

A Review of Referrals Reveal the Impact of Referral Content on the Triage and Management of Ophthalmology Wait Lists

Vincent Khou^{1,2}, Angelica Ly^{1,2}, Lindsay Moore^{1,2}, Maria Markoulli², Michael Kalloniatis^{1,2}, Michael Yapp^{1,2}, Michael Hennessy^{1,3}, Barbara Zangerl²

1. Centre for Eye Health, University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

2. School of Optometry and Vision Science, Faculty of Medicine and Health, University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

3. Department of Ophthalmology, Prince of Wales Hospital, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

Supplementary Materials

Supplementary Tables: 3

Supplementary Table 1. Information content of referrals by profession.

		Reason for Referral					Presence of Visual Acuity			Presence of a Sign or Symptom			
		Anterior Eye	Cataract	General Examination	Posterior Eye	Post hoc Analysis†	Visual Acuity Present	Visual Acuity Absent	Post hoc Analysis†	Signs or Symptoms Present	Diagnosis Reported	Signs or Symptoms Absent	Post hoc Analysis†
Set A: Existing Wait List, n (%)	a. General practitioner	52 (27.4)	62 (32.6)	32 (16.8)	44 (23.2)	a. vs b. P < 0.001	11 (5.8)	179 (94.2)	a. vs b. P < 0.001	81 (42.6)	77 (40.5)	32 (16.8)	a. vs b. P < 0.001
	b. Optometrist	15 (8.2)	124 (67.4)	3 (1.6)	42 (22.8)	b vs c. P < 0.001	168 (91.3)	16 (8.7)		167 (90.8)	15 (8.2)	2 (1.1)	
	c. Other	8 (18.2)	15 (34.1)	4 (9.1)	17 (38.6)		12 (27.3)	32 (72.7)		23 (52.3)	17 (38.6)	4 (9.1)	
Set B: New Incoming Referrals, n (%)	d. General practitioner	53 (24.8)	79 (36.9)	34 (15.9)	48 (22.4)	d. vs e. P < 0.001	21 (9.8)	193 (90.2)	d. vs e. P < 0.001	101 (47.2)	83 (38.8)	30 (14.0)	d. vs e. P < 0.001
	e. Optometrist	25 (11.0)	149 (65.6)	3 (1.3)	50 (22.0)	e. vs f. P < 0.001	212 (93.4)	15 (6.6)		204 (89.9)	22 (9.7)	1 (0.4)	
	f. Other	15 (17.2)	25 (28.7)	18 (20.7)	29 (33.3)		32 (36.8)	55 (63.2)		4 (57.1)	1 (14.3)	2 (28.6)	

†Post hoc α was Bonferroni corrected to 0.017. Only significant post hoc Fisher’s exact test P values shown.

Rows may not add up to exactly 100% due to rounding.

Supplementary Table 2. Presence of visual acuity and presence of a sign/symptom or diagnosis based on referral format.

Referral Format, n (%)	Presence of Visual Acuity			Presence of a Sign/Symptom or Diagnosis		
	Present	Absent	Post hoc Analysis [†]	Present	Absent	Post hoc Analysis [†]
a. Computer-generated	239 (35.9)	427 (64.1)	a. vs b. P < 0.001	588 (88.3)	78 (11.7)	a. vs c. P < 0.001
b. Handwritten	43 (57.3)	32 (42.7)	a. vs c. P < 0.001	72 (96.0)	3 (4.0)	
c. POWH Eye Clinic Template	174 (84.9)	31 (15.1)	b. vs c. P < 0.001	201 (98.0)	4 (2.0)	

[†]Post hoc α was Bonferroni corrected to 0.017. Only significant post hoc Fisher's exact test P values shown.

Supplementary Table 3. Triage decision of referrals based on the visual acuity provided.

Triage Decision, n (%)	Better than 6/12	6/12 to better than 6/60	Worse than 6/60	Not Reported
Within 1 month	24 (30.0)	5 (6.3)	5 (6.3)	46 (57.5)
3-6 months	17 (24.3)	22 (31.4)	9 (12.9)	22 (31.4)
6-12 months	0 (0.0)	2 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (50.0)
General Clinic non-urgent	22 (17.5)	17 (13.5)	5 (2.4)	84 (66.7)
Cataract Clinic non-urgent	28 (16.2)	79 (45.7)	5 (2.9)	61 (35.3)
Specific Doctor's Clinic	14 (20.9)	8 (11.9)	4 (6.0)	41 (61.2)
Rejected	0 (0.0)	1 (12.5)	0 (0.0)	7 (87.5)

Rows may not add up to exactly 100% due to rounding.