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Glaucoma is a lifelong eye disease. Treatment is usually effective to slow the progression of glaucoma. About 4000 people are registered with sight impairment each year because of glaucoma. Many healthy subjects are unnecessarily referred from the community to hospital eye services to rule out glaucoma.

New imaging tests that investigate the back of the eye can aid in the diagnosis of glaucoma and are safe and easy to perform. These technologies measure with high accuracy the tissues in the back of the eye that are typically thinned in glaucoma. This study was designed to evaluate the performance of four imaging tests at identifying, among patients referred to hospital, those who have glaucoma or are at risk and those who do not have any eye disease. We compared the imaging test results with an experienced eye doctor’s diagnosis. We also evaluated how well a possible care pathway would perform using imaging results combined with measurements of the eye pressure and vision, to identify whether or not the individual needed to see an eye doctor.

In total, 955 individuals were recruited. The best-performing test correctly diagnosed glaucoma in 87 out of every 100 patients tested. If imaging tests with an eye pressure test and a visual acuity test were used to screen out people without eye disease, there would be substantial savings to the health service, but not all patients with disease would be picked up. A relatively small proportion of patients with glaucoma and at risk of glaucoma would be missed (approximately one in seven).
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