surgery are less associated with glaucoma. *J. Ophthalmol.* 2014; 2014:838912.  
29  
30  
31 11. Lin HC, Chien CW, Hu CC, et al. Comparison of comorbid conditions between  
32  
33  
34 open-angle glaucoma patients and a control cohort: a case-control study.  
35  
36  
37 *Ophthalmology.* 2010 ;117:2088-95.  
38  
39  
40 12. Gordon MO, Beiser JA, Brandt JD, et al. Ocular Hypertension Treatment Study  
41  
42  
43 Group. The Ocular Hypertension Treatment Study: baseline factors that predict  
44  
45  
46 the onset of primary open angle glaucoma. *Arch Ophthalmol* 2002;120:714–20.  
47  
48  
49 13. Newman-Casey PA, Talwar N, Nan B, et al. The relationship between components  
50  
51  
52 of metabolic syndrome and open-angle glaucoma. *Ophthalmology.*  
53  
54  
55 2011;118:1318-26.  
56  
57  
58 14. Database NHIR. Taiwan, <http://nhird.nhri.org.tw/en/Background.html> (cited in  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 2015).
- 5  
6  
7 15. Foster P He M Liebmann J. Epidemiology, classification and mechanism. In:  
8  
9  
10 Weinreb R Friedman D eds. Angle Closure and Angle Closure Glaucoma. The  
11  
12  
13 Hague, The Netherlands: Kugler; 2006:1–20.  
14  
15
- 16 16. Sun X, Dai Y, Chen Y, et al. Primary angle closure glaucoma: What we know  
17  
18  
19 and what we don't know. *Prog Retin Eye Res.* 2017;57:26-45.  
20  
21
- 22 17. Rim TH, Kim MH, Kim WC, et al. Cataract subtype risk factors identified from  
23  
24  
25 the Korea National Health and Nutrition Examination survey 2008-2010. *BMC*  
26  
27  
28 *Ophthalmol.* 2014;14:4.  
29  
30
- 31 18. Park YH, Shin JA, Han K, et al. Gender difference in the association of metabolic  
32  
33  
34  
35 syndrome and its components with age-related cataract: the Korea National Health  
36  
37  
38 and Nutrition Examination Survey 2008-2010. *PLoS One.* 2014; 9:e85068.  
39  
40  
41
- 42 19. Lin SY, Lin CL, Ju SW, et al. Increasing risk of cataract in HCV patients receiving  
43  
44  
45 anti-HCV therapy: A nationwide cohort study. *PLoS One.* 2017;12:e0173125.  
46  
47  
48
- 49 20. Park S, Choi N-K Hepatitis virus infection and age-related cataract. *Sci Rep.* 2017;  
50  
51  
52 7: 13089.  
53  
54  
55
- 56 21. Neshet R, Mimouni MD, Khoury S, et al. Delayed diagnosis of subacute angle  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 closure glaucoma in patients presenting with headaches. *Acta Neurol Belg.*  
5  
6  
7 2014 ;114:269-72.  
8  
9

10  
11 22. Neshar R, Epstein E, Stern Y , et al. Headaches as the main presenting symptom  
12  
13  
14 of subacute angle closure glaucoma. *Headache.* 2005 ;45:172-6.  
15  
16

17  
18 23. Tripathi RC, Tripathi BJ, Haggerty C. Drug-induced glaucomas: mechanism and  
19  
20  
21 management. *Drug Saf.* 2003;26:749-67.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1. Demographic comparison between PACG cases and controls**

	PACG Cases		Controls		p-value
	N= 3322		N= 13288		
	n	(%)	n	(%)	
Sex					0.999
female	2031	61.1	8124	61.1	
male	5164	38.9	1291	38.9	
Age group (years)					0.999
20-49	398	12.0	1592	12.0	
50-64	1011	30.4	4044	30.4	
≥65	1913	57.6	7652	57.6	
Age (year), mean (SD) †	65.2(12.7)		64.8(13.0)		0.100
Comorbidity					
Hypertension	2025	60.6	6896	51.9	<0.001
Ischemic heart disease	1097	33.0	3561	26.8	<0.001
Hyperlipidemia	1389	41.8	4399	33.1	<0.001
Congestive heart failure	213	6.41	849	6.39	0.962
Cardiac arrhythmias	540	16.3	1826	13.7	<0.001
Peripheral vascular disorders	201	6.05	571	4.30	<0.001
Stroke	246	7.41	994	7.48	0.883
Headaches	1407	42.4	4772	35.9	<0.001
Migraine	125	3.76	456	3.43	0.353
Epilepsy	30	0.90	144	1.08	0.360
Dementia	110	3.31	448	3.37	0.863
Rheumatoid arthritis	11	0.33	45	0.34	0.957
Systemic lupus erythematosus	3	0.09	8	0.06	0.546
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	675	20.3	2343	17.6	<0.001
Asthma	418	12.6	1455	11.0	0.008
Pulmonary circulation disorders	26	0.78	85	0.64	0.366
Diabetes	710	21.4	2148	16.2	<0.001
Hypothyroidism	36	1.08	110	0.83	0.158
Renal failure	448	13.5	1435	10.8	<0.001
Liver diseases	898	27.0	2775	20.9	<0.001
Peptic ulcers	1409	42.4	4503	33.9	<0.001
Hepatitis B	182	5.48	610	4.59	0.032
Tuberculosis	86	2.59	294	2.21	0.194
Deficiency anemia	114	3.43	381	2.87	0.087

1						
2						
3						
4	Depression	328	9.87	922	6.94	<0.001
5	Psychosis	153	4.61	518	3.90	0.064
6	Metastatic cancer	1	0.03	2	0.02	0.564
7						
8	Solid tumor	190	5.72	630	4.74	0.020
9	Cataract	2088	62.9	4077	30.7	<0.001

11 Data are presented as the number of subjects in each group, with percentages given in  
12 parentheses.

13  
14 Chi-square test; † t-test

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only

**Table 2. Odds ratio and 95% confidence interval of PACG associated with comorbidities**

Variable	Crude		Adjusted <sup>†</sup>	
	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)
<b>Comorbidity</b>				
Hypertension	1.45	(1.34, 1.56)***	0.97	(0.88, 1.07)
Ischemic heart disease	1.35	(1.24, 1.46)***	0.92	(0.83, 1.01)
Hyperlipidemia	1.45	(1.34, 1.57)***	1.11	(1.01, 1.21)*
Congestive heart failure	1.00	(0.86, 1.17)	-	-
Cardiac arrhythmias	1.22	(1.10, 1.35)***	0.91	(0.81, 1.02)
Peripheral vascular disorders	1.44	(1.22, 1.69)***	1.02	(0.86, 1.21)
Stroke	0.98	(0.86, 1.14)	-	-
Headaches	1.31	(1.21, 1.42)***	1.13	(1.04, 1.23)***
Migraine	1.10	(0.90, 1.35)	-	-
Epilepsy	0.83	(0.56, 1.24)	-	-
Dementia	0.98	(0.79, 1.21)	-	-
Rheumatoid arthritis	0.98	(0.51, 1.89)	-	-
Systemic lupus erythematosus	1.50	(0.40, 5.66)	-	-
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	1.19	(1.08, 1.31)***	0.88	(0.79, 1.00)
Asthma	1.17	(1.04, 1.32)***	0.98	(0.86, 1.11)
Pulmonary circulation disorders	1.23	(0.79, 1.90)	-	-
Diabetes	1.41	(1.28, 1.55)***	1.03	(0.93, 1.15)
Hypothyroidism	1.31	(0.90, 1.92)	-	-
Renal failure	1.29	(1.15, 1.44)***	0.93	(0.82, 1.05)
Liver diseases	1.40	(1.29, 1.53)***	1.14	(1.03, 1.25)*
Peptic ulcers	1.44	(1.33, 1.55)***	1.10	(1.01, 1.20)*
Hepatitis B	1.21	(1.02, 1.43)*	1.09	(0.91, 1.31)
Tuberculosis	1.18	(0.92, 1.50)	-	-
Deficiency anemia	1.20	(0.97, 1.49)	-	-
Depression	1.47	(1.29, 1.68)***	1.12	(0.98, 1.29)
Psychosis	1.19	(0.99, 1.43)	-	-
Metastatic cancer	2.01	(0.18, 22.1)	-	-
Solid tumor	1.22	(1.03, 1.44)*	1.01	(0.85, 1.20)
Cataract	3.82	(3.53, 4.14)***	3.80	(3.49, 4.14)***

