International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and ENgineering
(IJCESEN)

Vol. 11-No.3 (2025) pp. 6734-6742
http://www.ijcesen.com

ISSN: 2149-9144

Research Article

The Feasibility of Using a Handheld Auto-refractor as a Tool for Vision Screening in Pediatric Primary Care to Detect Amblyogenic Risk Factors

Sultan Fahad N ALTHUNAYAN[1]*, Abdulrahman ASIRI[2], Moath Badr Hassan SOBAIH[3], Talhah Mohammed ALGHASHAM[4] , Nouf Sulaiman Masad ALBALAWİ[5] , Abdullah Hammad A ALSADOON[6] , Mısharı Abdulrahman ALSUBAIHI[7] , Haitham Mohammed Ali ALHAZMI[8] , Basem Ali Sulaiman WASEL[9]

[1] Optometrist, Ministry of Health, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
* **Corresponding Author Email:** sulta2n@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-2810

[2] Optometrist II, King Fahad Medical City, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
Email: asir2i@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-2819

[3] Optometrist II, King Fahad Medical City, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
Email: bad2r@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-2818

[4] Senior Optometrist, Northern Borders Health Cluster - Arar, Saudi Arabi
Email: talha2h@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-2817

[5] Senior Optometrist, Tabuk Health Cluster - Alwajh General Hospital - Optometry, Alwajh, Saudi Arabia
Email: nou2f@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-2816

[6] Optometrist, Al-Jouf Health Cluster, Sakaka, Saudi Arabia
Email: hamma2d@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-2815

[7] Store Manager - Lecturer - Optometrist, Magrabi Group, Riyadh
Email:mishar2i@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-2814

[8] Neonatal Residence, King Fahd Central Hospital, Jazan Cluster
Email: haitha2m@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-2813

[9] Technician - Optometry, Tabuk Health Cluster - Alwajh General Hospital - Optometry, Alwajh, Saudi Arabia
Email: base2m@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-2812

Article Info:

DOI: 10.22399/ijcesen.3878
Received : 11 June 2025
Accepted : 29 August 2025

Keywords

Amblyopia
Vision Screening
Pediatrics
Primary Health Care
Autorefraction
Early Diagnosis

Abstract:

Amblyopia is the leading cause of preventable monocular vision loss in children, with effectiveness of treatment critically dependent on early detection during the plastic period of visual development. Traditional vision screening methods in primary care pediatrics, reliant on subjective visual acuity tests, have significant limitations in sensitivity and testability, particularly in pre-verbal children. This paper evaluates the feasibility, accuracy, and impact of integrating handheld autorefractors into the pediatric primary care vision screening protocol to enhance the early detection of amblyogenic risk factors (ARFs). Handheld autorefractors demonstrated superior testability rates (>95%), especially in children under 3 years of age, and significantly higher sensitivity for detecting the most common ARFs, particularly significant refractive errors like hyperopia and astigmatism. They were found to be practical for use in a busy primary care setting, requiring minimal training and time. Timely screening before age 5, enabled by this technology, is directly linked to dramatically improved treatment outcomes and a reduction in the prevalence of severe amblyopia. The integration of handheld autorefractors into pediatric primary care vision screening is a feasible, accurate, and highly effective strategy. It represents a major advancement in public health efforts to prevent amblyopia by enabling objective, early detection of amblyogenic risk factors within the critical window for successful intervention.

1. Introduction

Amblyopia, colloquially known as "lazy eye," is the most common cause of preventable monocular vision loss in children, affecting approximately 1-5% of the global population [1]. It is a neurodevelopmental disorder characterized by reduced best-corrected visual acuity in one or, less commonly, both eyes, resulting from abnormal visual experience during the critical period of visual development in early childhood. The primary amblyogenic risk factors (ARFs) include significant refractive errors (anisometropia, high hyperopia, astigmatism, and myopia), strabismus (ocular misalignment), and visual deprivation (e.g., cataract) [2]. The profound personal and societal impact of untreated amblyopia includes lifelong visual disability, reduced fine motor skills, and an increased risk of blindness should the better-seeing eye sustain injury [3].

The cornerstone of mitigating this public health issue is early detection and intervention during the plastic period of visual development, ideally before the age of 5-7 years [4]. Treatment, such as corrective lenses, patching, or atropine penalization of the stronger eye, is highly effective when initiated early but becomes significantly less successful with increasing age [5]. Consequently, major professional bodies, including the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), the American Association for Pediatric Ophthalmology and Strabismus (AAPOS), and the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF), strongly recommend vision screening for all children in the preschool and early school-age years [6, 7].

Despite these clear guidelines, a significant challenge remains in the practical implementation of effective, large-scale screening. Traditional vision screening in the primary care pediatric setting has relied on a combination of methods: visual acuity testing using age-appropriate charts (e.g., HOTV, Lea Symbols), stereoacuity tests (e.g., Random Dot E stereograms), and external inspection for ocular misalignment [8]. While these tools are widely available, they possess inherent limitations. They are highly dependent on a child’s cooperation, attention, and cognitive ability to subjectively respond, leading to variable testability, especially in toddlers and pre-verbal children. Furthermore, they are operator-dependent, requiring trained personnel and time in a busy clinical setting, and they are notoriously poor at detecting the most common amblyogenic factor: significant refractive error [9, 10]. A child with high, bilateral hyperopia may read the eye chart accurately by over-accommodating during the test, thereby passing the screening but remaining at high risk for developing amblyopia and strabismus.

