#### J Global Health 2019; 9: 010427

# Global epidemiology of retinal vein occlusion: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prevalence, incidence, and risk factors

Peige Song <sup>1</sup>, Yuehong Xu <sup>2</sup>, Mingming Zha <sup>2</sup>, Yan Zhang <sup>3</sup>, Igor Rudan <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Centre for Global Health Research, Usher Institute of Population Health Sciences and Informatics, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK

- <sup>2</sup> Medical school Southeast University, Nanjing, Jiangsu, China
- <sup>3</sup> Faculty of Life Science and Medicine, Kings College London, London, England, UK

#### **Supplementary contents**

**Table S1**. Search strategies in bibliographic databases

**Table S2**. Quality score scale for assessing the risk of bias

Table S3. Characteristics of the included studies (n=22)

**Table S4**. Quality scores for assessing the risk of bias in the included studies (n=22)

Table S5. Meta-analyses of studies on any RVO prevalence

Table S6. Meta-analyses of studies on any BRVO prevalence

Table S7. Meta-analyses of studies on any CRVO prevalence

Table S8. Meta-analyses of risk factors for any RVO

Database	Access date	Search terms
PubMed	06/06/2018	(retinal vein occlusion[Title/Abstract] OR retinal vein
		obstruction[Title/Abstract]) AND
		(prevalence[Title/Abstract] OR incidence[Title/Abstract] OR
		epidemiology[Title/Abstract])
Medline	06/06/2018	1 retinal vein occlusion.mp. or exp Retinal Vein
		Occlusion/
		2 retinal vein obstruction.mp.
		3 exp PREVALENCE/ or prevalence.mp.
		4 incidence.mp. or exp INCIDENCE/
		5 exp EPIDEMIOLOGY/ or epidemiology.mp.
		6 1 or 2
		/ 3 0r 4 0r 5
		8 6 and 7
Employee	06/06/2010	9 limit 8 to numans
Embase	06/06/2018	retinal vein occlusion.mp. or exp retina vein
		2 ratingly win obstruction mn
		2 retinal veni obstruction.mp. 3 prevalence mp. or evp. prevalence /
		4 evn incidence / or incidence mn
		5 exp enidemiology / or enidemiology mp
		6 1 or 2
		7 3  or  4  or  5
		8 6 and 7
		9 limit 8 to (human and embase and (article or article in
		press or reports or short survey))
GLOBAL	06/06/2018	1 exp retinal vein occlusion/ or retinal vein
HEALTH		occlusion.mp.
		2 retinal vein obstruction.mp.
		3 (disease incidence or epidemiology or disease
		prevalence).sh.
		4 1 or 2
		5 3 and 4
Global	06/06/2018	tw:((retinal vein occlusion OR retinal vein obstruction) AND
Health		(prevalence OR incidence OR epidemiology))
Library		Index
		LILAUS (Americas) (remover)
		WPRIM (Western Pacific) (remover)
		IMISEAR (South-EastAsia) (remover)
		AIM (Africa) (romovor)
		Limite
		Adolescent (remover)
		Child (remover)
CNKI	06/06/2018	(SII%'初网腊静脉栓塞'+'初网腊静脉阳塞'+'初网腊静脉闭塞
GIVIN	00/00/2010	(J) AND (CH 0/ '台店家', '生生', '宝子', '玉子', '宝子', '玉子', '玉-', '玉-', '玉-', '玉-', '玉-', '玉-', '玉-', '玉-', '\', '
		J M M J J W M X M 平 + 及工半 + 志 M 平 + 惟 志 平 + 呪 志
		平 − − − − − − − − − − − − − − − − −
		In Medicine & Public Health category