Abbreviations: odds ratio (OR); confidence interval (CI)

<sup>†</sup>Covariables which were significantly associated with risk of PACG in univariable unconditional logistic regression model were further analyzed by multivariable unconditional logistic regression model.

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.001

**Table 3. Odds ratio and 95% confidence interval of PACG associated with comorbidities By sex**

Variable	Male				Female			
	Crude		Adjusted †		Crude		Adjusted †	
	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)
Comorbidity								
Hypertension	1.60	(1.41, 1.81)***	1.01	(0.87, 1.18)	1.36	(1.23, 1.50)***	0.94	(0.83, 1.06)
Ischemic heart disease	1.43	(1.25, 1.63)***	0.92	(0.78, 1.08)	1.30	(1.17, 1.44)***	0.90	(0.79, 1.02)
Hyperlipidemia	1.54	(1.35, 1.75)***	1.12	(0.96, 1.30)	1.41	(1.28, 1.56)***	1.13	(1.00, 1.26)*
Congestive heart failure	1.15	(0.91, 1.46)	-	-	0.91	(0.74, 1.12)	-	-
Cardiac arrhythmias	1.24	(1.05, 1.48)***	0.86	(0.71, 1.05)	1.20	(1.06, 1.37)***	0.93	(0.80, 1.07)
Peripheral vascular disorders	1.52	(1.17, 1.98)***	0.97	(0.73, 1.29)	1.38	(1.12, 1.71)***	1.04	(0.84, 1.31)
Stroke	1.10	(0.89, 1.36)	-	-	0.90	(0.74, 1.10)	-	-
Headaches	1.35	(1.19, 1.55)***	1.15	(1.00, 1.33)	1.30	(1.18, 1.44)***	1.15	(1.04, 1.28)**
Migraine	1.09	(0.70, 1.70)	-	-	1.10	(0.88, 1.39)	-	-
Epilepsy	0.91	(0.50, 1.67)	-	-	0.78	(0.46, 1.31)	-	-
Dementia	1.04	(0.74, 1.45)	-	-	0.95	(0.72, 1.25)	-	-
Rheumatoid arthritis	2.01	(0.37, 11.0)	-	-	0.88	(0.43, 1.81)	-	-
Systemic lupus erythematosus	4.00	(0.25, 64.0)	-	-	1.15	(0.24, 5.52)	-	-
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	1.34	(1.17, 1.54)***	0.89	(0.75, 1.05)	1.07	(0.94, 1.23)	-	-
Asthma	1.30	(1.08, 1.56)***	0.99	(0.80, 1.23)	1.10	(0.95, 1.28)	-	-

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

Pulmonary circulation disorders	1.07	(0.49, 2.34)	-	-	1.31	(0.77, 2.24)	-	-
Diabetes	1.67	(1.44, 1.94)***	1.19	(1.00, 1.40)*	1.26	(1.11, 1.42)***	0.93	(0.81, 1.07)
Hypothyroidism	1.18	(0.43, 3.20)	-	-	1.34	(0.89, 2.01)	-	-
Renal failure	1.46	(1.23, 1.73)***	0.96	(0.80, 1.16)	1.17	(1.00, 1.36)*	0.87	(0.74, 1.03)
Liver diseases	1.57	(1.37, 1.80)***	1.29	(1.11, 1.50)**	1.30	(1.16, 1.46)***	1.05	(0.92, 1.19)
Peptic ulcers	1.40	(1.24, 1.59)***	1.01	(0.87, 1.16)	1.46	(1.32, 1.61)***	1.14	(1.02, 1.28)*
Hepatitis B	1.25	(0.97, 1.61)	-	-	1.17	(0.93, 1.47)	-	-
Tuberculosis	1.29	(0.95, 1.75)	-	-	1.02	(0.68, 1.52)	-	-
Deficiency anemia	1.48	(0.99, 2.20)	-	-	1.12	(0.87, 1.44)	-	-
Depression	1.67	(1.31, 2.13)***	1.20	(0.93, 1.57)	1.40	(1.20, 1.64)***	1.11	(0.94, 1.31)
Psychosis	1.13	(0.81, 1.59)	-	-	1.22	(0.98, 1.52)	-	-
Metastatic cancer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Solid tumor	1.23	(0.93, 1.61)	-	-	1.22	(0.98, 1.50)	-	-
Cataract	4.37	(3.84, 4.96)***	4.30	(3.74, 4.94)***	3.54	(3.20, 3.92)***	3.54	(3.18, 3.95)***

Abbreviations: odds ratio (OR); confidence interval (CI)

†Covariables which were significantly associated with risk of PACG in univariable unconditional logistic regression model were further analyzed by multivariable unconditional logistic regression model.

**Table 4. Odds ratio and 95% confidence interval of PACG associated with comorbidities By age**

Variable	Age $\leq$ 64				Age $\geq$ 65			
	Crude		Adjusted <sup>†</sup>		Crude		Adjusted <sup>†</sup>	
	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)
Comorbidity								
Hypertension	1.77	(1.57, 2.00)***	1.15	(0.99, 1.34)	1.35	(1.20, 1.51)***	1.10	(0.97, 1.25)
Ischemic heart disease	1.79	(1.54, 2.08)***	1.00	(0.83, 1.21)	1.23	(0.11, 1.36)***	0.95	(0.84, 1.07)
Hyperlipidemia	1.81	(1.60, 2.06)***	1.20	(1.03, 1.40)*	1.28	(1.15, 1.41)***	1.04	(0.92, 1.16)
Congestive heart failure	1.75	(1.24, 2.48)***	0.96	(0.64, 1.44)	0.89	(0.74, 1.06)	-	-
Cardiac arrhythmias	1.49	(1.22, 1.83)***	1.01	(0.80, 1.28)	1.14	(1.01, 1.29)*	0.92	(0.80, 1.06)
Peripheral vascular disorders	1.65	(1.14, 2.40)***	0.84	(0.55, 1.28)	1.40	(1.16, 1.68)***	1.13	(0.93, 1.38)
Stroke	1.40	(0.99, 1.96)	-	-	0.92	(0.78, 1.08)	-	-
Headaches	1.48	(1.31, 1.67)***	1.14	(1.00, 1.30)	1.20	(1.09, 1.33)***	1.04	(0.93, 1.16)
Migraine	1.13	(0.83, 1.52)	-	-	1.08	(0.83, 1.42)	-	-
Epilepsy	1.17	(0.61, 2.24)	-	-	0.70	(0.42, 1.15)	-	-
Dementia	2.46	(1.16, 5.21)***	1.31	(0.57, 3.05)	0.92	(0.73, 1.15)	-	-
Rheumatoid arthritis	1.26	(0.50, 3.17)	-	-	0.77	(0.30, 2.00)	-	-
Systemic lupus erythematosus	2.01	(0.18, 22.1)	-	-	1.33	(0.27, 6.61)	-	-
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	1.60	(1.33, 1.93)***	1.08	(0.87, 1.34)	1.09	(0.97, 1.22)	-	-
Asthma	1.42	(1.15, 1.76)***	1.00	(0.78, 1.28)	1.08	(0.94, 1.25)	-	-