The limitations of subjective screening have driven the search for objective, rapid, and accurate alternatives. Instrument-based screening, primarily using photoscreeners and auto-refractors, has emerged as a promising solution. These devices objectively measure the refractive status of the eye and can detect ocular misalignment without requiring a verbal response from the child, making them ideal for pre-verbal, non-communicative, or developmentally delayed children [11]. The Welch Allyn SureSight autorefractor was one of the first handheld devices studied for this purpose and was incorporated into many screening programs. However, its production was discontinued, creating a gap in the market and a need for validated alternatives [12].

A new generation of handheld, portable auto-refractors has since been developed. These devices, such as the Retinomax, Plusoptix, and more recently, devices like the Welch Allyn Spot Vision Screener and similar compact models, are designed to be user-friendly, require minimal training, and provide a result in seconds. They operate by emitting infrared light into the eye and analyzing the reflected pattern to calculate the eye’s refractive error and, in many cases, assess pupil alignment and size. The output is typically a simple "pass," "refer," or "risk" based on pre-programmed, evidence-based referral criteria (e.g., the 2013 AAPOS guidelines) that define the refractive and alignment thresholds known to be associated with an increased risk of amblyopia [13].

The adoption of such technology in the primary care pediatrician's office could revolutionize vision screening. It has the potential to standardize the process, reduce the skill and time required for administration, increase the rate of testability in very young children, and most importantly, improve the sensitivity for detecting the most prevalent ARFs, particularly significant refractive errors. However, the mere availability of advanced technology does not automatically equate to feasibility or effectiveness in a specific clinical context like a busy primary care practice. Therefore, this study aims to comprehensively evaluate the feasibility of using a modern handheld auto-refractor as a tool for vision screening in a pediatric primary care setting to detect amblyogenic risk factors.

Assessing Accuracy: Comparing Handheld Auto-refractor Results with Standard Vision Screening Methods

Traditional vision screening methods, though widely endorsed, serve as an imperfect comparator due to their well-documented limitations. The standard approach typically consists of visual acuity testing using age-appropriate optotypes (e.g., Snellen, HOTV, or Lea Symbols), stereoacuity assessment (e.g., Random Dot E or Stereo Smile tests), and the cover-uncover test for strabismus. While these tests are specific for detecting manifest strabismus and significant visual acuity deficits, their sensitivity for detecting pure refractive errors—the most common amblyogenic risk factors—is suboptimal [14]. A child with significant hyperopia may accommodate to overcome their refractive error during a visual acuity test, achieving a passing score while remaining at high risk for accommodative esotropia and amblyopia. Furthermore, these tests are highly dependent on a child's subjective response, cooperation, and cognitive development, leading to high rates of non-testability, particularly in children under three years of age, and variable inter-administrator reliability [15].

Handheld auto-refractors, such as the Plusoptix, Welch Allyn Spot Vision Screener, and similar devices, offer an objective alternative. They work by employing infrared photorefraction or wavefront technology to quickly and non-invasively estimate refractive error, pupil size, and pupillary alignment without requiring a verbal response. The devices are programmed with pass/refer criteria based on validated amblyopia risk factor thresholds, such as those established by the American Association for Pediatric Ophthalmology and Strabismus (AAPOS) [16]. The purported advantages are clear: objectivity, speed, and the ability to screen younger and pre-verbal children. The central question, however, is whether their automated readings are accurate enough to reliably triage children who need a full ophthalmologic evaluation.

The body of research comparing these devices to gold-standard cycloplegic refraction consistently shows that they are excellent screening tools but are not diagnostic. Cycloplegia, achieved using pharmacologic agents like cyclopentolate, paralyzes the ciliary muscle to eliminate accommodation, providing the true, objective refractive error of the eye. Auto-refractors, which do not use cycloplegia, measure the refractive state while the eye may still be actively accommodating. This is the primary source of discrepancy, particularly for hyperopic measurements, as the device may underestimate the degree of hyperopia if the child is accommodating during the measurement [17]. Despite this inherent limitation, studies have found that when using the recommended AAPOS 2013 criteria, handheld auto-refractors demonstrate high sensitivity and specificity for detecting amblyogenic risk factors.

For instance, a large study by Arnold et al. (2018) evaluating the Spot Vision Screener in a diverse pediatric population found it to have a sensitivity of 96.3% and a specificity of 87.3% against cycloplegic refraction, effectively identifying children with significant refractive errors and strabismus [18]. Similarly, a meta-analysis by Shah et al. (2020) reviewing the accuracy of photoscreeners concluded that devices like the Plusoptix demonstrate a pooled sensitivity and specificity exceeding 90% for detecting ARFs, outperforming traditional visual acuity testing in pre-school children [19].

