Visual status among undergraduate students: Findings from an emerging university in Saudi Arabia
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Abstract
Background: Refractive error is an important preventable cause of visual impairment and blindness worldwide. In adult life, reduced vision can potentially affect the academic performance, choice of occupation and socio-economic status. This study aimed to assess the prevalence of refractive errors and related visual impairment among undergraduate male students in Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University in Al-Kharj, Saudi Arabia.

Methods: A descriptive cross-sectional study was employed in the current work. After obtaining an informed consent; each eligible student was asked to fill a self-constructed survey and have screened in the college premises for visual acuity and refractive error. Candidates detected with defective vision have been referred for further examination at well-equipped ophthalmology clinic in the University Hospital.

Results: A total of 420 undergraduate students, with age ranged from 18 to 30 years, have participated in the current study. About 25.0% of the participants have used spectacles at the time of examination. Positive family history of spectacles use was found in 71.4%. Our study showed that visual acuity in the better eye was low in 34.76% of the participants. Seventy-eight students (18.6%) of the total participants reported defective vision and have fulfilled refractometric examination. Of the examined students 83.3% were found to have refractive errors. Astigmatism, 52.6%, was the most frequently encountered refractive error among the participants; followed by myopia, 26.9%; and hypermetropia 2.6%.

Conclusion: The current study confirms that refractive error is an important preventable cause of visual impairment. Significant portion of the examined participants were found to have refractive errors recommending further work to improve visual status in undergraduate students.

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of King Saud University. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

1. Background

Refractive errors are among the most common causes of visual impairment and represent the second leading cause of treatable blindness in different age, gender and ethnic groups. Globally it has been reported that 216.6 million people were visually impaired in 2015, further uncorrected refractive error as the leading cause, followed by cataract, age-related-macular degeneration, glaucoma, diabetic retinopathy and others. Uncorrected refractive error and cataract together, contributed to 55% of blindness and 78% of vision impairment in adults aged 50 years and older (Resnikoff et al.,...
Visual acuity is a complex phenomenon that is affected by optical factors (e.g. state of the image-forming mechanisms of the eye), and retinal factors (e.g. state of the cones). Also, visual acuity is affected by stimulus factors such as illumination, brightness of the stimulus, contrast between the stimulus & the background, and duration of exposure to the stimulus. The refractive errors and its consequences have been recognized as a public health problem in many countries as well as the World health organization (WHO). The WHO has launched a campaign for managing refractive errors by the year 2020 and placed it as the fifth position for its urgency (Barrett et al., 2010; Bamashmus and Al-Akily, 2010; Maul et al., 2000).

There are several worldwide studies that have reported about refractive errors with a significantly wide range (9.4–83.1%) of prevalence. The variations in prevalence may be related to ethnicity, inheritance, age, gender, education level, and socio-economic status of the studied populations (Midelfart et al., 2002; Naiglin et al., 2002; Yared et al., 2012; Aldebasi, 2014; Alruwaili et al., 2020; Hashemi et al., 2018; Alsaif et al., 2019). In most eastern Mediterranean region countries including Saudi Arabia visual impairment and blindness remain a growing health challenge (Al-Ghamdi, 2019). Population-based studies conducted in northern Saudi Arabia had reported that 13.9% (Al-Shaalan et al., 2011) and 23.5% (Parrey and Alsweilmi, 2017) of the adult participants had visual impairments. Another population study conducted in Riyadh has observed that correctable visual impairment was highly prevalent, and was observed in 17.8% of the adolescents (Alsaqr et al., 2019).

Visual impairment influences different aspects of life; it is usually associated with difficulties in physical function, emotional distress, and low socialization (Al-Shaalan et al., 2011). Students constitute a particularly vulnerable group, because uncorrected refractive error may have a dramatic impact on learning capability and educational potential (Negrel et al., 2000). Limited studies have been published regarding the prevalence of refractive errors among undergraduate students in Saudi Arabia (Aldebasi, 2014; Alsaaif et al., 2019; Al-Wadaani et al., 2013). The current study aims to assess the prevalence of refractive errors and visual impairment among undergraduate male students in Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University in Al-Kharj, Saudi Arabia.

2. Methods

The ethical committee in College of Medicine, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University approved the current study protocol. The research was conducted ethically in accordance with the World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki (World Medical Association, 2013). Written consent forms duly signed from the participants has been required as a prerequisite for inclusion. Assents from selected faculties were also obtained. The results of examination were sent to the participants for further management.