**Table S1**. Search strategies in bibliographic databases

Bias type	Low risk (score=2)	Moderate risk (score=1)	High risk (score=0)
Selection (sample 1) population) 2) 3)	Sample from general 1) population, not a select group; Consecutive 2) unselected population; Rationale for case and 3) control selection explained. 4) 5)	Sample selected from large population but selection criteria not defined; Sample selection ambiguous but may be representative; Rationale for cases and controls not explained; Eligibility criteria not explained; Analysis to adjust for sampling strategy bias.	<ol> <li>Highly select population making it difficult to generalise finding;</li> <li>Sample selection ambiguous and sample unlikely to be representative.</li> </ol>
Selection (sample 1) size)	Sample size 1) calculation performed and adequate. 2)	Sample size calculation performed and reasons for not meeting sample size given; Sample size calculation not performed but all eligible persons studied.	1) Sample size estimation unclear or only sub-sample studied.
Selection 1) (participation rate)	High response rate 1) (>85%).	Moderate response rate (70–85%).	<ol> <li>Low response rate (&lt;70%);</li> <li>Response rate not reported.</li> </ol>
Performance bias 1) (outcome assessment)	Diagnosis using 1) consistent criteria and direct examination. 2)	Assessment from administrative database or register; Assessment from hospital record or interviewer.	<ol> <li>Assessment from non-validated data or generic estimate from the overall population.</li> </ol>
Performance bias 1) (analytical methods to control for bias)	Analysis appropriate 1) for the type of sample (subgroup analysis/regression etc.).	Analysis does not account for common adjustment.	1) Data confusing.

**Table S2**. Quality score scale for assessing the risk of bias

ID	Auth or	Year Publis hed	Country	Study setting	URBAN/ RURAL/ MIXED	Eth nici ty	Investi gation Date	Study Name	Study design	Sampling Strategy	Gradin g system	Outco me	MV analyses on risk factors	Sam ple size	Cas es	Age ran ge	Fema le prop ortio n	Age- specif ic estim ate	Sex- specif ic estim ate
P1[1]	Mitch ell P, et al.	1996	Australi a	2 postcod e areas in the Blue Mounta ins region	Urban	NS	Jan 1992- Jan 1994	The Blue Mountai ns Eye Study	Cross- section al	Random sampling	NS, graded by an ophthal mologis t	Prevale nce	Yes	365 4	59	49+	0.567 7	Yes	No
P2[2]	Klein R, et al.	2000	USA	Beaver Dam, Wiscon sin	Urban	99 %W hite	Sep 1987- May 1988	The Beaver Dam Eye Study	Cross- section al nested in a cohort study	Cluster sampling	The Wiscon sin Age- Related Maculo pathy grading scheme	Prevale nce	Yes	492 6	38	43- 84	0.558	Yes	Yes
P3[3]	Wong TY, et al.	2005	USA	ARIC: 4 United States commu nities; CHS: Forsyth County, North Carolin a and Washin gton County, Maryla nd (similar to the ARIC	Mixed	Mix ed (wh ite and blac k)	ARIC:19 93- 1995; CHS:19 97-1998	The Atheros clerosis Risk in Commu nities & Cardiov ascular Health Studies	Cross- section al	Cluster sampling	NS, graded at the Fundus Photogr aph Reading Center in Wiscon sin	Prevale nce	Yes	154 66	39	45+	0.563	Yes	No

**Table S3.** Characteristics of the included studies (n=22)

				Study) and Sacram ento County, Californ ia and Alleghe ny County, Pennsyl vania															
P4[4]	Liu W, et al.	2007	China	Beijing	Mixed	NS	June 2001- Oct 2001	The Beijing Eye Study	Cross- section al	Cluster sampling	NS, graded by ophthal mologis ts	Prevale nce	No	433 5	58	40+	0.562 63	Yes	Yes
P5[5]	Duan Y	2008	China	Handan	Rural	NS	Oct 2006- Oct2007	The Handan Eye Study	Cross- section al	Two- staged stratified random sampling	NS	Prevale nce	Yes	663 6	55	30+	0.535 112	Yes	Yes
P6[6]	Cheun g N, et al.	2008	USA	Six commu nities in the USA	Mixed	Mix ed (wh ite, blac k, His pani cs, Chi nes e)	Aug 2002- Jan2004	The Multiet hnic Study of Atheros clerosis (MESA)	Cross- section al nested in a cohort study	Random sampling	The Beaver Dam Eye Study	Prevale nce	Yes	614 7	65	45- 84	0.523 182	Yes	Yes
P7_a[ 7,8]	Roger s S, et al.	2010	Europe	7 centres spannin g north to south Europe	Mixed	Whi te	Dec 2000- July 2003	EUREYE Study	Cross- section al	Cluster sampling	NS, graded at the Fundus Photogr aph Reading	Prevale nce	No	475 3	39	64- 99	0.552	No	No