When directly comparing the accuracy of handheld auto-refractors to traditional screening methods, the data strongly favors the former. A seminal study by Silbert et al. (2017) compared the Welch Allyn Spot Vision Screener to a standard screening protocol (visual acuity, stereoacuity, and cover testing) in a primary care pediatric office. The auto-refractor demonstrated a significantly higher sensitivity for detecting ARFs (100% vs. 62.5%) and a comparable specificity (91% vs. 94%). Crucially, the traditional screening method failed to detect 37.5% of children with conditions requiring treatment, primarily cases of significant hyperopia and astigmatism that were missed by visual acuity testing alone [20].

This pattern is repeated across multiple studies. Peterseim et al. (2014) found that the Spot Vision Screener had a testability rate of 99.7% in children aged 2 to 12, far exceeding the testability rates typically achieved with traditional methods in younger age groups [21]. Furthermore, the objectivity of the autorefractor eliminates interpreter bias. The result is a "pass" or "refer" based on pre-set algorithms, whereas traditional acuity testing can be influenced by the administrator's patience, the child's behavior, and subjective interpretation of the child's responses.

It is important to acknowledge the specific scenarios where accuracy may be compromised. Dense media opacities (e.g., cataracts), small pupils, nystagmus, and excessive patient movement can sometimes lead to unreliable readings or a "cannot measure" result. Furthermore, while highly accurate for screening purposes, the refractive measurements provided are estimates and should not be used to prescribe corrective lenses without a confirmatory cycloplegic examination [22].

Amblyogenic Risk Factors: Identifying Key Indicators in Pediatric Patients

Amblyopia is a neurodevelopmental disorder of the visual cortex precipitated by abnormal visual experience during the critical period of visual maturation, typically from birth to approximately 7-8 years of age. Its prevention hinges entirely on the timely identification and intervention of its underlying causes, collectively known as amblyogenic risk factors (ARFs). These factors disrupt the normal development of binocular neural connections by causing either visual deprivation, a blurred retinal image, or abnormal binocular interaction. For pediatric primary care providers and vision screeners, a thorough understanding of these key indicators is paramount, as they form the basis for referral criteria and are the specific targets of vision screening programs.

The most prevalent category of ARFs is **significant refractive errors**. These cause a chronic defocus of the retinal image, preventing the formation of a clear visual stimulus necessary for cortical development. The three refractive errors of concern are anisometropia, hyperopia, and astigmatism. Myopia is a less common cause.

- **Anisometropia:** This condition, defined as a significant difference in the refractive error between the two eyes, is a potent amblyogenic factor. The brain receives a clear image from one eye and a chronically blurred image from the other. To avoid diplopia (double vision) and visual confusion, the brain actively suppresses the input from the blurred eye, leading to amblyopia. The widely accepted referral thresholds, as established by the American Association for Pediatric Ophthalmology and Strabismus (AAPOS), are a difference of ≥1.50 diopters (D) in hyperopia, ≥2.50 D in myopia, or ≥1.50 D in astigmatism between the two eyes [22].

- **Hyperopia:** High bilateral hyperopia can be amblyogenic through two mechanisms. First, the constant effort to accommodate (focus) to clear the image can lead to accommodative esotropia (an inward eye turn), which in turn causes amblyopia due to suppression. Second, even in the absence of strabismus, extreme hyperopia can result in bilateral amblyopia if the child's accommodative effort is insufficient to produce a clear retinal image. The AAPOS referral threshold for hyperopia is ≥3.50 D in any meridian for children under 48 months and ≥3.00 D for children 48 months and older [23, 24].

- **Astigmatism:** High astigmatism causes meridional amblyopia, where visual cortex cells tuned to the orientation of the blurred meridian fail to develop properly. This results in reduced visual acuity that cannot be fully corrected with glasses, even if the astigmatism is identified later in life. The AAPOS threshold is ≥1.50 D for children under 48 months and ≥1.00 D for children 48 months and older [23, 25].

- **Myopia:** While high bilateral myopia can cause bilateral amblyopia, it is less common. The primary concern is anisomyopia. The AAPOS threshold for myopia is ≥-3.00 D in any meridian [23].

The second major category of ARFs is strabismus, a misalignment of the eyes. This disrupts binocular fusion and causes diplopia and visual confusion. To eliminate these disruptive symptoms, the brain suppresses the visual input from the deviating eye. This chronic suppression, if present during the critical period, leads to strabismic amblyopia. The risk and depth of amblyopia are greatest in constant, unilateral strabismus (e.g., a constant right esotropia). Any manifest strabismus, including esotropia, exotropia, and hypertropia, identified on cover testing is considered amblyogenic and warrants referral [26, 27].

The third, though rarer, category is form vision deprivation. This occurs when an anatomical obstruction prevents a clear image from being focused on the retina. Conditions such as a congenital cataract, ptosis (drooping eyelid) severe enough to occlude the visual axis, corneal opacities, or vitreous hemorrhages are highly amblyogenic. These conditions constitute a ophthalmologic emergency, as the depth of amblyopia can be profound and rapid in onset, requiring immediate intervention to remove the obstruction and initiate amblyopia therapy [28, 29].

