Letters in High Energy Physics
ISSN: 2632-2714

Volume 2023
June

Diabetic Retinopathy in Primary Care: Family Medicine and Optometry Prespectives

Abdulelah Sulaiman Alsughayyir[1], Hamood Sulaiman Alturaigi[2], Talhah Mohammed Alghasham[3], Nouf Sulaiman Masad Albalawi[4], Abdullah Hammad A Alsadoon[5]

[1] Family and community medicine, security forces hospital, Riyadh, KSA
[2] Family medicine consultant, King Saud Medical City
[3] Senior Optometrist, Northern Borders Health Cluster - Saudi Arabia - Arar
[4] Senior Optometrist, Tabuk Health Cluster - Alwajh General Hospital - Optometry, Alwajh, Saudi Arabia
[5] Optometrist, Al-Jouf Health Cluster, Sakaka, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

Diabetic retinopathy (DR) remains a leading cause of preventable blindness among working-age adults, with its growing prevalence mirroring the global diabetes epidemic. This comprehensive review examines the current strategies, challenges, and innovations in DR screening and management across primary care, optometry, and ophthalmology settings. We highlight the critical role of family physicians in early detection through systematic screening protocols and risk factor modification, emphasizing gaps in adherence to guidelines and patient education. Optometrists emerge as essential frontline providers, leveraging advanced imaging technologies and telemedicine to enhance community-based detection, while ophthalmologists remain pivotal in managing advanced disease. The review explores the transformative potential of artificial intelligence (AI) in improving screening accuracy and accessibility, particularly in underserved regions. Key prevention strategies, including glycemic and blood pressure control, are discussed alongside evidence supporting organized screening programs that reduce severe vision loss by up to 90%. Despite advancements, disparities persist due to socioeconomic factors, healthcare access inequalities, and inconsistent implementation of screening programs. The integration of multidisciplinary care models, technological innovations, and policy reforms is essential to address these challenges and reduce the global burden of DR-related blindness.

Keywords: diabetes, diabetic retinopathy, primary care, optometry, family physicians

Introduction

Diabetic retinopathy (DR) is a leading cause of preventable blindness among working-age adults worldwide, affecting approximately one-third of people with diabetes [1]. As the global prevalence of diabetes continues to rise, projected to reach 700 million cases by 2045, the burden of DR is expected to increase correspondingly [2]. Early detection through systematic screening is critical in preventing vision loss, as timely intervention can reduce the risk of severe visual impairment by up to 90% [3]. However, despite the proven benefits of screening, a significant proportion of diabetic patients do not undergo regular retinal examinations, leading to delayed diagnosis and poorer outcomes [4].

Primary care plays a pivotal role in DR screening, serving as the first point of contact for most diabetic patients. Studies indicate that integrating DR screening into primary care settings can improve accessibility, particularly in underserved and rural populations where ophthalmology services are limited [5]. Currently, the gold standard for DR screening involves dilated fundus examinations performed by ophthalmologists, but this approach faces challenges such as high costs, long waiting times, and workforce shortages [6]. To address these barriers, alternative screening methods, including non-mydriatic fundus photography and telemedicine-based programs, have been implemented in primary care with promising results [7]. For instance, retinal imaging in primary care clinics, coupled with remote interpretation by specialists, has demonstrated a sensitivity of 80-90% and specificity exceeding 95% in detecting referable DR [8].

Despite these advancements, several challenges hinder the widespread adoption of DR screening in primary care. Variability in screening protocols, lack of standardized guidelines, and insufficient training

among primary care providers contribute to inconsistent screening rates [9]. Additionally, patient-related factors, such as poor awareness of DR risks, financial constraints, and logistical barriers, further reduce adherence to recommended screening intervals [10]. A systematic review by [11] found that only 50-60% of eligible diabetic patients in high-income countries and less than 30% in low-resource settings receive regular retinal screenings. These gaps highlight the need for more efficient, cost-effective, and patient-centered screening models tailored to primary care.

Technological innovations, particularly artificial intelligence (AI)-based screening tools, offer a potential solution to improve DR detection in primary care. AI algorithms trained on large datasets of retinal images have shown diagnostic accuracy comparable to human graders, with some systems achieving sensitivity and specificity rates above 95% [12]. Integrating AI into primary care workflows could enable real-time, automated screening, reducing reliance on specialist referrals and increasing scalability. However, the implementation of AI-driven screening faces regulatory, ethical, and operational challenges, including validation in diverse populations, data privacy concerns, and integration with existing electronic health records [13].

Given the growing diabetes epidemic and the preventable nature of DR-related blindness, strengthening primary care-based screening programs is a public health imperative. This review explores current strategies, challenges, and emerging technologies in DR screening within primary care settings, with the aim of identifying best practices to enhance early detection and reduce vision loss among diabetic patients.