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

Pulmonary circulation disorders	1.72	(0.66, 4.48)	-	-	1.13	(0.69, 1.86)	-	-
Diabetes	1.92	(1.63, 2.25)***	1.08	(0.89, 1.31)	1.21	(1.08, 1.37)**	0.96	(0.84, 1.09)
Hypothyroidism	1.28	(0.71, 2.30)	-	-	1.34	(0.81, 2.19)	-	-
Renal failure	1.82	(1.48, 2.24)***	1.08	(0.85, 1.37)	1.13	(0.99, 1.30)	-	-
Liver diseases	1.64	(1.43, 1.87)***	1.12	(0.96, 1.31)	1.26	(1.13, 1.42)***	1.02	(0.90, 1.16)
Peptic ulcers	1.70	(1.50, 1.92)***	1.21	(1.05, 1.40)**	1.32	(1.19, 1.45)***	1.06	(0.95, 1.19)
Hepatitis B	1.06	(0.83, 1.35)	-	-	1.37	(1.08, 1.73)***	1.20	(0.93, 1.54)
Tuberculosis	1.08	(0.64, 1.82)	-	-	1.21	(0.92, 1.59)	-	-
Deficiency anemia	1.36	(0.95, 1.92)	-	-	1.13	(0.86, 1.47)	-	-
Depression	1.78	(1.45, 2.20)***	1.18	(0.93, 1.50)	1.31	(1.10, 1.55)**	1.01	(0.85, 1.21)
Psychosis	1.27	(0.95, 1.69)	-	-	1.14	(0.90, 1.45)	-	-
Metastatic cancer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Solid tumor	1.16	(0.83, 1.60)	-	-	1.25	(1.02, 1.51)*	1.15	(0.94, 1.41)
Cataract	6.95	(6.00, 8.05)***	5.91	(5.07, 6.90)***	5.18	(4.56, 5.87)***	5.07	(4.46, 5.77)***

Abbreviations: odds ratio (OR); confidence interval (CI)

†Covariables which were significantly associated with risk of PACG in univariable unconditional logistic regression model were further analyzed by multivariable unconditional logistic regression model.



## STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation	Reported on Page No.
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	2,3
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2,3
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6,7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6,7
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6,7
		(b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	6,7
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6,7
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	6,7
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	6
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	7,8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	6-8
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	6-8
		(d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods	6-8

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

taking account of sampling strategy  

---

(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses

8

Continued on next page

For peer review only

<b>Results</b>			<b>Reported on Page No.</b>
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	8
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	8
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	x
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	8
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	8
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	8
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	8,9
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	8,9
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	8,9
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	8,9
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	8,9
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	8,9
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	8,9
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	9,10
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	10-12
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	10-12
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	11-12
<b>Other information</b>			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	14

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

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

# BMJ Open

## Comparison of medical comorbidity between primary angle closure glaucoma patients and a control cohort: A population-based study from Taiwan

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-024209.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	05-Feb-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Chen, Hsin-Yi; China Medical University, Ophthalmology Lin, Cheng-Li; China Medical University, Management Office for Health Data
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Ophthalmology
Keywords:	Epidemiology < TROPICAL MEDICINE, Glaucoma < OPHTHALMOLOGY, primary angle-closure glaucoma

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4 **Comparison of medical comorbidity between primary angle-closure**  
5 **glaucoma patients and a control cohort: A population-based study**  
6 **from Taiwan**  
7  
8

9  
10 Hsin-Yi Chen<sup>1,2</sup>, Cheng-Li Lin<sup>3</sup>  
11

12  
13 <sup>1</sup> School of Medicine, Medical College, China Medical University  
14

15 <sup>2</sup> Department of Ophthalmology, China Medical University Hospital  
16

17 <sup>3</sup> Management Office for Health Data, China Medical University  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 **Running Title: Primary angle closure glaucoma, medical comorbidity**  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 \*Total word count: 2131 , total number of pages: 25  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**\* Corresponding authors**

Hsin-Yi Chen, MD, Department of Ophthalmology, China Medical University

Hospital, Taichung, Taiwan. No. 2, Yuh-Der Road, Taichung 40447, Taiwan.

Tel: 886-4-22081700 / Fax:886-4-22081700; E-mail: hsin7850@url.com.tw;

glaucoma0606@gmail.com

## Abstract

**Objective** To determine the prevalence and risk of systemic comorbidities in primary angle-closure glaucoma in Taiwan population.

**Methods** We included 3322 PACG subjects and randomly selected patients without PACG from the Taiwan National Health Insurance Research Database and frequency matched four of them (n = 13288) to each PACG patient, based on age and sex. The univariable and multivariable unconditional logistic regression models were used to estimate the effect of comorbidities on the risk of PACG as indicated by the odds ratio with 95% confidence interval.

**Results** The mean age of the PACG group was  $65.2 \pm 12.7$  years, and 61.1% of the patients were female. The risk of PACG was greater for patients with the comorbidities of hyperlipidemia (ORs: 1.11), headaches (ORs: 1.13), liver diseases (ORs: 1.14), peptic ulcers (ORs: 1.10), and cataract (ORs: 3.80). For the male group, diabetes (ORs: 1.19), liver diseases (ORs: 1.29), and cataract (ORs: 4.30) were significantly associated with increasing PACG risk. For the female group, hyperlipidemia (ORs: 1.13), headaches (ORs: 1.15), peptic ulcers (ORs: 1.14), and cataract (ORs: 3.54) were significantly associated with increasing PACG risk. For the age group of 64 years and younger, patients with comorbidity of hyperlipidemia (ORs:

1  
2  
3  
4 1.20), peptic ulcers (ORs: 1.21), and cataract (ORs: 5.91) were significantly associated  
5  
6  
7 with increasing PACG risk. For the age group of 65 years and older, patients with  
8  
9  
10 cataract were significantly associated with increasing PACG risk (ORs: 5.07).  
11  
12  
13

14 **Conclusions** Clinicians should be aware of slightly increased PACG risk in the subjects  
15  
16  
17 with the medical comorbidities of hyperlipidemia, headaches, liver diseases, and peptic  
18  
19  
20 ulcers. However, cataract is the strongest risk factor of PACG.  
21  
22  
23

24 **Keywords:** primary angle-closure glaucoma, medical comorbidity, cataract, Taiwan.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Article summary

### Strengths and limitations of this study

- This is the first original study on the association between medical comorbidity and primary angle-closure glaucoma.
- A strength of this study is the large sample size.
- Clinicians should be aware of slightly increased PACG risk in the subjects with hyperlipidemia, headaches, liver diseases, and peptic ulcers.
- Cataract is the strongest risk factor of PACG in any age group and gender.
- This study has inherent limitations from the claims database, including miscoding and selection bias; the findings are thus not generalizable to all populations.