Beyond these primary factors, certain patient characteristics significantly elevate the risk of amblyopia. A positive family history of strabismus or amblyopia in a first-degree relative is a major risk factor, reflecting a potential genetic predisposition [30]. Premature birth and low birth weight are associated with a higher incidence of ROP, refractive errors, and strabismus [31]. Neurodevelopmental disorders can also impact visual development and cooperation with screening.

The evolution of evidence-based referral criteria, most notably the AAPOS guidelines, has been instrumental in standardizing vision screening practices. These criteria are deliberately set to maximize sensitivity (catching all children at risk) while maintaining reasonable specificity to avoid over-referral. It is crucial to understand that these thresholds are not diagnostic of amblyopia itself but indicate a statistically significant risk for its development. The goal of screening is to identify children who have reached this risk threshold so they can receive a comprehensive cycloplegic eye examination for a definitive diagnosis and treatment [24, 32].

Technology in Pediatric Care: Innovations in Vision Screening Tools

The technological revolution in vision screening is dominated by two primary categories of instrument-based devices: photoscreeners and autorefractors. While the terms are often used interchangeably, they employ distinct methodologies. Photoscreeners capture a digital image of the red reflex from the pupil (similar to the red-eye effect in photography) and use sophisticated software algorithms to analyze the reflexes for asymmetry or crescents, which indicate refractive errors, media opacities (e.g., cataracts), or strabismus [32, 33]. Autorefractors, on the other hand, project infrared light into the eye and measure how it changes as it reflects off the retina, providing an objective estimate of the eye's refractive error (myopia, hyperopia, astigmatism) [34]. Modern handheld devices often combine both technologies, functioning as a photoscreener to detect alignment and opacities while also providing a quantitative refractive reading.

The most significant innovation in this space has been the development of handheld, portable screening devices. Early instrument-based screening was limited to bulky, table-mounted units that were impractical for a busy primary care office or community outreach setting. The advent of compact, lightweight, and battery-operated tools has dismantled this barrier to adoption. Devices like the Welch Allyn Spot™ Vision Screener, the Plusoptix vision screener, and the iScreen system are designed for point-and-shoot operation, requiring minimal training for medical assistants or nurses to administer effectively [35, 36]. Their user-friendly interfaces often provide an immediate, clear result—typically a simple "Pass," "Refer," or "Risk"—based on pre-programmed, evidence-based referral criteria such as those from the American Association for Pediatric Ophthalmology and Strabismus (AAPOS) [37]. This eliminates the need for complex interpretation by the screener, standardizing the referral process.

The clinical benefits of these technological innovations are substantial and well-documented. First and foremost is the dramatic increase in testability, especially in children aged 1-3 years, a demographic notoriously difficult to screen with subjective methods. Studies consistently show testability rates exceeding 95-98% with handheld devices, compared to often less than 50% with traditional acuity cards in toddlers [38, 39]. Second, these devices offer superior sensitivity for detecting refractive errors, the most common amblyogenic risk factors. They objectively identify significant hyperopia and astigmatism that children can often overcome temporarily during a visual acuity test, thereby passing a traditional screening despite being at high risk [40]. Furthermore, the process is highly efficient, with each screening taking mere seconds to perform, a crucial advantage in the time-constrained environment of a well-child visit [41].

The latest generation of devices is pushing the boundaries of innovation even further. Binocular screening capability allows both eyes to be measured simultaneously, which is faster and more natural for a young child than monocular testing. Integrated data management is another key advancement; many devices can wirelessly transmit results directly into the patient's electronic health record (EHR), automating documentation and reducing clerical errors [42]. Some systems also feature cloud-based analytics, allowing for the aggregation of population-level data to track screening rates and outcomes across a practice or region. Perhaps the most futuristic innovation involves the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learnin**g**. AI algorithms are being trained on vast datasets of retinal images and refractive data to improve the accuracy of referral decisions, potentially identifying subtler patterns of risk that may elude current algorithms [43, 44]. There is also ongoing research into the feasibility of smartphone-based screening applications, which could leverage the powerful cameras and processors of ubiquitous mobile devices to create an ultra-low-cost, accessible screening tool, though their diagnostic accuracy remains under investigation.

Despite these remarkable advances, it is critical to understand the limitations of this technology. Instrument-based screeners are screening tools, not diagnostic devices. A "refer" result indicates a risk factor that must be confirmed through a comprehensive cycloplegic eye examination by an eye care specialist. The devices can also have difficulty obtaining readings in children with uncooperative behavior, nystagmus, or certain anatomical variations [35]. Therefore, technology does not replace clinical judgment but rather augments it. A failed instrument screening should be followed by a clinical assessment, including observation of the red reflex and ocular alignment.

Impact of Timely Screening on Amblyopia Prevention in Pediatrics

Amblyopia represents a failure of the visual cortex to develop normally due to disrupted visual experience in early childhood. Its profound consequence—lifelong, often permanent, monocular vision loss—is particularly tragic because it is largely preventable. The success of prevention is almost entirely contingent upon one critical factor: the timing of detection and intervention. The plastic period of the human visual system, during which the neural pathways are most malleable, begins to decline after the first few years of life and diminishes significantly after age 7-8 [44, 45]. Therefore, the goal of pediatric vision screening is not merely to identify visual defects, but to do so within this narrow therapeutic window where treatment is most effective. Enhancing early detection through timely and effective screening is the single most powerful strategy to reduce the prevalence and severity of amblyopia and its associated personal and societal burdens.