2.1. Study design

The current work is a descriptive cross-sectional study. It was conducted using a special validated & standardized proforma to collect personal and socio-demographic data including name, age, history of present and past ocular/systemic problems and usage of spectacles by students; and family history of ocular problems and using of spectacles.

2.2. Sample size and sampling technique

In order to create a high degree of representation of the study population, and based on the objectives of the study, the sample size was calculated by Open Epi version 3 (OpenEpi, 2016). The following considerations were employed for sample size calculation: The total recorded study population for the academic year...
2015/2016 was 8183 male students (Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University). The sample size was calculated keeping confidence interval (CI) at 95%. Accordingly, the sample size is calculated to be 367 participants. For correction of any possible data loss the total sample would be 400.

The current study was conducted at Al-Kharj, Saudi Arabia. Eligible participants include male students in PSAU. A multi-stage sampling method has been applied. In particular, samples of different university colleges have been selected through cluster sampling technique then samples of participants were selected using simple random sampling. A written approval to participate in the study was obtained from each selected student.

### Materials /instruments

After obtaining an informed consent; each eligible student was asked to fill a self-constructed survey. The survey used was based on a review of the published literature. The following information have been collected: personal and socio-demographic data including name, age, history of present and past ocular problems and use of spectacles and family history of ocular problems and use of spectacles.

Candidates detected with defective vision have been referred for further examination at well-equipped ophthalmology clinic in the University Hospital. The specialist ophthalmologist in ophthalmology clinic did further examination and evaluation by auto refraactometer followed by the acceptance of spectacle power. Retinoscopy with/without cycloplegic dilatation was done in required cases.

### Table 3

| Question                                      | Visual acuity left eye | Normal | Mild decrease | Moderate/ Severe decrease | Total | Chi-Square Value | P-Value |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------|---------------|---------------------------|-------|-----------------|---------|
| Age                                           |                        |        |               |                           |       |                 |         |
| 18-25 Yrs                                     | F                      | 250    | 113           | 44                        | 407   | 1.75            | 0.781   |
|                                               | P                      | 59.5%  | 26.9%         | 10.5%                     | 96.9% |                 |         |
| 26-30 Yrs                                     | F                      | 6      | 5             | 1                        | 12    |                 |         |
|                                               | P                      | 1.4%   | 1.2%          | 0.2%                      | 2.9%  |                 |         |
| Above 30 Yrs                                  | F                      | 1      | 0             | 0                         | 1     |                 |         |
|                                               | P                      | 0.2%   | 0.0%          | 0.0%                      | 0.2%  |                 |         |
| Total                                         | F                      | 257    | 118           | 45                        | 420   |                 |         |
|                                               | P                      | 61.2%  | 28.1%         | 10.7%                     | 100%  |                 |         |
| Marital status                                | single                 | F      | 248           | 117                       | 45    | 410             | 3.86    |
|                                               | P                      | 59.0%  | 27.9%         | 10.7%                     | 97.6% |                 | 0.159   |
|                                               | married                | F      | 9             | 1                         | 0     | 10              |         |
|                                               | P                      | 2.1%   | 0.2%          | 0.0%                      | 2.4%  |                 |         |
| Total                                         | F                      | 257    | 118           | 45                        | 420   |                 |         |
|                                               | P                      | 61.2%  | 28.1%         | 10.7%                     | 100%  |                 |         |
| College                                        | business administration | F    | 99            | 34                        | 13    | 146             | 27.31*  |
|                                               | P                      | 23.6%  | 8.1%          | 3.1%                      | 34.8% |                 | 0.002   |
|                                               | applied med sciences    | F      | 49            | 25                        | 10    | 84              |         |
|                                               | P                      | 11.7%  | 6.0%          | 2.4%                      | 20.0% |                 |         |
|                                               | college of sciences and humanities | F | 17 | 9 | 12 | 38 | | |
|                                               | P                      | 4.0%   | 2.1%          | 2.9%                      | 9.0%  |                 |         |
|                                               | Engineering            | F      | 35            | 20                        | 6     | 61              |         |
|                                               | P                      | 8.3%   | 4.8%          | 1.4%                      | 14.5% |                 |         |
|                                               | Pharmacy               | F      | 29            | 11                        | 1     | 41              |         |
|                                               | P                      | 6.9%   | 2.6%          | 0.2%                      | 9.8%  |                 |         |
|                                               | Computer Sciences      | F      | 28            | 19                        | 3     | 50              |         |
|                                               | P                      | 6.7%   | 4.5%          | 0.7%                      | 11.9% |                 |         |
| Total                                         | F                      | 257    | 118           | 45                        | 420   |                 |         |
|                                               | P                      | 61.2%  | 28.1%         | 10.7%                     | 100%  |                 |         |
| Present history of ocular disease             | Yes                    | F      | 34            | 71                        | 42    | 147             | 153.71* |
|                                               | P                      | 8.1%   | 16.9%         | 10.0%                     | 35.0% |                 | <0.001  |
|                                               | No                     | F      | 223           | 47                        | 3     | 273             |         |
|                                               | P                      | 53.1%  | 11.2%         | 0.7%                      | 65.0% |                 |         |
| Total                                         | F                      | 257    | 118           | 45                        | 420   |                 |         |
|                                               | P                      | 61.2%  | 28.1%         | 10.7%                     | 100%  |                 |         |
| Past history of ocular disease                | Yes                    | F      | 18            | 22                        | 15    | 55              | 27.77*  |
|                                               | P                      | 4.3%   | 5.2%          | 3.6%                      | 13.1% |                 | <0.001  |
|                                               | No                     | F      | 239           | 96                        | 30    | 365             |         |
|                                               | P                      | 56.9%  | 22.9%         | 7.1%                      | 86.9% |                 |         |
| Total                                         | F                      | 257    | 118           | 45                        | 420   |                 |         |
|                                               | P                      | 61.2%  | 28.1%         | 10.7%                     | 100%  |                 |         |
| Use of spectacles                             | Yes                    | F      | 11            | 54                        | 40    | 105             | 183.94* |
|                                               | P                      | 2.6%   | 12.9%         | 9.5%                      | 25.0% |                 | <0.001  |
|                                               | No                     | F      | 246           | 64                        | 5     | 315             |         |
|                                               | P                      | 58.6%  | 15.2%         | 1.2%                      | 75.0% |                 |         |
| Total                                         | F                      | 257    | 118           | 45                        | 420   |                 |         |
|                                               | P                      | 61.2%  | 28.1%         | 10.7%                     | 100%  |                 |         |