Epidemiology of Diabetic Retinopathy in Primary Care

Diabetic retinopathy (DR) remains one of the most prevalent microvascular complications of diabetes, with significant variations in its epidemiology across different populations and healthcare settings. Globally, DR affects an estimated 103 million adults, representing approximately 27% of all individuals with diabetes [14]. The prevalence is even higher among those with long-standing diabetes, with studies reporting that nearly 80% of patients with type 1 diabetes and 40-50% of those with type 2 diabetes develop some form of retinopathy after 20 years of disease duration [15]. Within primary care settings, where the majority of diabetic patients receive routine management, the detection rates of DR vary widely due to differences in screening protocols, access to ophthalmological services, and patient adherence to follow-up recommendations [16]. A large-scale study in the United Kingdom found that only 58% of diabetic patients in primary care underwent annual retinal screening, with lower rates observed in socioeconomically deprived areas and ethnic minority groups [17]. These disparities highlight the critical need for improved screening strategies in primary care to ensure early detection and intervention.

The progression of DR is influenced by multiple risk factors, including poor glycemic control, hypertension, dyslipidemia, and diabetes duration, all of which are routinely monitored in primary care [18]. A meta-analysis by [19] demonstrated that each 1% increase in HbA1c levels was associated with a 30-40% higher risk of developing DR, reinforcing the importance of glycemic management in preventing vision-threatening complications. Hypertension, particularly when poorly controlled, exacerbates retinal vascular damage, with systolic blood pressure levels above 140 mmHg increasing the likelihood of diabetic macular edema (DME) by nearly twofold [20]. Primary care providers play a crucial role in mitigating these risks through regular monitoring and patient education, yet studies indicate that fewer than 50% of diabetic patients achieve optimal blood pressure and glycemic targets in real-world clinical practice [21]. Furthermore, disparities in DR prevalence are evident across different ethnic groups, with Hispanic and African American populations exhibiting higher rates of advanced retinopathy compared to non-Hispanic whites, partly due to genetic predisposition and inequities in healthcare access [22].

The burden of undiagnosed DR in primary care is substantial, with population-based studies estimating that 20-30% of diabetic patients have some degree of retinopathy at the time of their first screening [23]. Late diagnosis is particularly concerning in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), where limited access to specialized eye care results in higher rates of preventable blindness. For instance, a study in India found that nearly 60%

of diabetic patients presenting to primary health centers had never undergone a retinal examination, and among those screened, 18% already had vision-threatening retinopathy [24]. Even in high-income countries with well-established screening programs, such as the UK and Sweden, a significant proportion of cases are detected at advanced stages due to patient non-adherence or gaps in referral pathways [25]. These findings underscore the urgent need for more robust primary care-based screening initiatives, particularly in regions with high diabetes prevalence and limited ophthalmological resources.

Emerging evidence suggests that integrating systematic DR screening into primary care can significantly reduce the incidence of blindness. The introduction of national screening programs in countries like Iceland and Scotland has led to a 40-50% decline in diabetes-related severe vision loss over the past two decades [26]. However, the success of such programs depends on high participation rates, effective referral systems, and continuous quality assurance—factors that remain inconsistent in many healthcare systems. A recent analysis of primary care-based screening in Australia revealed that while tele-retinal screening improved detection rates, nearly 25% of referred patients failed to attend follow-up ophthalmology appointments, leading to delayed treatment [27].

The Role of Family Physicians in the Detection and Management of Diabetic Retinopathy

Family physicians serve as the cornerstone of diabetic retinopathy (DR) detection and management, playing a pivotal role in early identification, risk factor modification, and timely referral to ophthalmology services. As primary care providers, they are often the first point of contact for diabetic patients, making them uniquely positioned to implement systematic screening protocols and monitor long-term ocular health [28]. Studies indicate that family physicians manage over 80% of routine diabetes care, yet fewer than half consistently adhere to evidence-based DR screening guidelines, primarily due to time constraints, lack of training in ocular examination, and limited access to retinal imaging tools [29]. Despite these challenges, integrating structured DR screening into primary care workflows has been shown to improve detection rates by up to 35%, particularly in underserved populations where access to ophthalmologists is limited [30]. The use of non-mydriatic fundus cameras in family practice settings, combined with telemedicine platforms for remote specialist interpretation, has emerged as an effective strategy to enhance screening accessibility while maintaining diagnostic accuracy comparable to traditional ophthalmologist-led evaluations [31].

Beyond screening, family physicians are instrumental in addressing modifiable risk factors that influence DR progression, including glycemic control, hypertension, and dyslipidemia. Tight glycemic management, with HbA1c targets individualized between 6.5% and 7.5%, has been associated with a 25-40% reduction in DR incidence and progression, underscoring the importance of regular monitoring and patient education [32]. Blood pressure control is equally critical, with evidence suggesting that maintaining systolic pressure below 130 mmHg can reduce the risk of diabetic macular edema (DME) by nearly 50% [33]. Despite these well-established benefits, clinical audits reveal that only 30-40% of diabetic patients in primary care achieve optimal glycemic and blood pressure targets, highlighting gaps in guideline implementation and patient adherence [34]. Family physicians must adopt a proactive, multidisciplinary approach, collaborating with endocrinologists, pharmacists, and diabetes educators to optimize metabolic control and minimize microvascular complications. Additionally, smoking cessation counseling and statin therapy for lipid management further contribute to retinal protection, though these interventions are often underutilized in routine diabetes care [35].