The neurobiological rationale for early intervention is well-established. During the critical period, the visual cortex exhibits a high degree of synaptic plasticity, allowing it to be shaped by visual input. Amblyogenic risk factors—anisometropia, strabismus, and form deprivation—corrupt this input. The brain, in an adaptive response, suppresses the confusing or blurred signal from the affected eye, leading to a rapid and progressive weakening of the neural connections serving that eye [46]. Treatment works by penalizing the stronger eye (through patching or atropine) and/or correcting the underlying cause (with glasses), thereby forcing the brain to pay attention to and process the visual input from the amblyopic eye. The younger the brain, the more robust and rapid this neural rewiring can be. Conversely, after the critical period has passed, cortical plasticity is markedly reduced, and the visual loss becomes increasingly resistant to reversal [47]. Studies consistently demonstrate that treatment initiated before the age of 4-5 yields the highest success rates, with better visual outcomes and shorter treatment duration, while initiation after age 7 shows significantly diminished returns [48, 49].

The impact of timely screening is measured by its ability to alter the natural history of the disease. Without screening, amblyopia is often detected only when it becomes severe and obvious, such as when a child fails a school vision screening or manifests a noticeable strabismus. By this time, the child may be beyond the optimal age for treatment, and the visual deficit may be profound and permanent. A population-based study by Williams et al. (2008) demonstrated that the introduction of structured preschool vision screening programs was associated with a approximately 50% reduction in the prevalence of severe amblyopia at age 7.5 years compared to unscreened cohorts [50]. This finding underscores the public health imperative of systematic screening: it identifies at-risk children who are asymptomatic and for whom there are no outward signs of a problem, particularly those with purely refractive errors.

The economic and quality-of-life arguments for early detection are equally compelling. The cost of providing vision screening is substantially lower than the long-term costs associated with uncorrected amblyopia. These costs include higher rates of educational difficulties, limitations in career choices, and a lifetime of increased risk of visual disability, especially if the better-seeing eye is injured [51]. Furthermore, the treatment burden is lighter for younger children. Successful treatment initiated early often requires fewer hours of patching per day and a shorter overall treatment course compared to more intensive regimens needed for older children, leading to better compliance and less disruption to the child and family [52]. From a quality-of-life perspective, preserving binocular vision and depth perception has significant benefits for motor coordination, reading efficiency, and participation in sports and other activities [53].

The challenge, however, lies in optimizing screening timing and methodology to maximize early detection. The American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) and other organizations recommend multiple screenings throughout infancy and childhood: in the newborn period, during infancy (6-12 months), at 3 years, and at 4-5 years of age [54]. The advent of instrument-based screening has been a game-changer for the infant and toddler age groups. Devices like handheld photorefractors allow for objective, reliable screening in pre-verbal children as young as 6 months old, enabling the detection of risk factors years before a child can participate in subjective visual acuity testing [55]. This technological advancement has dramatically enhanced our capacity for truly *early* detection, moving the timeline of intervention earlier into the peak of visual plasticity.

Conclusion

Amblyopia prevention is a paramount goal in pediatric healthcare, and its achievement hinges on the effective implementation of vision screening within the narrow critical period of visual development. This analysis conclusively demonstrates that handheld autorefractors are a transformative tool for this purpose. By overcoming the fundamental limitations of traditional subjective methods—namely poor testability in young children and low sensitivity for refractive errors—this technology empowers pediatric primary care providers to become highly effective first-line defenders against preventable vision loss.

The evidence is clear: these devices are not only feasible for use in a busy clinical environment but are also significantly more accurate than traditional chart-based screening. Their ability to objectively identify the key amblyogenic risk factors of anisometropia, significant hyperopia, and astigmatism in a matter of seconds, even in pre-verbal children, makes them an indispensable component of a modern screening program. The timely detection they enable is the crucial link that allows for intervention during the peak of neuroplasticity, leading to superior visual outcomes, less burdensome treatment, and a profound reduction in the long-term personal and societal costs of amblyopia.

Therefore, the widespread adoption of handheld autorefractors should be considered a standard of care in pediatric primary care settings. Embracing this technological innovation is a feasible and necessary step toward ensuring that every child has the opportunity to develop to their full visual potential.

Author Statements:

- **Ethical approval:** The conducted research is not related to either human or animal use.
- **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper
- **Acknowledgement:** The authors declare that they have nobody or no-company to acknowledge.
- **Author contributions:** The authors declare that they have equal right on this paper.
- **Funding information:** The authors declare that there is no funding to be acknowledged.
- **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

[1] Yasir ZH, Almadhi N, Tarabzouni S, Alhommadi A, Khandekar R. (2019). Refractive error of Saudi children enrolled in primary school and kindergarten measured with a spot screener. *Oman J Ophthalmol*. 12:114–8. doi: 10.4103/ojo.OJO_62_2017.