## INTRODUCTION

Primary angle-closure glaucoma (PACG) is a leading cause of blindness worldwide; it is especially common in Asian countries.<sup>1-3</sup> A recent meta-analysis study shows that PACG affects approximately 0.75% of adult Asians, and this percentage doubles every decade; 60% of cases are in females.<sup>4</sup> The proposed mechanism of PACG is pupillary block, with anterior lens movement as a strong contributing factor, often due to aging-induced cataract formation.<sup>4,5</sup> Risk factors for PACG are aging, female gender, shallow anterior chamber, and short axial length in hyperopic eye.<sup>4,5</sup> Contrary to primary open angle glaucoma (POAG)—which has been associated with systemic diseases, including cardiovascular, metabolic, neurodegenerative, psychological diseases, and others<sup>6-13</sup>—few studies have evaluated medical illness among PACG subjects. Age is the main factor contributing to the coexisting of systemic comorbidities and cataract formation. Therefore, it is quite meaningful to understand if age related medical illness would be associated with PACG which is also a very important issue in our population because of very high prevalence of this type of glaucoma in Taiwan.

Here, we use a nationwide dataset from Taiwan to determine the prevalence of some common medical comorbidities in the PACG population. We also study whether these comorbidities are associated with the increased risk of PACG compared with controls. This is the first original study using a large claims database to evaluate this important topic.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Patient and public involvement statement

This work is a retrospective longitudinal case–control study from a claims database.

Patients were not involved in the recruitment or conduct of the study.

### Data Source

We conducted a nationwide population-based retrospective cohort study using data from the Longitudinal Health Insurance Database 2000 (LHID 2000). The LHID 2000 contains the enrollment and claims information of 1 million randomly sampled enrollees of the National Health Insurance (NHI) program in 2000. The NHI program provides mandatory universal health insurance to Taiwan's 23.75 million citizens and residents, with an enrollment rate of approximately 99%.<sup>14</sup> The LHID 2000 includes all ambulatory care, inpatient services, prescription drugs, traditional Chinese Medicine, and dental services claims data. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of China Medical University and Hospital (CMUH-104-REC2-115). Diseases are coded according to the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM), 2001 edition.

### Sampled Participants

From the LHID 2000, we identified patients aged more than 20 years with a diagnosis of PACG (ICD-9-CM code 365.2) between January 1, 2005, and December 31, 2011 as the case group. The diagnosis of PACG was based on definitions agreed on by the World Glaucoma Association.<sup>15</sup> The date of diagnosis of PACG was defined as the index date. We excluded patients with a history of POAG (ICD-9-CM code 365.1) diagnosed before the index date. Secondary, juvenile, and congenital glaucoma were

1  
2  
3 also excluded. For each PACG case, four insured beneficiaries with no history of  
4  
5 glaucoma (ICD-9-CM code 365) were assigned to a non-PACG control group,  
6  
7 frequency matched to the patients in the PACG case group according to age (every 5  
8  
9 years), sex, and index year of PACG diagnosis; the same exclusion criteria used for the  
10  
11 PACG case group was applied.  
12  
13

### 14 15 **Common medical comorbidity**

16  
17 The comorbidities were hypertension (ICD-9-CM codes 401–405), ischemic heart  
18  
19 disease (ICD-9-CM codes 410–414), hyperlipidemia (ICD-9-CM code 272), congestive  
20  
21 heart failure (ICD-9-CM code 428), cardiac arrhythmias (ICD-9-CM codes 426 and  
22  
23 427), peripheral vascular disorders (ICD-9-CM codes 440.2, 440.3, 440.8, 440.9, 443,  
24  
25 444.22, 444.8, 447.8, and 447.9), stroke (ICD-9-CM codes 430–438), headaches (ICD-  
26  
27 9-CM code 784.0), migraine (ICD-9-CM code 346), epilepsy (ICD-9-CM code 345),  
28  
29 dementia (ICD-9-CM code 290, 294.1, and 331.0), rheumatoid arthritis (ICD-9-CM  
30  
31 code 714), systemic lupus erythematosus (ICD-9-CM code 710.0), chronic obstructive  
32  
33 pulmonary disease (ICD-9-CM codes 491, 492, and 496), asthma (ICD-9-CM code  
34  
35 493), pulmonary circulation disorders (ICD-9-CM codes 415–417), diabetes (ICD-9-  
36  
37 CM code 250), hypothyroidism (ICD-9-CM codes 243 and 244), renal failure (ICD-9-  
38  
39 CM codes 584–586), liver diseases (ICD-9-CM codes 570–573), peptic ulcers (ICD-9-  
40  
41 CM codes 531–533), hepatitis B (ICD-9-CM codes V02.61, 070.20, 070.22, 070.30,  
42  
43 and 070.32), tuberculosis (ICD-9-CM codes 011–018), deficiency anemias (ICD-9-CM  
44  
45 codes 280, and 281), depression (ICD-9-CM codes 296.2, 296.3, 300.4, and 311),  
46  
47 psychosis (ICD-9-CM codes 295–299), metastatic cancer (ICD-9-CM codes 196–198),  
48  
49 and solid tumor (ICD-9-CM codes 140–195).  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56  
57 Cataract (ICD-9-CM code 366) was also evaluated because of higher prevalence  
58  
59 in the elderly population.  
60

## Statistical analysis

The baseline characteristics and comorbidities of the PACG case group and non-PACG control group were compared. Chi squared test and *t* test were used to evaluate the difference of categorical and continuous variables, respectively, between the two groups. Univariable and multivariable unconditional logistic regression models were used to estimate the effect of comorbidities on the risk of PACG as indicated by the odds ratio (OR) with 95% confidence interval (CI). All analyses were performed using SAS software version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Carey, NC), and the significance level was set at 0.05 for the two-tailed tests.

## RESULTS

A total of 3322 PACG cases met the study criteria, and 13288 subjects were matched according to sex and age to form the control group (**Table 1**). The PACG group comprised 61.1% women, and 57.6% were older than 65 years. The mean age was  $65.2 \pm 12.7$  years in the PACG group and  $64.8 \pm 13.0$  years in the control group. Compared with the controls, PACG patients have significantly higher prevalence of hypertension, ischemic heart disease, hyperlipidemia, cardiac arrhythmias, peripheral vascular disorders, headaches, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, asthma, diabetes, renal failure, liver diseases, peptic ulcers, hepatitis B, depression, solid tumor, and cataract ( $p < 0.05$ ).