P7_b[ 7,9]	Roger s S, et al.	2010	USA	Pima and Santa Cruz	Mixed	His pani c	1997- 1999	Proyect o VER Study	Cross- section al	Random sampling of block groups	Center in Wiscon sin NS, graded at the Fundus	Prevale nce	No	290 9	58	40- 96	0.612	No	No
				countie s in Arizona							Photogr aph Reading Center in Wiscon sin								
P8[10 ]	Yasud a M, et al.	2010	Japan	Hisaya ma	Mixed	NS	1998	The Hisaya ma Study	Cohort	Random sampling (performe d a cross- sectional examinati on and follow-up survey of Hisayama n residents aged 40 years or older in 1998)	NS, graded by retinal speciali sts	Prevale nce	Yes	177 5	38	40+	0.612 394	Yes	Yes
P9[11 ]	Jonas JB, et al.	2013	India	Eight villages in Kalmes hwar Tehsil	Rural	NS	2006- 2009	The Central India Eye and Medical Study (CIEMS)	Cross- section al	Random sampling (age 30- 100)	The Age- Related Eye Disease Study	Prevale nce	Yes	454 4	35	30- 100	0.535	Yes	No
P10[1 2]	Wu PC, et al.	2014	China	Maqin	Rural	Chi nes e	Oct 2011	NS	Cross- section al	Cluster sampling	NS	Prevale nce	Yes	251 1	21	40+	Not menti on	Yes	No

P11[1 3]	Ponto KA, et al.	2015	German y	City of Mainz or the district of Mainz- Bingen	Mixed	NS	April 2007- April 2012	the Gutenbe rg Health Study	Cohort	Random sample is stratified 1:1 for sex and residence (urban vs. rural) and in equal strata across four age decades	NS, graded at the Moorfie lds Eye Hospita l Reading Center, London	Prevale nce	Yes	129 54	59	35- 74	0.498 379	Yes	Yes
P12[1 4]	Shin YU, et al.	2016	Korea	Korea	Mixed	NS	July 2008 - Dec 2012	KNHAN ES	Cross- section al	Stratified, multistage , clustered probabilit y sampling	NS, graded by retinal speciali sts	Prevale nce	Yes	257 65	205	19+	about 0.505	No	Yes
P13[1 5]	Koh V, et al.	2016	Singapo re	South- western part of Singapo re	Mixed	Chi nes e, Indi an and Mal ay	2004- 2011	The Singapo re Epidemi ology of Eye Disease Study: SEED ONLY SCES	Cross- section al	Randomly selected based on an age- stratified random sampling strategy	The Blue Mounta ins Eye Study	Prevale nce	Yes	Chin ese: 331 2; Indi an:3 337; Mal ay:3 265	Chi nes e:23 ; Indi an:2 6; Mal ay:2 2	40- 84	Chine se:0.5 04; India n:0.49 8; Malay :0.52	Yes	No
P14[1 6]	Duan X	2017	China	Qingya ng	Mixed	Chi nes e	Jan 2014- Jan 2016	NS	Cross- section al	Two- staged stratified random sampling	NS	Prevale nce	No	793 0	120	25+	0.379 95	Yes	Yes
P15[1 7]	Thapa R, et al.	2017	Nepal	Bhakta pur district	Mixed	NS	Aug 2013 - Dec 2015	the Bhaktap ur retina study	Cross- section al	Cluster sampling	NS, graded by retinal speciali sts	Prevale nce	No	186 0	55	60- 95	0.558 6	Yes	Yes