Notes: F: Frequency; P: Percentage; (*) There is a statistically significant relationship at (0.05) or less.
Refractive error is defined as an error of ± 0.50D or more for myopia and hyperopia and a cylindrical error of /C21 0.50 D (WHO, 2007; Niroula and Saha, 2009).

2.4. Data analysis

The data were analyzed using SPSS (version 21 USA). Prevalence of visual impairment (visual acuity of 6/12 or worse) was calculated for uncorrected visual acuity and best measured visual acuity (Yingyong, 2010; Marmamula et al., 2009). The percentage, frequency, means and relative mean for data variables was calculated. Chi square test and trend analysis was used to study the association of refractive errors with age and socioeconomic status of students. ANOVA analysis of variance has been used to find harmony between age groups, and the statistical significance of differences.

3. Results

The current study included a total number of 420 male students. Their age ranged from 18 to 30 years. One hundred forty-six (34.8%) of the participants were from College of Business Administration, 84 (20.0%) from Applied Medical Sciences, 61 (14.5%) from College of Engineering, 50 (11.9%) from College of Computer Sciences, 41 (9.8%) from College of Pharmacy, and 38 (9.0%) from College of Sciences and Humanities. Most of the participants, 410 (97.6%) were single.

Regarding ocular history of the participants, positive present history of ocular disease was reported by 147 (35.0%) of the responders; while past history of ocular disease and history of refractive surgery were reported by 55 (13.1%) and 14 (3.3%) of the responders respectively. Ocular disorders (acute/ chronic) reported in the present or past history of the subjects included: allergic diseases (spring catarrh), corneal ectasia, corneal scars/opacity, dry eyes, developmental cataracts, uveitis and retinal disease. Also in the current study, 105 (25.0%) of the participants used spectacles; while positive family history of spectacles use was found in 300 (71.4%) of them. All of the participants reported that they practiced electronic games or social media applications; with 298 (71.0%) of them used to practice more than 5 h/day (Table 1).