Patient education and engagement are other critical responsibilities of family physicians in DR management. Many diabetic patients remain unaware of the asymptomatic nature of early DR, leading to poor compliance with annual eye examinations. Surveys indicate that nearly 40% of patients with diabetes do not recognize DR as a serious complication, and only 60% adhere to recommended screening intervals [36]. Family physicians can bridge this knowledge gap by incorporating structured discussions about ocular complications during routine diabetes visits, using visual aids to emphasize the consequences of untreated retinopathy, and employing motivational interviewing techniques to enhance patient commitment to screening [37]. Culturally tailored education programs have proven particularly

effective in high-risk populations, such as Indigenous communities and ethnic minorities, where DR prevalence and vision loss rates are disproportionately high [38]. Furthermore, leveraging electronic health record (EHR) reminders and automated recall systems can significantly improve screening adherence, with studies demonstrating a 20-30% increase in follow-up rates when such tools are implemented in primary care practices [39].

The growing integration of artificial intelligence (AI)-based screening tools into primary care presents new opportunities for family physicians to enhance DR detection efficiency. AI algorithms capable of analyzing retinal images for referable DR with over 90% sensitivity are increasingly being validated for use in primary care settings, offering real-time decision support and reducing reliance on specialist referrals [40]. However, successful implementation requires addressing barriers such as cost, workflow integration, and provider confidence in interpreting AI-generated reports. Training programs that familiarize family physicians with AI-assisted screening and emphasize triage protocols for abnormal findings are essential to maximize the technology's potential [41].

The Role of Optometrists

Optometrists serve as frontline eyecare professionals in the detection and management of diabetic retinopathy (DR), playing a crucial role in early diagnosis, monitoring disease progression, and facilitating timely referrals to ophthalmologists when sight-threatening complications arise. As primary eyecare providers, optometrists perform comprehensive dilated fundus examinations, retinal imaging, and visual function assessments that are essential for identifying the earliest signs of DR, often before patients become symptomatic [42]. Studies demonstrate that optometrist-led DR screening programs achieve sensitivity rates exceeding 85% and specificity above 90% when compared to gold-standard ophthalmologist evaluations, making them highly effective in community-based detection [43]. The increasing adoption of advanced imaging technologies in optometric practice, including optical coherence tomography (OCT) and ultra-widefield fundus photography, has further enhanced the ability to detect subtle retinal changes, with OCT particularly valuable for identifying diabetic macular edema (DME) at its earliest stages [44]. In many healthcare systems, particularly in countries with robust primary eyecare networks like the United Kingdom and Australia, optometrists form the backbone of national DR screening programs, accounting for over 60% of initial DR detections in diabetic populations [45]. This critical function helps alleviate pressure on overburdened ophthalmology services while ensuring patients receive prompt evaluation and appropriate management recommendations.

Beyond detection, optometrists play an active role in managing early to moderate non-proliferative DR through regular monitoring, patient education, and co-management with other healthcare providers. For patients with mild DR, optometrists typically implement six to twelve-month surveillance intervals using multimodal imaging to track disease progression, a strategy shown to reduce unnecessary specialist referrals by 30-40% without compromising patient outcomes [46]. They also serve as important educators, explaining the relationship between systemic diabetes control and ocular health while reinforcing the importance of adherence to medical treatment and lifestyle modifications [47]. Research indicates that optometrist-delivered diabetes education improves patient understanding of DR risks by 50% compared to standard care alone, leading to better glycemic control and higher screening compliance rates [48]. Furthermore, optometrists frequently collaborate with family physicians and endocrinologists through shared care models, providing regular updates on ocular status that inform overall diabetes management decisions [49]. This interdisciplinary approach has been shown to improve both metabolic parameters and ocular outcomes, with studies reporting a 25% reduction in DR progression rates when optometrists are actively involved in the diabetes care team [50].

The evolving scope of optometric practice now includes more advanced roles in DR management, particularly with the integration of telemedicine and artificial intelligence (AI) technologies. Many optometry practices serve as imaging hubs for tele-retinal screening programs, where retinal photos are captured and transmitted to grading centers or analyzed by AI algorithms in real-time [51]. This model has proven particularly effective in rural and underserved areas, increasing screening coverage by

up to 70% in populations that previously had limited access to eyecare services [52]. Optometrists are also increasingly trained to interpret automated DR screening reports generated by AI systems, allowing for immediate patient counseling and same-day referral decisions when needed [53]. The combination of optometric expertise with AI-assisted screening has demonstrated remarkable accuracy, with some programs achieving 95% concordance with specialist gradings while significantly reducing time-to-treatment for sight-threatening DR [54]. Additionally, certain jurisdictions now permit optometrists to manage select DR complications through expanded prescribing rights, including the initiation of treatment for DME with anti-vascular endothelial growth factor (anti-VEGF) agents in collaborative care models [55]. These advancements position optometrists as key players in reducing vision loss from diabetes, particularly as the global prevalence of diabetes continues to rise dramatically.