1  
2  
3  
4 The crude and adjusted ORs for the model were fitted to examine the association  
5  
6  
7 between medical comorbidities and the risk of PACG (**Table 2**). Hyperlipidemia  
8  
9  
10 increased the risk of PACG by 1.11 fold (95% CI: 1.01-1.21). Headaches increased the  
11  
12  
13 risk of PACG by 1.13 fold (95% CI: 1.04-1.23). Liver diseases increased the risk of  
14  
15  
16 PACG by 1.14 fold (95% CI: 1.03-1.25). Peptic ulcers increased the risk of PACG by  
17  
18  
19 1.10 fold (95% CI: 1.01-1.20). Cataract increased the risk of PACG by 3.80 fold (95%  
20  
21  
22 CI: 3.49-4.14).

23  
24  
25 For the male group, diabetes (ORs: 1.19, 95% CI: 1.00-1.40), liver diseases (ORs:  
26  
27  
28 1.29, 95% CI: 1.11-1.50), and cataract (ORs: 4.30, 95%CI: 3.74-4.94) were  
29  
30  
31 significantly associated with increasing PACG risk (**Table 3**). For the female group,  
32  
33  
34 hyperlipidemia (ORs: 1.13, 95% CI: 1.00-1.26), headaches (ORs: 1.15, 95% CI: 1.04-  
35  
36  
37 1.28), peptic ulcers (ORs: 1.14, 95% CI: 1.02-1.28), and cataract (ORs: 3.54, 95% CI:  
38  
39  
40 3.18-3.95) were significantly associated with increasing PACG risk.

41  
42  
43 For the age group of 64 years and younger, patients with comorbidity of  
44  
45  
46 hyperlipidemia (ORs: 1.20, 95% CI: 1.03-1.40), peptic ulcers (ORs: 1.21, 95% CI:  
47  
48  
49 1.05-1.40), and cataract (ORs: 5.91, 95% CI: 5.07-6.90) were significantly associated  
50  
51  
52 with increasing PACG risk (**Table 4**). For the age group of 65 years and older, patients  
53  
54  
55 with cataract were significantly associated with increasing PACG risk (ORs: 5.07, 95%  
56  
57  
58 CI: 4.46-5.77).

## DISCUSSION

Among the 3322 PACG patients, 41.8 % had hyperlipidemia, 42.4 % had headache and peptic ulcer, and 62.9% had cataract. The risk of PACG was greater for patients with the comorbidities of hyperlipidemia, headaches, liver diseases, peptic ulcers, and cataract. For the male group, diabetes, liver diseases, and cataract were significantly associated with increasing PACG risk. For the female group, hyperlipidemia, headaches, peptic ulcers, and cataract were significantly associated with increasing PACG risk. For both the genders, cataract was the same and strongest risk factor for PACG development (ORs: 4.30 for the male group; ORs: 3.54 for the female group).

Regarding the effect of age on the risk of PACG, we subclassified the study groups into two. Interesting results were obtained; patients with comorbidity of hyperlipidemia, peptic ulcers, and cataract were associated with increasing PACG risk in the age group of 64 years and younger. However, for the age group of 65 years and older, cataract was the only factor for the increased risk of PACG. Cataract was the same and strongest risk factor for PACG onset for both the age groups (ORs: 5.91 for the age group younger than 65 years; ORs :5.07 for the age group older than 65 years).

Our study is the first one that discussed the medical comorbidity in a large PACG cohort using a large claims database. Potential explanations about the strong relationship between some medical illness and the risk of PACG should be mentioned

1  
2  
3  
4 as below.  
5  
6

### 7 **Pathogenetic mechanisms of PACG and association between cataract and PACG** 8 9

10 Our study reveals that cataract is the strongest risk factor for PACG in any age group  
11 and gender compared with other medical comorbidity. PACG has its characteristic  
12 anatomy features and unique pathological process, including a crowded anterior  
13 segment and narrow anterior chamber angle.<sup>15</sup> The lens is considered to play a crucial  
14 role in the pathogenesis of PACG either because of an increase in its thickness or a  
15 more anterior position resulting in angle crowding and a greater predisposition to  
16 pupillary block.<sup>5,6,15,16</sup> Furthermore, the lens thickness increases with age and makes  
17 the narrow anterior chamber angle even more crowded, which might be why most  
18 PACG occurs in patients older than 40 years.<sup>15,16</sup> Our study result supports that ocular  
19 anatomical factor plays a more important role in the pathogenesis of PACG than any  
20 other medical comorbidities in Taiwan Chinese population.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 **Association between hyperlipidemia and diabetes and PACG** 44 45

46 In one Korean epidemiological study, hypercholesterolemia, hypertension, and diabetes  
47 mellitus were independent risk factors for the development of any cataract.<sup>17</sup> Moreover,  
48 in one study, the authors demonstrated that metabolic syndrome and its components are  
49 associated with age-related cataract only among Korean women.<sup>18</sup> We believe that the  
50 potential reasons for diabetes and hyperlipidemia in the risk of PACG from our result  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 could be attributed to the increased risk of cataract. Further, longitudinal observational  
5  
6  
7 study is needed to address this issue.  
8  
9

### 10 **Association between liver disease and PACG**

11  
12  
13 One recent study from Taiwan reported that hepatitis C infection, even without the  
14  
15  
16 complication of cirrhosis, is associated with an increased risk of cataract.<sup>19</sup> Another  
17  
18  
19 study from Korean reported that hepatitis B and hepatitis C infection were significantly  
20  
21  
22 associated with cataract.<sup>20</sup> The strong association between liver disease and the risk of  
23  
24  
25 PACG might increase the risk of cataract in liver disease patients. However, further  
26  
27  
28 study is needed to elucidate this interesting result.  
29

### 30 **Association between headache and PACG**

31  
32  
33 PACG patients complain of headache caused by increased intraocular pressure.<sup>21,22</sup>  
34  
35  
36  
37 PACG patients seek medical help due to headache before the diagnosis of PACG. Our  
38  
39  
40 results indicate that headache is associated with higher risk for PACG. Headache may  
41  
42  
43 be a symptom of PACG missed by the physician. Therefore, clinicians should consider  
44  
45  
46 the possibility of PACG in patients with headache.  
47  
48

### 49 **Association between peptic ulcers and PACG**

50  
51  
52 No previous study has reported the presence or absence of an association between  
53  
54  
55 peptic ulcers and PACG. We speculate that Histamine 2 receptor antagonist that was  
56  
57  
58 widely used in peptic ulcer treatment might induce or precipitate PACG.<sup>23</sup> Further  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 longitudinal study is mandatory in this interesting topic.  
5  
6

7         Despite these promising results, our study had certain limitations. First, glaucoma  
8  
9 and medical comorbidity were defined entirely on the basis of claims data (ICD-9-CM  
10  
11 codes assigned by clinicians).<sup>21</sup> This approach is less accurate than diagnosing  
12  
13 personally through a standardized procedure.<sup>21</sup> The second limitation is selection bias.<sup>21</sup>  
14  
15  
16  
17 Because the NHI database only comprises data of patients who have received treatment,  
18  
19 patients who have received no treatment for glaucoma or any of these medial disease  
20  
21 might have been recruited in the comparison cohort. Third, despite the large sample,  
22  
23 the study cohort comprised Taiwanese patients. Therefore, these findings cannot be  
24  
25 generalized to other populations. Nevertheless, our study has the following strengths.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34 First, the strength of the database is excellent because of the large sample  
35  
36 randomization.<sup>21</sup> We could follow patient cases over time to assess the relationship  
37  
38 between medical illness and the subsequent onset of PACG. Second, the database  
39  
40 includes data of people with diverse sociodemographic profiles, unlike some smaller  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 studies that recruited patients from specific regions and thus lack in representativeness.