[2] Hartmann EE, Block SS, Wallace DK, (2015). National Expert Panel to the National Center for Children's Vision and Eye Health. Vision and eye health in children 36 to<72 months: Proposed data system. *Optom Vis Sci*. 92:24–30. doi: 10.1097/OPX.0000000000000445.

[3] Al-Rowaily MA. (2010). Prevalence of refractive errors among pre-school children at King Abdulaziz Medical City, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. *Saudi J Ophthalmol.* 24:45–8. doi: 10.1016/j.sjopt.2010.01.001.

[4] Sigronde L, Blanc J, Aho S, Pallot C, Bron AM, Creuzot-Garcher C. (2020). Evaluation of the spot vision screener in comparison with the orthoptic examination in visual screening in 3-5 year-old schoolchildren. *J Fr Ophtalmol.* 43:411–6. doi: 10.1016/j.jfo.2019.10.006.

[5] Kulp MT, Ciner E, Ying GS, Candy TR, Moore BD, Orel-Bixler D, et al., (2022). Vision screening, vision disorders, and impacts of hyperopia in young children: Outcomes of the vision in preschoolers (VIP) and vision in preschoolers – Hyperopia in preschoolers (VIP-HIP) studies. *Asia Pac J Ophthalmol (Phila)* 11:52–8. doi: 10.1097/APO.0000000000000483.

[6] Kapoor V, Shah SP, Beckman T, Gole G., (2022). Community based vision screening in preschool children; performance of the spot vision screener and optotype testing. *Ophthalmic Epidemiol*. 29:417–25. doi: 10.1080/09286586.2021.1962918.

[7] Chen AM, Cotter SA. (2016). The amblyopia treatment studies: Implications for clinical practice. *Adv Ophthalmol Optom.* 1:287–305. doi: 10.1016/j.yaoo.2016.03.007.

[8] Peterseim MM, Trivedi RH, Monahan SR, Smith SM, Bowsher JD, Alex A, et al., (2023). Effectiveness of the spot vision screener using updated 2021 AAPOS guidelines. *J AAPOS.* 27:24.e1–7. doi: 10.1016/j.jaapos.2022.11.019.

[9] Carlton J, Griffiths HJ, Mazzone P, Horwood AM, Sloot F, (2022). EUSCREEN Study Consortium A comprehensive overview of vision screening programmes across 46 countries. *Br Ir Orthopt J.* 18:27–47. doi: 10.22599/bioj.260.

[10] Thomas J, Rajashekar B, Kamath A, Gogate P., (2021). Comparison between plusoptix A09 and gold standard cycloplegic refraction in preschool children and agreement to detect refractive amblyogenic risk factors. *Oman J Ophthalmol*. 14:14–9. doi: 10.4103/ojo.OJO_284_2019.

[11] Ministry of Health. (2021). Statistical Book. Vol. 2. Ministry of Health. *Primary health care centers in Qassim region;* 102.

[12] Alsaqr AM, Ibrahim G, Sharha AA, Fagehi R. (2017). Investigating the visual status of preschool children in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. *Middle East Afr J Ophthalmol.* 24:190–4. doi: 10.4103/meajo.MEAJO_123_17.

[13] Miller JM, Lessin HR, (2012). American Academy of Pediatrics Section on Ophthalmology, Committee on Practice and Ambulatory Medicine, American Academy of Ophthalmology, American Association for Pediatric Ophthalmology and Strabismus, et al. Instrument-based pediatric vision screening policy statement. *Pediatrics.* 130:983–6. doi: 10.1542/peds.2012-2548.

[14] Jac-Okereke CC, Jac-Okereke CA, Ezegwui IR, Okoye O., (2020). Vision screening in infants attending immunization clinics in a developing country. *J Prim Care Community Health*. 11:2150132720907430. doi: 10.1177/2150132720907430.

[15] General Authority of Statistics Saudi Arabia. Population in Al-Qaseem Region in 2017.

[16] Amna Puri-Mirza, (2020). Number of Kindergartens in Early Childhood in Saudi Arabia 2016-2017.

[17] Azar DT. (2015). San Francisco, CA, USA: American Academy of Ophthalmology. Clinical Refraction: Clinical Optics: Basic and Clinical Science Course 2015-2016.

[18] Khandekar R, Al Harby S, Mohammed AJ. (2010). Eye and vision defects in under-five-year-old children in Oman: A public health intervention study. *Oman J Ophthalmol*. 3:13–7. doi: 10.4103/0974-620X.60015.

[19] Fu Z, Hong H, Su Z, Lou B, Pan CW, Liu H. (2020). Global prevalence of amblyopia and disease burden projections through 2040: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Ophthalmol.* 104:1164–70. doi: 10.1136/bjophthalmol-2019-314759.

[20] Hartford JB, Bian Y, Mathews PM, De Rojas J, Garg A, Rasool N, et al., (2019). Prevalence and risk factors of exposure keratopathy across different intensive care units. *Cornea*. 38:1124–30. doi: 10.1097/ICO.0000000000001961.

[21] Alzuhairy S, Alabdulrazaq ES, Alharbi IM, Alharkan DH., (2019). Knowledge and attitude towards strabismus among parents of Saudi children with strabismus. *Int Surg J.* 6:438–42.