P16[1 8]	Keel S, et al.	2018	Australi a	30 sites across five Australi an States and one Territor y, stratifie d by remote ness.	Mixed	Whi te (no n- Indi gen ous)	March 2015 and April 2016.	The Nationa l Eye Health Survey (2015– 2016)	Cross- section al	Multi- stage, random- cluster sampling	NS, graded at the Centre for Eye Researc h Australi a	Prevale nce	Yes	non - Indi gen ous Aust ralia ns: 301 0; Indi gen ous Aust ralia s: 168 2	non - Indi gen ous Aust ralia ns: 27; Indi gen ous Aust ralia ns: 14	non - Indi gen ous Aust ralia ns: 50+; Indi gen ous Aust ralia ns: 40+	non- Indige nous Austr alians : 0.589; Indige nous Austr alians : 0.537	Yes	Yes
I1[2]	Klein R, et al.	2000	USA	Beaver Dam, Wiscon sin	Urban	99 %W hite	Mar 1993- June 1995	The Beaver Dam Eye Study	Cross- section al nested in a cohort study	Cluster sampling	The Wiscon sin Age- Related Maculo pathy grading scheme	5-year cumulat ive inciden ce	Yes	359 3	28	48- 89	Not menti on	Yes	Yes
I2[19]	Cugati S, et al.	2006	Australi a	West of Sydney	Urban	Larg ely whit e	1997- 1999	The Blue Mountai ns Eye Study	Cohort	Cluster sampling	NS, graded by retinal speciali sts	5-year cumulat ive Inciden ce and 10-year cumulat ive Inciden ce	Yes	234 6	23 in 5 year s and 33 in 10 year s	49+	0.594	Yes	No
I3[20]	Klein BE, et al.	2006	USA	Beaver Dam, Wiscon sin	Urban	99 %W hite	Mar 1998- June 2000	The Beaver Dam Eye Study	Cohort	Cluster sampling	The Wiscon sin Age- Related Maculo pathy	5-year cumulat ive Inciden ce and 10-year	No	359 4	31 in 5 year s and 58	43- 84	0.563	No	No

											grading scheme	cumulat ive Inciden			in 10 year				
I4[21]	Araka wa S, et al.	2007	Japan	Hisaya ma	Urban	NS	1998	The Hisaya ma Study	Cohort	Cluster sampling	The Wiscon sin Age- Related Maculo pathy grading scheme	9-year cumulat ive Inciden ce	Yes	136 9	41	49+	0.628 926	Yes	Yes
15[22]	Klein R, et al.	2008	USA	Beaver Dam, Wiscon sin	Urban	99 %W hite	Mar 2003- April 2005	The Beaver Dam Eye Study	Cross- section al nested in a cohort study	Cluster sampling	The Wiscon sin Age- Related Maculo pathy grading scheme	15-year cumulat ive Inciden ce	Yes	368 4	83	58- 99	0.569	No	No
I6[23]	Zhou J, et al.	2013	China	Beijing	Mixed	NS	2011	The Beijing Eye Study	Cohort	Cluster sampling	NS	10-year cumulat ive Inciden ce	Yes	269 5	49	45+	0.577	No	Yes

Note: NS, not specified; USA, United States of America; For studies reporting RVO incidence, sample size referred to sample at risk and cases referred to number of new cases.

		Voar	*		Qua	lity score		
ID	Author	Published	Sample population	Sample size	Partici pation	Outcome assessment	Analytical methods	Total scores
P1[1]	Mitchell P, et al.	1996	2	1	2	2	1	8
P2&I1[2]	Klein R, et al.	2000	2	2	1	2	2	9
P3[3]	Wong TY, et al.	2005	2	1	1	1	1	6
P4[4]	Liu W, et al.	2007	2	2	1	2	1	8
P5[5]	Duan Y	2008	2	2	2	2	2	10
P6[6]	Cheung N, et al.	2008	2	1	2	2	2	9
P7_a[7,8]	Rogers S, et al.	2010	2	1	1	2	1	7
P7_b[7,9]	Rogers S, et al.	2010	2	1	1	2	1	7
P8[10]	Yasuda M, et al.	2010	2	1	0	2	2	7
P9[11]	Jonas JB, et al.	2013	2	1	2	2	1	8
P10[12]	Wu PC, et al.	2014	2	2	0	2	1	7
P11[13]	Ponto KA, et al.	2015	2	1	2	2	2	9
P12[14]	Shin YU, et al.	2016	2	1	0	2	1	6
P13[15]	Koh V, et al.	2016	2	1	1	2	2	8
P14[16]	Duan X	2017	2	2	0	1	2	7
P15[17]	Thapa R, et al.	2017	2	1	2	2	1	8
P16[18]	Keel S, et al.	2018	2	1	2	2	2	9
I2[19]	Cugati S, et al.	2006	2	2	1	2	1	8
I3[20]	Klein BE, et al.	2006	2	2	1	1	1	7
I4[21]	Arakawa S, et al.	2007	2	2	1	2	2	9
I5[22]	Klein R, et al.	2008	2	2	2	2	1	9
I6[23]	Zhou J, et al.	2011	2	2	0	2	2	8