49         In conclusion, our population-based study using the NHIRD revealed that the  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
PACG risk is strongest in cataract patients and is slightly higher in patients with medical  
comorbidities of hyperlipidemia, headaches, liver diseases, and peptic ulcers.  
Clinicians should be aware of these findings when encountering patients with these

diseases.

For peer review only

1  
2  
3  
4 **Contributors** H Y Chen: conception and design, acquisition of data, analysis and  
5  
6  
7 interpretation of data, drafting of the manuscript, critical revision of the manuscript  
8  
9  
10 for important intellectual content, obtaining funding; C L Lin: statistical expertise,  
11  
12  
13 conception and design, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual  
14  
15  
16 content.

17  
18  
19 **Competing interests** None declared.

20  
21  
22 **Funding** This work was supported by grants from the Ministry of Health and Welfare, Taiwan  
23  
24  
25 (MOHW107-TDU-B-212-123004), China Medical University Hospital, Academia Sinica  
26  
27  
28 Stroke Biosignature Project (BM10701010021), MOST Clinical Trial Consortium for  
29  
30  
31 Stroke (MOST 107-2321-B-039 -004-), Tseng-Lien Lin Foundation, Taichung, Taiwan, and  
32  
33  
34 Katsuzo and Kiyo Aoshima Memorial Funds, Japan.

35  
36  
37 **Data sharing statement** No additional data available.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**References:**

1. Chen HY, Huang ML, Tsai YY, et al. Comparing glaucomatous optic neuropathy in primary open angle and primary angle closure glaucoma eyes by scanning laser polarimetry-variable corneal compensation. *J Glaucoma*. 2008 ;17:105-10.
2. Chan EW, Li X, Tham YC, et al. Glaucoma in Asia: regional prevalence variations and future projections. *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2016 ;100 :78-85.
3. Vijaya L, George R, Arvind H, et al. Prevalence of primary angle-closure disease in an urban south Indian population and comparison with a rural population. The Chennai Glaucoma Study. *Ophthalmology*. 2008 ;115:655-60.
4. Cheng JW, Zong Y, Zeng YY, et al. The prevalence of primary angle closure glaucoma in adult Asians: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2014 ;9:e103222.
5. Wright C, Tawfik MA, Waisbourd M, et al. Primary angle-closure glaucoma: an update. *Acta Ophthalmol*. 2015 Jun 27.
6. Trikha S, Perera SA, Husain R, et al. The role of lens extraction in the current management of primary angle-closure glaucoma. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol*. 2015 ;26:128-34.
7. Pache M, Flammer J. A sick eye in a sick body? Systemic findings in patients with

- 1  
2  
3  
4 primary open-angle glaucoma. *Surv Ophthalmol* 2006;51:179 –212.  
5  
6  
7 8. Bayer AU, Ferrari F, Erb C. High occurrence rate of glaucoma among patients  
8  
9  
10 with Alzheimer's disease. *Eur Neurol* 2002; 47:165– 8.  
11  
12  
13 9. Skalicky S, Goldberg I. Depression and quality of life in patients with glaucoma:  
14  
15 a cross-sectional analysis using the Geriatric Depression Scale-15, assessment of  
16  
17 function related to vision, and the Glaucoma Quality of Life-15. *J Glaucoma*  
18  
19 2008;17:546 –51.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 10. Chen HY, Chang YC, Lin CC, et al. Obstructive sleep apnea patients having  
26  
27 surgery are less associated with glaucoma. *J. Ophthalmol.* 2014; 2014:838912.  
28  
29  
30  
31 11. Lin HC, Chien CW, Hu CC, et al. Comparison of comorbid conditions between  
32  
33 open-angle glaucoma patients and a control cohort: a case-control study.  
34  
35 *Ophthalmology.* 2010 ;117:2088-95.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 12. Gordon MO, Beiser JA, Brandt JD, et al. Ocular Hypertension Treatment Study  
41  
42 Group. The Ocular Hypertension Treatment Study: baseline factors that predict  
43  
44 the onset of primary open angle glaucoma. *Arch Ophthalmol* 2002;120:714 –20.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 13. Newman-Casey PA, Talwar N, Nan B, et al. The relationship between components  
50  
51 of metabolic syndrome and open-angle glaucoma. *Ophthalmology.*  
52  
53 2011;118:1318-26.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58 14. Database NHIR. Taiwan, <http://nhird.nhri.org.tw/en/Background.html> (cited in  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 2015).
- 5  
6  
7 15. Foster P He M Liebmann J. Epidemiology, classification and mechanism. In:  
8  
9  
10 Weinreb R Friedman D eds. Angle Closure and Angle Closure Glaucoma. The  
11  
12  
13 Hague, The Netherlands: Kugler; 2006:1–20.  
14  
15
- 16 16. Sun X, Dai Y, Chen Y, et al. Primary angle closure glaucoma: What we know  
17  
18  
19 and what we don't know. *Prog Retin Eye Res.* 2017;57:26-45.  
20  
21
- 22 17. Rim TH, Kim MH, Kim WC, et al. Cataract subtype risk factors identified from  
23  
24  
25 the Korea National Health and Nutrition Examination survey 2008-2010. *BMC*  
26  
27  
28 *Ophthalmol.* 2014;14:4.  
29  
30
- 31 18. Park YH, Shin JA, Han K, et al. Gender difference in the association of metabolic  
32  
33  
34  
35 syndrome and its components with age-related cataract: the Korea National Health  
36  
37  
38 and Nutrition Examination Survey 2008-2010. *PLoS One.* 2014; 9:e85068.  
39  
40  
41
- 42 19. Lin SY, Lin CL, Ju SW, et al. Increasing risk of cataract in HCV patients receiving  
43  
44  
45 anti-HCV therapy: A nationwide cohort study. *PLoS One.* 2017;12:e0173125.  
46  
47  
48
- 49 20. Park S, Choi N-K Hepatitis virus infection and age-related cataract. *Sci Rep.* 2017;  
50  
51  
52 7: 13089.  
53  
54  
55
- 56 21. Neshet R, Mimouni MD, Khoury S, et al. Delayed diagnosis of subacute angle  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 closure glaucoma in patients presenting with headaches. *Acta Neurol Belg.*  
5  
6  
7 2014 ;114:269-72.  
8  
9

10  
11 22. Neshar R, Epstein E, Stern Y , et al. Headaches as the main presenting symptom  
12  
13  
14 of subacute angle closure glaucoma. *Headache.* 2005 ;45:172-6.  
15  
16

17  
18 23. Tripathi RC, Tripathi BJ, Haggerty C. Drug-induced glaucomas: mechanism and  
19  
20  
21 management. *Drug Saf.* 2003;26:749-67.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1. Demographic comparison between PACG cases and controls**