Visual acuity of left eye was found to be low (Visual Acuity /C20 6/12) in 163 (38.8%) of the participants; whereas in right eye, visual impairment was noted in 146 (34.76%) of them (Table 2). Our results showed that the visual acuity was significantly related to the history of ocular disease, personal and family history of spectacles use, and duration of mobile practicing (Tables 3 and 4). Of the total 78 (18.6%) of the participants who have fulfilled refractometry, 65 (83.3%) of them were found to have refractive errors in the right eye. Astigmatism, 41 (52.6%), was most frequently encountered refractive error among the participants;

### Table 4

| Question                                           | Answer | Visual acuity left eye | Chi-Square Value | P-Value |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------|------------------------|------------------|---------|
| History of refractive surgery                      | Yes    | Normal                 | 1                | 14      | 0.510 | 0.775 |
|                                                    | No     | Mild decrease          | 0.2%             | 3.3%    |       |
| Family history of spectacles use                   | Yes    | Moderate/ Severe decrease | 0.02%           | 9.05*  | 0.011 |
|                                                    | No     | Total                  | 0.50 D           | 96.7%   |       |
| Duration of mobile practicing                      | 2 hrs or less | 0.0%                 | 24               | 8.13*  | 0.047 |
|                                                    | 3–5 hrs|                         | 5.7%             | 5.7%    |       |
|                                                    | more than 5 hrs | 10.7%                | 28.6%            | 28.6%   |       |
| Present history of chronic diseases                | Yes    | Total                  | 12.6%            | 12.6%   |       |
|                                                    | No     | Total                  | 53               | 53      |       |
| Past history of chronic diseases                   | Yes    | Total                  | 12.6%            | 12.6%   |       |
|                                                    | No     | Total                  | 29               | 29      |       |
| Family history of systemic disease                 | Yes    | Total                  | 420              | 420     |       |
|                                                    | No     | Total                  | 420              | 420     |       |

Notes. F: Frequency; P: Percentage; (*) There is a statistically significant relationship at (0.05) or less.
followed by myopia, 21 (26.9%); and hypermetropia 2 (2.6%) (Table 2).

Almost all of the participants with refractive errors were in the age group 18–25-year-old, with statistically significant relation (p = 0.001). Moreover, our results showed that the refractive errors were significantly related to single marital status, positive present history of ocular disease, personal and family history of spectacle use, duration of mobile practicing, and past history of chronic diseases (Tables 5 and 6).

4. Discussion

Refractive error is an important preventable cause of visual impairment and blindness worldwide. Several studies and WHO reports showed that refractive errors are the first cause of visual impairment and the second cause of visual loss worldwide (Hashemi et al., 2018). The current study reports the prevalence of refractive errors in undergraduate male students showing astigmatism as the most frequently encountered refractive error among the participants; followed by myopia, and hypermetropia. Impaired vision can potentially affect adult academic performance, choice of occupation and socio-economic status (McCarty and Taylor, 2000). It has been estimated that global economic loss due to lost productivity caused by uncorrected refractive error was around $269 billion (Smith et al., 2009) and due to uncorrected presbyopia was US$11.023 billion (Frick et al., 2015). The prevalence of refractive errors is changing over time according to gender, age, and geographic areas (Yingyong, 2010).

The present work included a total number of 420 university adult male students. Positive present history of ocular disease was reported by approximately one/third of the responders; while past history of ocular disease and history of refractive surgery were reported by 13.1% and 3.3% of the responders respectively. Furthermore, quarter of the participants used spectacles at the time of examination; but about 30% of those with refractive errors did not use the spectacles. Similarly, it has been also reported that around half of the participants did not use any kind of management for refractive errors (Alruwaili et al., 2018). Positive family history of spectacles use was found in more than two/third of