**Table S4**. Quality scores for assessing the risk of bias in the included studies (n=22)

Table S5. Meta-analyses of studies on any RVO prevalence

Meta-analysis of studies that reported the prevalence of any RVO revealed significantly high heterogeneity between studies ( $I^2$  =93.6%, p<0.001); By using random-effects meta-analysis, the pooled prevalence of any RVO was 0.95% (95% CI=0.75-1.22) (**Figure S1**).



Figure S1. Forest plot of studies reporting the prevalence of any RVO (n=20)

The sensitivity analysis found that the pooled prevalence of any RVO varied from 0.90% (95% CI=0.72-1.13) to 1.03% (95% CI=0.83-1.28) after removing one study at one time, no single study had significantly influenced the liability and stability of the overall pooled prevalence (**Figure S2**).

Ommiting study	Events per 1 observation	00 is Prevalence (%)	95% C
Omitting Mitchell P, et al., 1996	<del></del>	0.93	[0.72; 1.20]
Omitting Klein R, et al., 2000		0.97	[0.75; 1.25]
Omitting Wong TY, et al., 2005		1.03	[0.83; 1.28]
Omitting Liu W, et al., 2007		0.94	[0.73; 1.22]
Omitting Duan Y, 2008		0.97	[0.75; 1.25]
Omitting Cheung N, et al., 2008		0.95	[0.74; 1.23]
Omitting Rogers S, et al., 2010		0.97	[0.75; 1.25]
Omitting Rogers S, et al., 2010	<b></b>	0.92	[0.72; 1.18]
Omitting Yasuda M, et al., 2010	<b></b>	0.92	[0.72; 1.17]
Omitting Jonas JB, et al., 2013		0.97	[0.75; 1.25]
Omitting Wu PC, et al., 2014		0.97	[0.75; 1.24]
Omitting Ponto KA, et al., 2015	<b></b>	1.00	[0.79; 1.27]
Omitting Shin YU, et al., 2016	<b></b>	0.97	[0.74; 1.27]
Omitting Koh V, et al., 2016		0.97	[0.76; 1.25]
Omitting Koh V, et al., 2016		0.97	[0.75; 1.25]
Omitting Koh V, et al., 2016		0.98	[0.76; 1.25]
Omitting Duan X, 2017		0.93	[0.72; 1.21]
Omitting Thapa R, et al., 2017		0.90	[0.72; 1.13]
Omitting Keel S, et al., 2018		0.96	[0.75; 1.24]
Omitting Keel S, et al., 2018		0.97	[0.75; 1.24]
Random effects model	•	0.96	[0.75; 1.22]
L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L	1 1		
0	1 2	3 4	

**Figure S2**. Leave-one-out sensitivity analysis of the influence of single study on the pooled prevalence of any RVO (n=20)

According to funnel plot, Egger's test (t=-0.500, p= 0.623) and Begg's test (z= -0.714, p= 0.475), no publication bias was revealed (**Figure S3**).



Table S6. Meta-analyses of studies on any BRVO prevalence

Significantly high heterogeneity also existed between studies that reported the prevalence of BRVO ( $I^2 = 93.1\%$ , p<0.001). Therefore, a random-effects meta-analysis was adopted, where a pooled prevalence of BRVO of 0.79% (95% CI=0.60-1.04) was revealed (**Figure S4**).