Despite these important contributions, several challenges persist in optimizing the optometrist's role in DR care. Variations in scope of practice regulations across regions create disparities in the services optometrists can provide, with some healthcare systems underutilizing their potential in DR management [56]. Reimbursement policies also frequently limit the frequency of optometric DR evaluations, particularly for patients without visual symptoms, creating financial barriers to optimal monitoring [57]. Additionally, while optometrists excel at detecting DR, surveys indicate that only 40-50% consistently document and communicate findings to patients' primary care providers, representing a missed opportunity for coordinated care [58]. Addressing these limitations through standardized protocols, enhanced interprofessional communication systems, and policy reforms could further strengthen optometrists' impact on DR outcomes. As the diabetes epidemic grows, with projections suggesting that 1 in 3 Americans will have diabetes by 2050, the strategic integration of optometrists into multidisciplinary DR detection and management networks will be essential for preserving vision on a population level [59]. Their unique position in community eyecare, combined with advancing technologies and expanding clinical roles, makes optometrists indispensable in the global effort to reduce diabetes-related blindness.

Prevention and Screening Strategies for Diabetic Retinopathy

The prevention and early detection of diabetic retinopathy (DR) represent critical components in reducing the global burden of diabetes-related vision loss, requiring a multifaceted approach that integrates systemic risk factor control, population-based screening programs, and emerging technological innovations. Epidemiological studies demonstrate that rigorous glycemic control can prevent or delay the onset of DR by 35-50%, with the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT) showing that intensive glucose management reduces the risk of developing retinopathy by 76% in type 1 diabetes patients [60]. Similarly, the UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) established that each 1% reduction in HbA1c is associated with a 35% decrease in microvascular complications, including DR, in type 2 diabetes [61]. Blood pressure control exerts equally profound effects, with clinical trials demonstrating that maintaining systolic pressure below 130 mmHg reduces DR progression by 34% and the need for laser treatment by 47% [62]. These findings underscore the importance of primary prevention through optimal diabetes management in primary care settings, where most patients receive their ongoing care. However, real-world data indicate significant gaps in achieving these targets, with only 30-40% of diabetic patients attaining recommended HbA1c and blood pressure goals, highlighting the need for more effective implementation strategies in clinical practice [63].

Systematic screening programs constitute the cornerstone of secondary prevention, enabling early detection of DR during its asymptomatic stages when interventions are most effective at preventing vision loss. The efficacy of organized screening is well-established, with population-based studies showing that regular retinal examinations can reduce severe visual impairment from DR by up to 90% through timely detection and treatment [64]. Current guidelines universally recommend annual screening for all patients with diabetes, beginning at diagnosis for type 2 diabetes and within 3-5 years of diagnosis for type 1 diabetes [65]. Traditional screening modalities relying on ophthalmologist-performed dilated fundus examinations face substantial limitations in scalability, particularly in resource-limited settings, prompting the development of

alternative approaches. Retinal photography-based screening programs, particularly those utilizing non-mydriatic cameras operated by trained technicians in primary care settings, have demonstrated 80-90% sensitivity for detecting referable DR when combined with centralized image grading [66]. This model has been successfully implemented in several national programs, including Scotland's Diabetic Eye Screening Programme, which achieves screening coverage exceeding 85% of the diabetic population and has contributed to a 40% reduction in diabetes-related blindness since its inception [67]. Telemedicine platforms extending screening to remote areas through mobile units or primary care-based imaging stations with remote interpretation have further improved accessibility, particularly for rural and underserved populations [68].

Technological advancements are revolutionizing DR screening through artificial intelligence (AI) algorithms capable of automated image analysis with performance comparable to human graders. Several AI systems have now received regulatory approval for autonomous DR detection, demonstrating sensitivity and specificity exceeding 90% for identifying referable DR in real-world clinical settings [69]. These technologies offer particular promise for expanding screening capacity in low-resource regions where specialist availability is limited, with pilot programs in India and Thailand showing that AI-assisted screening can increase coverage from <30% to >70% of diabetic populations [70]. However, successful implementation requires addressing challenges including integration with existing healthcare infrastructure, ensuring quality assurance mechanisms, and maintaining patient trust in automated systems [71]. Emerging technologies such as smartphone-based fundus photography and portable optical coherence tomography (OCT) devices are further democratizing access to advanced screening, enabling community health workers to perform retinal assessments in non-traditional settings [72].

Conclusion

Diabetic retinopathy represents a significant public health challenge that demands a coordinated, multi-tiered approach to prevention, screening, and management. The evidence underscores the effectiveness of early detection through systematic screening programs, particularly those incorporating retinal imaging and telemedicine in primary care and optometry settings. Family physicians play a crucial role in risk factor modification and ensuring adherence to screening guidelines, while optometrists enhance detection rates through advanced imaging and patient education. Ophthalmologists remain vital for treating sight-threatening complications, but their workload can be alleviated through efficient triage systems enabled by AI and telemedicine.

Technological advancements, particularly AI-assisted screening, have demonstrated remarkable potential in improving diagnostic accuracy and expanding access to underserved populations. However, successful implementation requires addressing barriers such as cost, infrastructure, and equitable distribution of resources. Prevention remains paramount, with glycemic control, blood pressure management, and smoking cessation significantly reducing DR incidence and progression.