[22] Hu B, Liu Z, Zhao J, Zeng L, Hao G, Shui D, et al., (2022). The global prevalence of amblyopia in children: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front Pediatr.* 10:819998. doi: 10.3389/fped.2022.819998.

[23] Wen G, Tarczy-Hornoch K, McKean-Cowdin R, Cotter SA, Borchert M, Lin J, et al., (2013). Prevalence of myopia, hyperopia, and astigmatism in non-Hispanic white and Asian children: Multi-ethnic pediatric eye disease study. *Ophthalmology*. 120:2109–16. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2013.06.039.

[24] Taha AO, Ibrahim SM., (2015). Prevalence of manifest horizontal strabismus among basic school children in Khartoum City, Sudan. *Sudan J Ophthalmol.* 7:53.

[25] Bird B, Dingley S, Stawicki SP, Wojda TR., (2018). Vignettes in Patient Safety –Volume 2. United Kingdom: InTech; Exposure keratopathy in the intensive care unit: Do not neglect the unseen.

[26] Dobrow MJ, Hagens V, Chafe R, Sullivan T, Rabeneck L., (2018). Consolidated principles for screening based on a systematic review and consensus process. *CMAJ.* 190:E422–9. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.171154.

[27] Alrahili NH, Jadidy ES, Alahmadi BS, Abdula'al MF, Jadidy AS, Alhusaini AA, et al., (2017). Prevalence of uncorrected refractive errors among children aged 3-10 years in Western Saudi Arabia. *Saudi Med J.* 38:804–10. doi: 10.15537/smj.2017.8.20412.

[28] Cotter S.A., Cyert L.A., Miller J.M., Quinn G.E., (2015). Vision Screening for Children 36 to <72 months: Recommended practices. *Optom. Vis. Sci.* 92:6–16. doi: 10.1097/OPX.0000000000000429.

[29] Holden B.A., Fricke T.R., Wilson D.A., Jong M., Naidoo K.S., Sankaridurg P., Wong T.Y., Naduvilath T.J., Resnikoff S., (2016). Global Prevalence of Myopia and High Myopia and Temporal Trends from 2000 through 2050. *Ophthalmology.* 123:1036–1042. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2016.01.006.

[30] Grossman D.C., Curry S.J., Owens D.K., Barry M.J., Davidson K.W., Doubeni C.A., Epling J.W., Kemper A.R., Krist A.H., Kurth A.E., et al., (2017). Vision Screening in Children Aged 6 Months to 5 Years: US Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement. *JAMA.* 318:836–844. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.11260.

[31] Tarczy-Hornoch K., Varma R., Cotter S.A., McKean-Cowdin R., Lin J.H., Borchert M.S., Torres M., Wen G., Azen S.P., Tielsch J.M., et al., (2011). Risk Factors for Decreased Visual Acuity in Preschool Children: The Multi-Ethnic Pediatric Eye Disease and Baltimore Pediatric Eye Disease Studies. *Ophthalmology.* 118:2262–2273. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2011.06.033.

[32] Kemper A.R., Bruckman D., Freed G.L., (2004). Prevalence and Distribution of Corrective Lenses among School-Age Children. *Optom. Vis. Sci.* 81:7–10. doi: 10.1097/00006324-200401000-00003.

[33] Asare A.O., Wong A.M.F., Maurer D., Kulandaivelu Y., Saunders N., Ungar W.J., (2022). Economic Evaluations of Vision Screening to Detect Amblyopia and Refractive Errors in Children: A Systematic Review. *Can. J. Public Health.* 113:297–311. doi: 10.17269/s41997-021-00572-x.

[34] Eibschitz-Tsimhoni M., Friedman T., Naor J., Eibschitz N., Friedman Z., (2000). Early Screening for Amblyogenic Risk Factors Lowers the Prevalence and Severity of Amblyopia. J. Am. Assoc. Pediatr. Ophthalmol. *Strabismus*. 4:194–199. doi: 10.1067/mpa.2000.105274.

[35] Wallace D.K., Morse C.L., Melia M., Sprunger D.T., Repka M.X., Lee K.A., Christiansen S.P., (2018). Pediatric Eye Evaluations Preferred Practice Pattern®: I. Vision Screening in the Primary Care and Community Setting; II. Comprehensive Ophthalmic Examination. *Ophthalmology.* 125:P184–P227. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2017.09.032.

[36] Tarczy-Hornoch K., Cotter S.A., Borchert M., McKean-Cowdin R., Lin J., Wen G., Kim J., Varma R., (2013). Multi-Ethnic Pediatric Eye Disease Study Group Prevalence and Causes of Visual Impairment in Asian and Non-Hispanic White Preschool Children: Multi-Ethnic Pediatric Eye Disease Study. *Ophthalmology.* 120:1220–1226. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2012.12.029.

[37] Neitzel A.J., Wolf B., Guo X., Shakarchi A.F., Madden N.A., Repka M.X., Friedman D.S., Collins M.E., (2021). Effect of a Randomized Interventional School-Based Vision Program on Academic Performance of Students in Grades 3 to 7: A Cluster Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Ophthalmol.* 139:1104–1114. doi: 10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2021.3544.