Ommiting study		OD	servation	5	Pre	valence (%)	95% CI
Omitting Mitchell P, et al., 1996						0.77	[0.58; 1.03]
Omitting Klein R, et al., 2000						0.80	[0.60; 1.07]
Omitting Wong TY, et al., 2005		<u> </u>				0.86	[0.67; 1.10]
Omitting Liu W, et al., 2007		<b>—</b>				0.77	[0.58; 1.03]
Omitting Duan Y, 2008						0.79	[0.59; 1.06]
Omitting Cheung N, et al., 2008						0.78	[0.58; 1.05]
Omitting Rogers S, et al., 2010						0.80	[0.60; 1.07]
Omitting Rogers S, et al., 2010		<b>—</b>				0.76	[0.57; 1.00]
Omitting Yasuda M, et al., 2010		<b></b>				0.75	[0.57; 0.98]
Omitting Jonas JB, et al., 2013						0.80	[0.60; 1.06]
Omitting Ponto KA, et al., 2015						0.83	[0.63; 1.09]
Omitting Shin YU, et al., 2016						0.79	[0.58; 1.08]
Omitting Koh V, et al., 2016		<b></b>				0.81	[0.61; 1.08]
Omitting Koh V, et al., 2016		<b></b>				0.80	[0.60; 1.06]
Omitting Koh V, et al., 2016						0.81	[0.61; 1.07]
Omitting Thapa R, et al., 2017		+				0.73	[0.58; 0.94]
Omitting Keel S, et al., 2018						0.79	[0.60; 1.06]
Omitting Keel S, et al., 2018						0.79	[0.60; 1.05]
Random effects model		•				0.79	[0.60: 1.04]
		<u>;</u> 1	1	1			
	0	1	2	3	4		
Figure S5. Leave-one-out sens	itivi	itv analvs	is of the	influe	nce of si	ingle study	on the pooled

prevalence of BRVO (n=18)

Visually inspection of the funnel plot didn't suggest potential publication bias. Moreover, neither Egger's test (t= -0.517, p= 0.612) or Begg's test (z= -1.099, p= 0.272) significantly indicated any publication bias (**Figure S6**).



Table S7. Meta-analyses of studies on any CRVO prevalence

Similarly, moderate heterogeneity was also significantly detected between studies reporting the prevalence of CRVO ( $I^2 = 71.8\%$ , p<0.001). The random-effects meta-analysis revealed the pooled prevalence of CRVO as 0.13% (95% CI=0.09-0.19) (**Figure S7**).





Study				Odds	%
D	Author	Pubyr		ratio (95% CI)	Weight
23	Wong TY, et al.	2005		• <b>)</b> 2.59 (1.63, 3.39)	10.99
26	Cheung N, et al.	2008		1.34 (1.00, 1.81)	14.54
98	Yasuda M, et al.	2010		1.47 (1.04, 2.08)	11.87
9	Jonas JB, et al.	2013		1.63 (1.10, 2.16)	12.31
213_Chinese	Koh V, et al.	2016	-	1.10 (0.74, 1.79)	8.31
213_Indian	Koh V, et al.	2016		1.63 (1.00, 2.37)	8.61
213_Malay	Koh V, et al.	2016		1.48 (0.90, 2.37)	7.18
212	Shin YU, et al.	2016		1.72 (1.27, 2.34)	14.01
216	Keel S, et al.	2018		1.64 (1.17, 2.31)	12.18
Overall (I-squa	red = 29.6%, p = 0.182	2)		1.60 (1.38, 1.84)	100.00
IOTE: Weights	are from random effe	cts analysis			
		.295	1	3.39	