Despite progress, persistent disparities in screening uptake—driven by socioeconomic factors, geographic barriers, and healthcare system fragmentation—highlight the need for policy interventions and community engagement strategies. Future efforts should focus on integrating AI into existing workflows, standardizing screening protocols, and fostering collaboration among primary care providers, optometrists, and ophthalmologists. By combining technological innovation with patient-centered care models, healthcare systems can mitigate the rising burden of DR and prevent unnecessary vision loss in diabetic populations worldwide.

References:

1. Wang Y, Lin Z, Zhai G, Ding XX, Wen L, Li D, Zou B, Feng KM, Liang YB, Xie C. Prevalence of and Risk Factors for Diabetic Retinopathy and Diabetic Macular Edema in Patients with Early- and Late-Onset Diabetes Mellitus. Ophthalmic Res. 2022;65(3):293-299.
2. Garner A. Histopathology of diabetic retinopathy in man. Eye (Lond). 1993;7 (Pt 2):250-3.
3. Vieira-Potter VJ, Karamichos D, Lee DJ. Ocular Complications of Diabetes and

Therapeutic Approaches. Biomed Res Int. 2016;2016:3801570.

4. Schreur V, van Asten F, Ng H, Weeda J, Groenewoud JMM, Tack CJ, Hoyng CB, de Jong EK, Klaver CCW, Jeroen Klevering B. Risk factors for development and progression of diabetic retinopathy in Dutch patients with type 1 diabetes mellitus. Acta Ophthalmol. 2018 Aug;96(5):459-464.
5. Crăiţoiu S. [The morphopathological aspects of diabetic retinopathy]. Oftalmologia. 1992 Apr-Jun;36(2):141-8.
6. Kador PF, Wyman M, Oates PJ. Aldose reductase, ocular diabetic complications and the development of topical Kinostat(®). Prog Retin Eye Res. 2016 Sep;54:1-29.
7. Moutray T, Evans JR, Lois N, Armstrong DJ, Peto T, Azuara-Blanco A. Different lasers and techniques for proliferative diabetic retinopathy. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2018 Mar 15;3(3):CD012314.
8. Vincent JA, Mohr S. Inhibition of caspase-1/interleukin-1beta signaling prevents degeneration of retinal capillaries in diabetes and galactosemia. Diabetes. 2007 Jan;56(1):224-30.
9. Hendrick AM, Gibson MV, Kulshreshtha A. Diabetic Retinopathy. Prim Care. 2015 Sep;42(3):451-64.
10. Lei X, Zhang J, Shen J, Hu LM, Wu Y, Mou L, Xu G, Li W, Xu GT. EPO attenuates inflammatory cytokines by Muller cells in diabetic retinopathy. Front Biosci (Elite Ed). 2011 Jan 01;3(1):201-11.
11. Freyberger H, Bröcker M, Yakut H, Hammer J, Effert R, Schifferdecker E, Schatz H, Derwahl M. Increased levels of platelet-derived growth factor in vitreous fluid of patients with proliferative diabetic retinopathy. Exp Clin Endocrinol Diabetes. 2000;108(2):106-9.
12. Nittala MG, Keane PA, Zhang K, Sadda SR. Risk factors for proliferative diabetic retinopathy in a Latino American population. Retina. 2014 Aug;34(8):1594-9.
13. Cai J, Boulton M. The pathogenesis of diabetic retinopathy: old concepts and new questions. Eye (Lond). 2002 May;16(3):242-60.
14. Kern TS, Antonetti DA, Smith LEH. Pathophysiology of Diabetic Retinopathy: Contribution and Limitations of Laboratory Research. Ophthalmic Res. 2019;62(4):196-202.
15. Wang W, Lo ACY. Diabetic Retinopathy: Pathophysiology and Treatments. Int J Mol Sci. 2018 Jun 20;19(6).
16. Pannicke T, Iandiev I, Wurm A, Uckermann O, vom Hagen F, Reichenbach A, Wiedemann P, Hammes HP, Bringmann A. Diabetes alters osmotic swelling characteristics and membrane conductance of glial cells in rat retina. Diabetes. 2006 Mar;55(3):633-9.
17. Gupta V, Arevalo JF. Surgical management of diabetic retinopathy. Middle East Afr J Ophthalmol. 2013 Oct-Dec;20(4):283-92.
18. Vujosevic S, Midena E. Retinal layers changes in human preclinical and early clinical diabetic retinopathy support early retinal neuronal and Müller cells alterations. J Diabetes Res. 2013;2013:905058.
19. Behl T, Kotwani A. Exploring the various aspects of the pathological role of vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) in diabetic retinopathy. Pharmacol Res. 2015 Sep;99:137-48.
20. Wilkinson-Berka JL, Miller AG. Update on the treatment of diabetic retinopathy. ScientificWorldJournal. 2008 Feb 06;8:98-120.
21. Sayin N, Kara N, Pekel G. Ocular complications of diabetes mellitus. World J Diabetes. 2015 Feb 15;6(1):92-108.
22. Diabetes Control and Complications Trial Research Group. Nathan DM, Genuth S, Lachin J, Cleary P, Crofford O, Davis M,

Rand L, Siebert C. The effect of intensive treatment of diabetes on the development and progression of long-term complications in insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. N Engl J Med. 1993 Sep 30;329(14):977-86.