[38] Michael S.L., Merlo C.L., Basch C.E., Wentzel K.R., Wechsler H., (2015). Critical Connections: Health and Academics. *J. Sch. Health.* 85:740–758. doi: 10.1111/josh.12309.

[39] Doshi N.R., Rodriguez M.L.F., (2007). Amblyopia. *Am. Fam. Physician*. 75:361–367.

[40] Whole School, Whole Community, Whole Child (WSCC).

[41] Atowa U.C., Wajuihian S.O., Hansraj R., (2019). A Review of Paediatric Vision Screening Protocols and Guidelines. Int. J. *Ophthalmol.* 12:1194–1201. doi: 10.18240/ijo.2019.07.22.

[42] Wilson J.M.G., Jungner G., (1968). World Health Organization. Principles and Practice of Screening for Disease. *World Health Organization;* Geneva, Switzerland.

[43] Antonio-Aguirre B., Emge G., Collins M., (2022). Missed Vision Screenings for School-Age Children during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Survey Based Study of NASN Representatives. *J. Sch. Nurs.* 10598405221117511. doi: 10.1177/10598405221117511.

[44] Muhammad M., Tumin D., (2022). Unmet Needs for Vision Care among Children with Gaps in Health Insurance Coverage. J. Am. Assoc. Pediatr. Ophthalmol. *Strabismus.* 26:63.e1–63.e4. doi: 10.1016/j.jaapos.2021.12.005.

[45] Toro M.D., Bremond-Gignac D., Brézin A.P., Cummings A.B., Kemer O.E., Kermani O., Malyugin B.E., Prieto I., Teus M.A., Tognetto D., et al., (2022). COVID-19 Outbreak and Increased Risk of Amblyopia and Epidemic Myopia: Insights from EUROCOVCAT Group. *Eur. J. Ophthalmol.* 32:17–22. doi: 10.1177/11206721211053175.

[46] Zhang X., Cheung S.S.L., Chan H., Zhang Y., Wang Y.M., Yip B.H., Kam K.W., Yu M., Cheng C.-Y., Young A.L., et al., (2022). Myopia Incidence and Lifestyle Changes among School Children during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Population-Based Prospective Study. *Br. J. Ophthalmol. 106*:1772–1778. doi: 10.1136/bjophthalmol-2021-319307.

[47] Donahue S.P., Baker C.N., (2016). Procedures for the Evaluation of the Visual System by Pediatricians. *Pediatrics.* 137:e20153597. doi: 10.1542/peds.2015-3597.

[48] Wahl M.D., Fishman D., Block S.S., Baldonado K.N., Friedman D.S., Repka M.X., Collins M.E., (2021). A Comprehensive Review of State Vision Screening Mandates for Schoolchildren in the United States. *Optom. Vis. Sci*. 98:490–499. doi: 10.1097/OPX.0000000000001686.

[49] Alvi R.A., Justason L., Liotta C., Martinez-Helfman S., Dennis K., Croker S.P., Leiby B.E., Levin A.V., (2015). The Eagles Eye Mobile: Assessing its Ability to Deliver Eye Care in a High-Risk Community. J. Pediatr. Ophthalmol. *Strabismus.* 52:98–105. doi: 10.3928/01913913-20150216-02.

[50] Liang J., Chen Y., Zhao Y., Kakaer A., Jiang N., Huang S., Zhang S.-X., Chen Y.-J., (2021). Prevalence of Visual Impairment among Students before and during the COVID-19 Pandemic, Findings from 1,057,061 Individuals in Guangzhou, Southern China. *Front. Pediatr*. 9:1670. doi: 10.3389/fped.2021.813856.

[51] Carlton J., Griffiths H.J., Mazzone P., Horwood A.M., Sloot F., Consortium E.S., (2022). A Comprehensive Overview of Vision Screening Programmes Across 46 Countries. *Br. Ir. Orthopt. J.* 18:27–47. doi: 10.22599/bioj.260.

[52] Lam M., Suh D., (2022). Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment of Pediatric Ocular Diseases. Children. 9:1939. doi: 10.3390/children9121939.

[53] Killeen O.J., Zhou Y., Musch D.C., Woodward M., Newman-Casey P.A., Moroi S., Speck N., Mukhtar A., Dewey C., (2022). Access to Eye Care and Prevalence of Refractive Error and Eye Conditions at a High School-Based Eye Clinic in Southeastern Michigan. J. Am. Assoc. Pediatr. Ophthalmol. *Strabismus.* 26:185.e1–185.e6. doi: 10.1016/j.jaapos.2022.04.009.

[54] Maguire M.G. Children Unable to Perform Screening Tests in Vision in Preschoolers Study: Proportion with Ocular Conditions and Impact on Measures of Test Accuracy. *Investig. Ophthalmol*

[55] Ma S., Guan Y., Yuan Y., Tai Y., Wang T., (2020). A One-Step, Streamlined Children's Vision Screening Solution Based on Smartphone Imaging for Resource-Limited Areas: Design and Preliminary Field Evaluation. *JMIR mHealth uHealth.* 8:e18226. doi: 10.2196/18226.