## **Table S8**. Meta-analyses of risk factors for any RVO

oraay			Odds	70
ID	Author	Pubyr	ratio (95% C	l) Weight
P8	Yasuda M, et al.	2010	1.08 (0.48, 2.	38) 16.06
P11	Ponto KA, et al.	2015	1.50 (0.85, 2.	65) 26.44
P13_Chinese	Koh V, et al.	2016 -	0.71 (0.28, 1.	83) 12.38
P13_Indian	Koh V, et al.	2016 -	0.76 (0.32, 1.	83) 13.99
P13_Malay	Koh V, et al.	2016	2.49 (0.91, 6.	84) 10.96
P16	Keel S, et al.	2018	0.75 (0.37, 1.	47) 20.17
Overall (I-squar	ed = 21.6%, p = 0.271	)	1.08 (0.76, 1.	55) 100.00
		.146	1 6.84	
factor 3-Crea	atinine (per 10 mn	nol/L increase)		
factor 3-Crea	atinine (per 10 mn	nol/L increase)	Odds	%
<i>factor 3-Crea</i> Study ID	atinine (per 10 mn	nol/L increase) Pubyr	Odds ratio (95% CI)	% Weight
<i>factor 3-Cred</i> Study ID P13_Chinese	<i>atinine (per 10 mn</i> Author Koh V, et al.	nol/L increase) Pubyr 2016	Odds ratio (95% Cl)	% Weight 51.22
<i>factor 3-Cret</i> Study ID P13_Chinese P13_Indian	atinine (per 10 mn Author Koh V, et al. Koh V, et al.	nol/L increase) Pubyr 2016 2016	Odds ratio (95% CI) 1.05 (1.01, 1.09)	% Weight 51.22 27.33
<i>factor 3-Cred</i> Study ID P13_Chinese P13_Indian P13_Malay	atinine (per 10 mn Author Koh V, et al. Koh V, et al. Koh V, et al.	nol/L increase) Pubyr 2016 2016 2016	Odds ratio (95% Cl) 1.05 (1.01, 1.09) 1.05 (1.00, 1.11) 1.02 (0.96, 1.08)	% Weight 51.22 27.33 21.45
<i>factor 3-Cred</i> Study ID P13_Chinese P13_Indian P13_Malay Overall (I-square	atinine (per 10 mn Author Koh V, et al. Koh V, et al. Koh V, et al. d = 0.0%, p = 0.694)	nol/L increase) Pubyr 2016 2016 2016	Odds ratio (95% CI) 1.05 (1.01, 1.09) 1.05 (1.00, 1.11) 1.02 (0.96, 1.08) 1.04 (1.02, 1.07)	% Weight 51.22 27.33 21.45 100.00







Study					%
ID	Author	Pubyr		Odds ratio (95% CI)	Weight
P1	Mitchell P, et al.	1996	-	1.90 (1.10, 3.20)	16.98
P6	Cheung N, et al.	2008		2.06 (1.18, 3.59)	16.16
P8	Yasuda M, et al.	2010	-	4.25 (1.82, 9.94)	8.91
P11	Ponto KA, et al.	2015	•	2.73 (1.39, 5.39)	12.47
P13_Chinese	Koh V, et al.	2016	+	— 10.41 (1.34, 81.04)	1.86
P13_Indian	Koh V, et al.	2016		3.63 (1.02, 12.86)	4.53
P13_Malay	Koh V, et al.	2016	-	1.31 (0.35, 4.89)	4.22
P12	Shin YU, et al.	2016	+	2.58 (1.31, 5.08)	12.47
P14	Duan X	2017	<b>→</b>	4.27 (2.31, 5.25)	22.41
Overall (I-squ	ared = 28.6%, p = 0.1	91)	\$	2.82 (2.12, 3.75)	100.00
NOTE: Weights	s are from random ef	fects analysis			