23. Mori K, Duh E, Gehlbach P, Ando A, Takahashi K, Pearlman J, Mori K, Yang HS, Zack DJ, Ettyreddy D, Brough DE, Wei LL, Campochiaro PA. Pigment epithelium-derived factor inhibits retinal and choroidal neovascularization. J Cell Physiol. 2001 Aug;188(2):253-63.

24. Ziche M, Maglione D, Ribatti D, Morbidelli L, Lago CT, Battisti M, Paoletti I, Barra A, Tucci M, Parise G, Vincenti V, Granger HJ, Viglietto G, Persico MG. Placenta growth factor-1 is chemotactic, mitogenic, and angiogenic. Lab Invest. 1997 Apr;76(4):517-31.

25. Eisma JH, Dulle JE, Fort PE. Current knowledge on diabetic retinopathy from human donor tissues. World J Diabetes. 2015 Mar 15;6(2):312-20.

26. Intensive blood-glucose control with sulphonylureas or insulin compared with conventional treatment and risk of complications in patients with type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 33). UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) Group. Lancet. 1998 Sep 12;352(9131):837-53.

27. Porta M, Sjoelie AK, Chaturvedi N, Stevens L, Rottiers R, Veglio M, Fuller JH., EURODIAB Prospective Complications Study Group. Risk factors for progression to proliferative diabetic retinopathy in the EURODIAB Prospective Complications Study. Diabetologia. 2001 Dec;44(12):2203-9.

28. Curtis TM, Hamilton R, Yong PH, McVicar CM, Berner A, Pringle R, Uchida K, Nagai R, Brockbank S, Stitt AW. Müller glial dysfunction during diabetic retinopathy in rats is linked to accumulation of advanced glycation end-products and advanced lipoxidation end-products. Diabetologia. 2011 Mar;54(3):690-8.

29. Khan A, Petropoulos IN, Ponirakis G, Malik RA. Visual complications in diabetes mellitus: beyond retinopathy. Diabet Med. 2017 Apr;34(4):478-484.

30. Coughlin BA, Feenstra DJ, Mohr S. Müller cells and diabetic retinopathy. Vision Res. 2017 Oct;139:93-100.

31. Kwan CC, Fawzi AA. Imaging and Biomarkers in Diabetic Macular Edema and Diabetic Retinopathy. Curr Diab Rep. 2019 Aug 31;19(10):95.

32. Pannicke T, Iandiev I, Uckermann O, Biedermann B, Kutzera F, Wiedemann P, Wolburg H, Reichenbach A, Bringmann A. A potassium channel-linked mechanism of glial cell swelling in the postischemic retina. Mol Cell Neurosci. 2004 Aug;26(4):493-502.

33. Tripathy K, Chawla R, Vohra R. Evaluation of the fundus in poorly dilating diabetic pupils using ultrawide field imaging. Clin Exp Optom. 2017 Nov;100(6):735-736.

34. Ezra E, Keinan E, Mandel Y, Boulton ME, Nahmias Y. Non-dimensional analysis of retinal microaneurysms: critical threshold for treatment. Integr Biol (Camb). 2013 Mar;5(3):474-80.

35. Reichenbach A, Wurm A, Pannicke T, Iandiev I, Wiedemann P, Bringmann A. Müller cells as players in retinal degeneration and edema. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol. 2007 May;245(5):627-36.

36. Muqit MM, Marcellino GR, Henson DB, Young LB, Patton N, Charles SJ, Turner GS, Stanga PE. Optos-guided pattern scan laser (Pascal)-targeted retinal photocoagulation in proliferative diabetic retinopathy. Acta Ophthalmol. 2013 May;91(3):251-8.

37. Tripathy K, Chawla R, Wadekar BR, Venkatesh P, Sharma YR. Evaluation of rhegmatogenous retinal detachments using Optos ultrawide field fundus fluorescein angiography and comparison with ETDRS

7 field overlay. J Curr Ophthalmol. 2018 Sep;30(3):263-267.