	PACG Cases		Controls		p-value
	N= 3322		N= 13288		
	n	(%)	n	(%)	
Sex					0.999
female	2031	61.1	8124	61.1	
male	5164	38.9	1291	38.9	
Age group (years)					0.999
20-49	398	12.0	1592	12.0	
50-64	1011	30.4	4044	30.4	
≥65	1913	57.6	7652	57.6	
Age (year), mean (SD) †	65.2(12.7)		64.8(13.0)		0.100
Comorbidity					
Hypertension	2025	60.6	6896	51.9	<0.001
Ischemic heart disease	1097	33.0	3561	26.8	<0.001
Hyperlipidemia	1389	41.8	4399	33.1	<0.001
Congestive heart failure	213	6.41	849	6.39	0.962
Cardiac arrhythmias	540	16.3	1826	13.7	<0.001
Peripheral vascular disorders	201	6.05	571	4.30	<0.001
Stroke	246	7.41	994	7.48	0.883
Headaches	1407	42.4	4772	35.9	<0.001
Migraine	125	3.76	456	3.43	0.353
Epilepsy	30	0.90	144	1.08	0.360
Dementia	110	3.31	448	3.37	0.863
Rheumatoid arthritis	11	0.33	45	0.34	0.957
Systemic lupus erythematosus	3	0.09	8	0.06	0.546
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	675	20.3	2343	17.6	<0.001
Asthma	418	12.6	1455	11.0	0.008
Pulmonary circulation disorders	26	0.78	85	0.64	0.366
Diabetes	710	21.4	2148	16.2	<0.001
Hypothyroidism	36	1.08	110	0.83	0.158
Renal failure	448	13.5	1435	10.8	<0.001
Liver diseases	898	27.0	2775	20.9	<0.001
Peptic ulcers	1409	42.4	4503	33.9	<0.001
Hepatitis B	182	5.48	610	4.59	0.032
Tuberculosis	86	2.59	294	2.21	0.194
Deficiency anemia	114	3.43	381	2.87	0.087



1						
2						
3						
4	Depression	328	9.87	922	6.94	<0.001
5	Psychosis	153	4.61	518	3.90	0.064
6	Metastatic cancer	1	0.03	2	0.02	0.564
7						
8	Solid tumor	190	5.72	630	4.74	0.020
9	Cataract	2088	62.9	4077	30.7	<0.001
10						

11 Data are presented as the number of subjects in each group, with percentages given in  
12 parentheses.

13  
14 Chi-square test; † t-test

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only

**Table 2. Factors associated with risk of PACG**

Variable	Crude		Adjusted <sup>†</sup>	
	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)
Comorbidity				
Hypertension	1.45	(1.34, 1.56)***	0.97	(0.88, 1.07)
Ischemic heart disease	1.35	(1.24, 1.46)***	0.92	(0.83, 1.01)
Hyperlipidemia	1.45	(1.34, 1.57)***	1.11	(1.01, 1.21)*
Congestive heart failure	1.00	(0.86, 1.17)	-	-
Cardiac arrhythmias	1.22	(1.10, 1.35)***	0.91	(0.81, 1.02)
Peripheral vascular disorders	1.44	(1.22, 1.69)***	1.02	(0.86, 1.21)
Stroke	0.98	(0.86, 1.14)	-	-
Headaches	1.31	(1.21, 1.42)***	1.13	(1.04, 1.23)***
Migraine	1.10	(0.90, 1.35)	-	-
Epilepsy	0.83	(0.56, 1.24)	-	-
Dementia	0.98	(0.79, 1.21)	-	-
Rheumatoid arthritis	0.98	(0.51, 1.89)	-	-
Systemic lupus erythematosus	1.50	(0.40, 5.66)	-	-
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	1.19	(1.08, 1.31)***	0.88	(0.79, 1.00)
Asthma	1.17	(1.04, 1.32)***	0.98	(0.86, 1.11)
Pulmonary circulation disorders	1.23	(0.79, 1.90)	-	-
Diabetes	1.41	(1.28, 1.55)***	1.03	(0.93, 1.15)
Hypothyroidism	1.31	(0.90, 1.92)	-	-
Renal failure	1.29	(1.15, 1.44)***	0.93	(0.82, 1.05)
Liver diseases	1.40	(1.29, 1.53)***	1.14	(1.03, 1.25)*
Peptic ulcers	1.44	(1.33, 1.55)***	1.10	(1.01, 1.20)*
Hepatitis B	1.21	(1.02, 1.43)*	1.09	(0.91, 1.31)
Tuberculosis	1.18	(0.92, 1.50)	-	-
Deficiency anemia	1.20	(0.97, 1.49)	-	-
Depression	1.47	(1.29, 1.68)***	1.12	(0.98, 1.29)
Psychosis	1.19	(0.99, 1.43)	-	-
Metastatic cancer	2.01	(0.18, 22.1)	-	-
Solid tumor	1.22	(1.03, 1.44)*	1.01	(0.85, 1.20)
Cataract	3.82	(3.53, 4.14)***	3.80	(3.49, 4.14)***

Abbreviations: odds ratio (OR); confidence interval (CI)

<sup>†</sup>Covariables which were significantly associated with risk of PACG in univariable unconditional logistic regression model were further analyzed by multivariable unconditional logistic regression model.

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.001

**Table 3. Factors affecting the risk of PACG according to sex**

Variable	Male				Female			
	Crude		Adjusted †		Crude		Adjusted †	
	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)
Comorbidity								
Hypertension	1.60	(1.41, 1.81)***	1.01	(0.87, 1.18)	1.36	(1.23, 1.50)***	0.94	(0.83, 1.06)
Ischemic heart disease	1.43	(1.25, 1.63)***	0.92	(0.78, 1.08)	1.30	(1.17, 1.44)***	0.90	(0.79, 1.02)
Hyperlipidemia	1.54	(1.35, 1.75)***	1.12	(0.96, 1.30)	1.41	(1.28, 1.56)***	1.13	(1.00, 1.26)*
Congestive heart failure	1.15	(0.91, 1.46)	-	-	0.91	(0.74, 1.12)	-	-
Cardiac arrhythmias	1.24	(1.05, 1.48)***	0.86	(0.71, 1.05)	1.20	(1.06, 1.37)***	0.93	(0.80, 1.07)
Peripheral vascular disorders	1.52	(1.17, 1.98)***	0.97	(0.73, 1.29)	1.38	(1.12, 1.71)***	1.04	(0.84, 1.31)
Stroke	1.10	(0.89, 1.36)	-	-	0.90	(0.74, 1.10)	-	-
Headaches	1.35	(1.19, 1.55)***	1.15	(1.00, 1.33)	1.30	(1.18, 1.44)***	1.15	(1.04, 1.28)**
Migraine	1.09	(0.70, 1.70)	-	-	1.10	(0.88, 1.39)	-	-
Epilepsy	0.91	(0.50, 1.67)	-	-	0.78	(0.46, 1.31)	-	-
Dementia	1.04	(0.74, 1.45)	-	-	0.95	(0.72, 1.25)	-	-
Rheumatoid arthritis	2.01	(0.37, 11.0)	-	-	0.88	(0.43, 1.81)	-	-
Systemic lupus erythematosus	4.00	(0.25, 64.0)	-	-	1.15	(0.24, 5.52)	-	-
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	1.34	(1.17, 1.54)***	0.89	(0.75, 1.05)	1.07	(0.94, 1.23)	-	-
Asthma	1.30	(1.08, 1.56)***	0.99	(0.80, 1.23)	1.10	(0.95, 1.28)	-	-