### References

- 1 Mitchell P, Smith W, Chang A. Prevalence and associations of retinal vein occlusion in Australia. The Blue Mountains Eye Study. Arch Ophthalmol. 1996;114:1243-7.
- 2 Klein R, Klein BE, Moss SE, Meuer SM. The epidemiology of retinal vein occlusion: the Beaver Dam Eye Study. Trans Am Ophthalmol Soc. 2000;98:133-41.
- Wong TY, Larsen EK, Klein R, Mitchell P, Couper DJ, Klein BE, et al. Cardiovascular risk factors for retinal vein occlusion and arteriolar emboli: the Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities & Cardiovascular Health studies. Ophthalmology. 2005;112:540-7.
- 4 Weiwei L, Xu L, Xie X, Peng X, Yang H, Li J. Epidemiology of retinal vein occlusion in adult Chinese population in rural and urban areas in Beijing (北京城乡人群视网膜静脉阻塞患病 情况调查). Ophthalmol CHN (眼科). 2007:233-6.
- 5 Duan Y. The prevelence of retinal vein occlusion and analysis of its related risk factors in rural area of North China (中国北方农村地区视网膜静脉阻塞患病率调查及相关危险因素分析) [Master Dissertation]: Central South University (中南大学); 2008.
- 6 Cheung N, Klein R, Jie JW, Cotch MF, Islam AFM, Klein BEK, et al. Traditional and novel cardiovascular risk factors for retinal vein occlusion: The multiethnic study of atherosclerosis. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2008;49:4297-302.
- 7 Rogers S, McIntosh RL, Cheung N, Lim L, Wang J, Mitchell P, et al. The prevalence of retinal vein occlusion: pooled data from population studies from the United States, Europe, Asia, and Australia. Ophthalmology. 2010;117:313-e1.
- 8 Augood C, Fletcher A, Bentham G, Chakravarthy U, De Jong P, Rahu M, et al. Methods for a population-based study of the prevalence of and risk factors for age-related maculopathy and macular degeneration in elderly European populations: the EUREYE study. Ophthalmic Epidemiol. 2004;11:117-29.
- West SK, Klein R, Rodriguez J, Muñoz B, Broman AT, Sanchez R, et al. Diabetes and diabetic retinopathy in a Mexican-American population: Proyecto VER. Diabetes Care. 2001;24:1204-9.
- 10 Yasuda M, Kiyohara Y, Arakawa S, Hata Y, Yonemoto K, Doi Y, et al. Prevalence and systemic risk factors for retinal vein occlusion in a general Japanese population: the Hisayama study. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2010;51:3205-9.
- 11 Jonas J, Nangia V, Khare A, Sinha A, Lambat S. Prevalence and associations of retinal vein occlusions: The Central India Eye and Medical Study. Retina. 2013;33:152-9.
- 12 Wu P, Zhang W, Lu P, Chen S, Tao M. Epidemical survey of relative factors of retinal vessels disease of the native Tibetan among the people aged 40 and above in Maqin county, Qinghai province (青海省玛沁县 40 岁以上世居藏族人群视网膜血管性疾病相关因素的流行病学 调查). Int Eye Sci (国际眼科杂志). 2014:1288-91.
- 13 Ponto KA, Elbaz H, Peto T, Laubert-Reh D, Binder H, Wild PS, et al. Prevalence and risk factors of retinal vein occlusion: the Gutenberg Health Study. J Thromb Haemost. 2015;13:1254-63.
- 14 Shin YU, Cho H, Kim JM, Bae K, Kang MH, Shin JP, et al. Prevalence and associated factors of retinal vein occlusion in the Korean National Health and Nutritional Examination Survey, 2008-2012: A cross-sectional observational study. Medicine. 2016;95:e5185.
- 15 Koh V, Cheung CY, Li X, Tian D, Wang J, Mitchelle P, et al. Retinal vein occlusion in a multiethnic Asian population: the Singapore Epidemiology of Eye Disease Study. Ophthalmic Epidemiol. 2016;23:6-13.
- 16 Duan X. Investigation of the risk factors of retinal vein occlusion in Qingyang (庆阳市居民视 网膜静脉阻塞发病情况及危险因素调查). Chin J of PHM (中国公共卫生管理). 2017:84-5+8.
- 17 Thapa R, Bajimaya S, Paudyal G, Khanal S, Tan S, Thapa SS, et al. Prevalence, pattern and risk factors of retinal vein occlusion in an elderly population in Nepal: the Bhaktapur retina study. BMC Ophthalmol. 2017;17:162.
- 18 Keel S, Xie J, Foreman J. Prevalence of retinal vein occlusion in the Australian National Eye Health Survey. Clin Exp Ophthalmol. 2018;46:260-5.

- 19 Cugati S, Jie JW, Rochtchina E, Mitchell P. Ten-year incidence of retinal vein occlusion in an older population: The blue mountains eye study. Arch Ophthalmol. 2006;124:726-32.
- 20 Klein BE, Meuer SM, Knudtson MD, Klein R. The relationship of optic disk cupping to retinal vein occlusion: the Beaver Dam Eye Study. Am J Ophthalmol. 2006;141:859-62.
- 21 Arakawa S, Yasuda M, Nagata M, Ninomiya T, Hirakawa Y, Doi Y, et al. Nine-year incidence and risk factors for retinal vein occlusion in a general Japanese population: the Hisayama Study. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2011;52:5905-9.
- 22 Klein R, Moss SE, Meuer SM, Klein BE. The 15-year cumulative incidence of retinal vein occlusion: the Beaver Dam Eye Study. Arch Ophthalmol. 2008;126:513-8.
- 23 Zhou J, Xu L, Wang S, Wang Y, You Q, Tu Y, et al. The 10-year incidence and risk factors of retinal vein occlusion: the Beijing Eye Study. Ophthalmology. 2013;120:803-8.