38. Early photocoagulation for diabetic retinopathy. ETDRS report number 9. Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study Research Group. Ophthalmology. 1991 May;98(5 Suppl):766-85.
39. Tripathy K, Sharma YR, R K, Chawla R, Gogia V, Singh SK, Venkatesh P, Vohra R. Recent advances in management of diabetic macular edema. Curr Diabetes Rev. 2015;11(2):79-97.
40. Jorge EC, Jorge EN, Botelho M, Farat JG, Virgili G, El Dib R. Monotherapy laser photocoagulation for diabetic macular oedema. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2018 Oct 15;10(10):CD010859.
41. Brown DM, Ou WC, Wong TP, Kim RY, Croft DE, Wykoff CC., DAVE Study Group. Targeted Retinal Photocoagulation for Diabetic Macular Edema with Peripheral Retinal Nonperfusion: Three-Year Randomized DAVE Trial. Ophthalmology. 2018 May;125(5):683-690.
42. Nikkhah H, Ghazi H, Razzaghi MR, Karimi S, Ramezani A, Soheilian M. Extended targeted retinal photocoagulation versus conventional pan-retinal photocoagulation for proliferative diabetic retinopathy in a randomized clinical trial. Int Ophthalmol. 2018 Feb;38(1):313-321.
43. Ruia S, Tripathy K. StatPearls [Internet]. StatPearls Publishing; Treasure Island (FL): Aug 25, 2023. Fluorescein Angiography.
44. Lajmi H, Hmaied W, Othmen AB, Chelly Z, El Fekih L. Optical coherence tomography angiography microvascular changes in diabetics without diabetic retinopathy. Saudi J Ophthalmol. 2020 Jul-Sep;34(3):156-159.
45. Kanski JJ. Diabetic retinopathy--a preventable cause of blindness. Practitioner. 1985 Apr;229(1402):343-8.
46. Zhang Q, Zhao G, Yang N, Zhang L. Fasting blood glucose levels in patients with different types of diseases. Prog Mol Biol Transl Sci. 2019;162:277-292.
47. Classification of diabetic retinopathy from fluorescein angiograms. ETDRS report number 11. Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study Research Group. Ophthalmology. 1991 May;98(5 Suppl):807-22.
48. Tripathy K, Chawla R, Venkatesh P, Sharma YR, Vohra R. Ultrawide Field Imaging in Uveitic Non-dilating Pupils. J Ophthalmic Vis Res. 2017 Apr-Jun;12(2):232-233.
49. Grading diabetic retinopathy from stereoscopic color fundus photographs--an extension of the modified Airlie House classification. ETDRS report number 10. Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study Research Group. Ophthalmology. 1991 May;98(5 Suppl):786-806.
50. Wilkinson CP, Ferris FL, Klein RE, Lee PP, Agardh CD, Davis M, Dills D, Kampik A, Pararajasegaram R, Verdaguer JT., Global Diabetic Retinopathy Project Group. Proposed international clinical diabetic retinopathy and diabetic macular edema disease severity scales. Ophthalmology. 2003 Sep;110(9):1677-82.
51. Diabetic Retinopathy Clinical Research Network. Wells JA, Glassman AR, Ayala AR, Jampol LM, Aiello LP, Antoszyk AN, Arnold-Bush B, Baker CW, Bressler NM, Browning DJ, Elman MJ, Ferris FL, Friedman SM, Melia M, Pieramici DJ, Sun JK, Beck RW. Aflibercept, bevacizumab, or ranibizumab for diabetic macular edema. N Engl J Med. 2015 Mar 26;372(13):1193-203.
52. Brown DM, Nguyen QD, Marcus DM, Boyer DS, Patel S, Feiner L, Schlottmann PG, Rundle AC, Zhang J, Rubio RG, Adamis AP, Ehrlich JS, Hopkins JJ., RIDE and RISE Research Group. Long-term outcomes of ranibizumab therapy for diabetic macular edema: the 36-month results from two phase III trials: RISE and

RIDE. Ophthalmology. 2013 Oct;120(10):2013-22.