Pulmonary circulation disorders	1.07	(0.49, 2.34)	-	-	1.31	(0.77, 2.24)	-	-
Diabetes	1.67	(1.44, 1.94)***	1.19	(1.00, 1.40)*	1.26	(1.11, 1.42)***	0.93	(0.81, 1.07)
Hypothyroidism	1.18	(0.43, 3.20)	-	-	1.34	(0.89, 2.01)	-	-
Renal failure	1.46	(1.23, 1.73)***	0.96	(0.80, 1.16)	1.17	(1.00, 1.36)*	0.87	(0.74, 1.03)
Liver diseases	1.57	(1.37, 1.80)***	1.29	(1.11, 1.50)**	1.30	(1.16, 1.46)***	1.05	(0.92, 1.19)
Peptic ulcers	1.40	(1.24, 1.59)***	1.01	(0.87, 1.16)	1.46	(1.32, 1.61)***	1.14	(1.02, 1.28)*
Hepatitis B	1.25	(0.97, 1.61)	-	-	1.17	(0.93, 1.47)	-	-
Tuberculosis	1.29	(0.95, 1.75)	-	-	1.02	(0.68, 1.52)	-	-
Deficiency anemia	1.48	(0.99, 2.20)	-	-	1.12	(0.87, 1.44)	-	-
Depression	1.67	(1.31, 2.13)***	1.20	(0.93, 1.57)	1.40	(1.20, 1.64)***	1.11	(0.94, 1.31)
Psychosis	1.13	(0.81, 1.59)	-	-	1.22	(0.98, 1.52)	-	-
Metastatic cancer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Solid tumor	1.23	(0.93, 1.61)	-	-	1.22	(0.98, 1.50)	-	-
Cataract	4.37	(3.84, 4.96)***	4.30	(3.74, 4.94)***	3.54	(3.20, 3.92)***	3.54	(3.18, 3.95)***

Abbreviations: odds ratio (OR); confidence interval (CI)

†Covariables which were significantly associated with risk of PACG in univariable unconditional logistic regression model were further analyzed by multivariable unconditional logistic regression model.

**Table 4. factors affecting the risk of PACG according to the age**

Variable	Age $\leq$ 64				Age $\geq$ 65			
	Crude		Adjusted <sup>†</sup>		Crude		Adjusted <sup>†</sup>	
	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)	OR	(95%CI)
Comorbidity								
Hypertension	1.77	(1.57, 2.00)***	1.15	(0.99, 1.34)	1.35	(1.20, 1.51)***	1.10	(0.97, 1.25)
Ischemic heart disease	1.79	(1.54, 2.08)***	1.00	(0.83, 1.21)	1.23	(0.11, 1.36)***	0.95	(0.84, 1.07)
Hyperlipidemia	1.81	(1.60, 2.06)***	1.20	(1.03, 1.40)*	1.28	(1.15, 1.41)***	1.04	(0.92, 1.16)
Congestive heart failure	1.75	(1.24, 2.48)***	0.96	(0.64, 1.44)	0.89	(0.74, 1.06)	-	-
Cardiac arrhythmias	1.49	(1.22, 1.83)***	1.01	(0.80, 1.28)	1.14	(1.01, 1.29)*	0.92	(0.80, 1.06)
Peripheral vascular disorders	1.65	(1.14, 2.40)***	0.84	(0.55, 1.28)	1.40	(1.16, 1.68)***	1.13	(0.93, 1.38)
Stroke	1.40	(0.99, 1.96)	-	-	0.92	(0.78, 1.08)	-	-
Headaches	1.48	(1.31, 1.67)***	1.14	(1.00, 1.30)	1.20	(1.09, 1.33)***	1.04	(0.93, 1.16)
Migraine	1.13	(0.83, 1.52)	-	-	1.08	(0.83, 1.42)	-	-
Epilepsy	1.17	(0.61, 2.24)	-	-	0.70	(0.42, 1.15)	-	-
Dementia	2.46	(1.16, 5.21)***	1.31	(0.57, 3.05)	0.92	(0.73, 1.15)	-	-
Rheumatoid arthritis	1.26	(0.50, 3.17)	-	-	0.77	(0.30, 2.00)	-	-
Systemic lupus erythematosus	2.01	(0.18, 22.1)	-	-	1.33	(0.27, 6.61)	-	-
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	1.60	(1.33, 1.93)***	1.08	(0.87, 1.34)	1.09	(0.97, 1.22)	-	-
Asthma	1.42	(1.15, 1.76)***	1.00	(0.78, 1.28)	1.08	(0.94, 1.25)	-	-

1									
2									
3									
4									
5	Pulmonary circulation disorders	1.72 (0.66, 4.48)	-	-	1.13 (0.69, 1.86)	-	-		
6	Diabetes	1.92 (1.63, 2.25)***	1.08 (0.89, 1.31)		1.21 (1.08, 1.37)**	0.96 (0.84, 1.09)			
7	Hypothyroidism	1.28 (0.71, 2.30)	-	-	1.34 (0.81, 2.19)	-	-		
8	Renal failure	1.82 (1.48, 2.24)***	1.08 (0.85, 1.37)		1.13 (0.99, 1.30)	-	-		
9	Liver diseases	1.64 (1.43, 1.87)***	1.12 (0.96, 1.31)		1.26 (1.13, 1.42)***	1.02 (0.90, 1.16)			
10	Peptic ulcers	1.70 (1.50, 1.92)***	1.21 (1.05, 1.40)**		1.32 (1.19, 1.45)***	1.06 (0.95, 1.19)			
11	Hepatitis B	1.06 (0.83, 1.35)	-	-	1.37 (1.08, 1.73)***	1.20 (0.93, 1.54)			
12	Tuberculosis	1.08 (0.64, 1.82)	-	-	1.21 (0.92, 1.59)	-	-		
13	Deficiency anemia	1.36 (0.95, 1.92)	-	-	1.13 (0.86, 1.47)	-	-		
14	Depression	1.78 (1.45, 2.20)***	1.18 (0.93, 1.50)		1.31 (1.10, 1.55)**	1.01 (0.85, 1.21)			
15	Psychosis	1.27 (0.95, 1.69)	-	-	1.14 (0.90, 1.45)	-	-		
16	Metastatic cancer	-	-	-	-	-	-		
17	Solid tumor	1.16 (0.83, 1.60)	-	-	1.25 (1.02, 1.51)*	1.15 (0.94, 1.41)			
18	Cataract	6.95 (6.00, 8.05)***	5.91 (5.07, 6.90)***		5.18 (4.56, 5.87)***	5.07 (4.46, 5.77)***			

Abbreviations: odds ratio (OR); confidence interval (CI)

†Covariables which were significantly associated with risk of PACG in univariable unconditional logistic regression model were further analyzed by multivariable unconditional logistic regression model.

## STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation	Reported on Page No.
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	2,3
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2,3
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6,7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6,7
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6,7
		(b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	6,7
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6,7
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	6,7
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	6
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	7,8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	6-8
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	6-8
		(d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods	6-8

1  
2 taking account of sampling strategy

---

3 (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses

8

4 Continued on next page

5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only



<b>Results</b>			<b>Reported on Page No.</b>
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	8
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	8
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	x
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	8
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	8
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	8
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	8,9
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	8,9
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	8,9
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	8,9
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	8,9
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	8,9
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	8,9
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	9,10
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	10-12
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	10-12
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	11-12
<b>Other information</b>			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	14

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

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