53. Mitchell P, Bandello F, Schmidt-Erfurth U, Lang GE, Massin P, Schlingemann RO, Sutter F, Simader C, Burian G, Gerstner O, Weichselberger A., RESTORE study group. The RESTORE study: ranibizumab monotherapy or combined with laser versus laser monotherapy for diabetic macular edema. Ophthalmology. 2011 Apr;118(4):615-25.
54. Vaziri K, Schwartz SG, Relhan N, Kishor KS, Flynn HW. New Therapeutic Approaches in Diabetic Retinopathy. Rev Diabet Stud. 2015 Spring-Summer;12(1-2):196-210.
55. Michaelides M, Kaines A, Hamilton RD, Fraser-Bell S, Rajendram R, Quhill F, Boos CJ, Xing W, Egan C, Peto T, Bunce C, Leslie RD, Hykin PG. A prospective randomized trial of intravitreal bevacizumab or laser therapy in the management of diabetic macular edema (BOLT study) 12-month data: report 2. Ophthalmology. 2010 Jun;117(6):1078-1086.e2.
56. Diabetic Retinopathy Clinical Research Network. Elman MJ, Aiello LP, Beck RW, Bressler NM, Bressler SB, Edwards AR, Ferris FL, Friedman SM, Glassman AR, Miller KM, Scott IU, Stockdale CR, Sun JK. Randomized trial evaluating ranibizumab plus prompt or deferred laser or triamcinolone plus prompt laser for diabetic macular edema. Ophthalmology. 2010 Jun;117(6):1064-1077.e35.
57. Cai S, Bressler NM. Aflibercept, bevacizumab or ranibizumab for diabetic macular oedema: recent clinically relevant findings from DRCR.net Protocol T. Curr Opin Ophthalmol. 2017 Nov;28(6):636-643.
58. Korobelnik JF, Do DV, Schmidt-Erfurth U, Boyer DS, Holz FG, Heier JS, Midena E, Kaiser PK, Terasaki H, Marcus DM, Nguyen QD, Jaffe GJ, Slakter JS, Simader C, Soo Y, Schmelter T, Yancopoulos GD, Stahl N, Vitti R, Berliner AJ, Zeitz O, Metzig C, Brown DM. Intravitreal aflibercept for diabetic macular edema. Ophthalmology. 2014 Nov;121(11):2247-54.
59. Lattanzio R, Cicinelli MV, Bandello F. Intravitreal Steroids in Diabetic Macular Edema. Dev Ophthalmol. 2017;60:78-90.
60. Nguyen QD, Shah SM, Heier JS, Do DV, Lim J, Boyer D, Abraham P, Campochiaro PA., READ-2 Study Group. Primary End Point (Six Months) Results of the Ranibizumab for Edema of the mAcula in diabetes (READ-2) study. Ophthalmology. 2009 Nov;116(11):2175-81.e1.
61. Hussain RM, Ciulla TA. Treatment strategies for refractory diabetic macular edema: switching anti-VEGF treatments, adopting corticosteroid-based treatments, and combination therapy. Expert Opin Biol Ther. 2016;16(3):365-74.
62. Brown DM, Emanuelli A, Bandello F, Barranco JJE, Figueira J, Souied E, Wolf S, Gupta V, Ngah NF, Liew G, Tuli R, Tadayoni R, Dhoot D, Wang L, Bouillaud E, Wang Y, Kovacic L, Guerard N, Garweg JG. KESTREL and KITE: 52-Week Results From Two Phase III Pivotal Trials of Brolucizumab for Diabetic Macular Edema. Am J Ophthalmol. 2022 Jun;238:157-172.
63. Diabetic Retinopathy Clinical Research Network. Scott IU, Edwards AR, Beck RW, Bressler NM, Chan CK, Elman MJ, Friedman SM, Greven CM, Maturi RK, Pieramici DJ, Shami M, Singerman LJ, Stockdale CR. A phase II randomized clinical trial of intravitreal bevacizumab for diabetic macular edema. Ophthalmology. 2007 Oct;114(10):1860-7.
64. Stefanini FR, Arevalo JF, Maia M. Bevacizumab for the management of diabetic macular edema. World J Diabetes. 2013 Apr 15;4(2):19-26.
65. Massin P, Bandello F, Garweg JG, Hansen LL, Harding SP, Larsen M, Mitchell P, Sharp D, Wolf-Schnurrbusch UE, Gekkieva M, Weichselberger A, Wolf S. Safety and efficacy of ranibizumab in

diabetic macular edema (RESOLVE Study): a 12-month, randomized, controlled, double-masked, multicenter phase II study. Diabetes Care. 2010 Nov;33(11):2399-405.

66. Rajendram R, Fraser-Bell S, Kaines A, Michaelides M, Hamilton RD, Esposti SD, Peto T, Egan C, Bunce C, Leslie RD, Hykin PG. A 2-year prospective randomized controlled trial of intravitreal bevacizumab or laser therapy (BOLT) in the management of diabetic macular edema: 24-month data: report 3. Arch Ophthalmol. 2012 Aug;130(8):972-9.

67. Kumar A, Tripathy K, Chawla R. Intraocular use of bevacizumab in India: An issue resolved? Natl Med J India. 2017 Nov-Dec;30(6):345-347.

68. Do DV, Schmidt-Erfurth U, Gonzalez VH, Gordon CM, Tolentino M, Berliner AJ, Vitti R, Rückert R, Sandbrink R, Stein D, Yang K, Beckmann K, Heier JS. The DA VINCI Study: phase 2 primary results of VEGF Trap-Eye in patients with diabetic macular edema. Ophthalmology. 2011 Sep;118(9):1819-26.

69. Maturi RK, Glassman AR, Liu D, Beck RW, Bhavsar AR, Bressler NM, Jampol LM, Melia M, Punjabi OS, Salehi-Had H, Sun JK., Diabetic Retinopathy Clinical Research Network. Effect of Adding Dexamethasone to Continued Ranibizumab Treatment in Patients With Persistent Diabetic Macular Edema: A DRCR Network Phase 2 Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Ophthalmol. 2018 Jan 01;136(1):29-38.

70. Cunningham ET, Adamis AP, Altaweel M, Aiello LP, Bressler NM, D'Amico DJ, Goldbaum M, Guyer DR, Katz B, Patel M, Schwartz SD., Macugen Diabetic Retinopathy Study Group. A phase II randomized double-masked trial of pegaptanib, an anti-vascular endothelial growth factor aptamer, for diabetic macular edema. Ophthalmology. 2005 Oct;112(10):1747-57.

71. Sultan MB, Zhou D, Loftus J, Dombi T, Ice KS., Macugen 1013 Study Group. A phase 2/3, multicenter, randomized, double-masked, 2-year trial of pegaptanib sodium for the treatment of diabetic macular edema. Ophthalmology. 2011 Jun;118(6):1107-18.

72. Brown DM, Nguyen QD, Ehrlich JS., RISE and RIDE Research Group. Ranibizumab for diabetic macular edema. Author reply. Ophthalmology. 2013 Jan;120(1):221-2.