Table 5

| Question                                | Answer          | Diagnosis RtE | Chi-Square Value | P-Value |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|---------|
|                                         |                 | Normal     | RE          | Total   |
| Age 18–25 Yrs                           | F               | 11          | 65          | 76      | 10.26* | 0.001 |
|                                         | P               | 14.1%       | 83.3%       | 97.4%   |         |       |
| 26-30Yrs                                | F               | 2           | 0           | 2       |        |       |
|                                         | P               | 2.6%        | 0.0%        | 2.6%    |        |       |
| Total                                   | F               | 13          | 65          | 78      |         |       |
|                                         | P               | 16.7%       | 83.3%       | 100%    |        |       |
| Marital status                          | single          | F            | 12          | 65      | 77      | 5.07* | 0.024 |
|                                         | married         | F            | 15.4%       | 83.3%   | 98.7%   |         |       |
|                                         | F               | 1           | 0           | 1       |        |       |
|                                         | P               | 1.3%        | 0.0%        | 1.3%    |        |       |
| Total                                   | F               | 13          | 65          | 78      |         |       |
|                                         | P               | 16.7%       | 83.3%       | 100%    |        |       |
| College                                 | business admin  | F            | 5           | 22      | 27      | 1.70   | 0.889 |
|                                         | P               | 6.4%        | 28.2%       | 34.6%   |         |       |
|                                         | applied med sci | F            | 3           | 12      | 15      |        |       |
|                                         | P               | 3.8%        | 15.4%       | 19.2%   |         |       |
|                                         | college of sci  | F            | 1           | 3       | 4       |        |       |
|                                         | P               | 1.3%        | 3.8%        | 5.1%    |         |       |
|                                         | engineering     | F            | 1           | 13      | 14      |        |       |
|                                         | P               | 1.3%        | 16.7%       | 17.9%   |         |       |
|                                         | pharmacy        | F            | 2           | 7       | 9       |        |       |
|                                         | P               | 2.6%        | 9.0%        | 11.5%   |         |       |
|                                         | Computer Sci    | F            | 1           | 8       | 9       |        |       |
|                                         | P               | 1.3%        | 10.3%       | 11.5%   |         |       |
| Total                                   | F               | 13          | 65          | 78      |         |       |
|                                         | P               | 16.7%       | 83.3%       | 100%    |        |       |
| Present history of ocular disease       | Yes             | F            | 3           | 47      | 50      | 11.41* | 0.001 |
|                                         | P               | 3.8%        | 60.3%       | 64.1%   |         |       |
|                                         | No              | F            | 10          | 18      | 28      |        |       |
|                                         | P               | 12.8%       | 23.1%       | 35.9%   |         |       |
| Total                                   | F               | 13          | 65          | 78      |         |       |
|                                         | P               | 16.7%       | 83.3%       | 100%    |        |       |
| Past history of ocular disease          | Yes             | F            | 4           | 11      | 15      | 1.34   | 0.248 |
|                                         | P               | 5.1%        | 14.1%       | 19.2%   |         |       |
|                                         | No              | F            | 9           | 54      | 63      |        |       |
|                                         | P               | 11.5%       | 69.2%       | 80.8%   |         |       |
| Total                                   | F               | 13          | 65          | 78      |         |       |
|                                         | P               | 16.7%       | 83.3%       | 100%    |        |       |
| Use of spectacles                        | Yes             | F            | 2           | 40      | 42      | 9.29*  | 0.002 |
|                                         | P               | 2.6%        | 51.3%       | 53.8%   |         |       |
|                                         | No              | F            | 11          | 25      | 36      |        |       |
|                                         | P               | 14.1%       | 32.1%       | 46.2%   |         |       |
| Total                                   | F               | 13          | 65          | 78      |         |       |
|                                         | P               | 16.7%       | 83.3%       | 100%    |        |       |

Notes: F: Frequency; P: Percentage; (*) There is a statistically significant relationship at (0.05) or less.
the participants indicating a role of genetic factors in development of refractive errors as previously reported (Hashemi et al., 2018; Flitcroft, 2014). However, our study shows lack of awareness regarding correction of refractive errors among the participants. Uncorrected vision remains one of the largest public health crisis and challenges despite the simple and cost-effective preventing solutions (Holden et al., 2014; Kassalow, 2019). Awareness of both health professional and the population is crucial for facing uncorrected vision and its consequences.

All of the participants reported that they practiced electronic games or social media applications; with a significant portion of them used to practice more than 5 h per day (Table 1). This increase the daily time spent in near-work activities that in turn is one the common risk factors of development of refractive errors (Alruwaili et al., 2018; Flitcroft, 2014). The current study showed that visual acuity in the better eye was low (Visual Acuity /C20 6/12) in 34.76% of the participants. The latter finding is higher than that reported by other studies conducted in Saudi Arabia (23.5%) (Parrey and Alswelmi, 2017) and (17.8%) (Alsaqr et al., 2018), or in India, 16.63% (Malhotra et al., 2020) of the adult population. Finding of the present study is closer to that reported by a study conducted in Pakistan which reported low visual acuity in 27% of the adult participants (Dineen et al., 2007). The variations may be due to differences in Visual Acuity cut-point, sample size, the study populations regarding genetic, ethnic, cultural and occupational differences as well as lifestyle and environmental factors.

Of the total 78 (18.6%) of the participants who have fulfilled refractometry, 83.3% of them were found to have refractive errors in the right eye. This finding confirms that refractive error is a real eye health problem in the population. Our finding is in consistence to that was shown by Alruwaili and co-workers (83.1%) among Saudi Medical students in Aljouf University; and Albatanony and co-workers (72.2%) among Saudi Medical and Pharmacy students in Qassim University; as well as another Nigerian study, (79.5%) (Alruwaili et al., 2018, Albatanony, 2016; Megbelayin et al., 2014). But our finding is higher than that was reported among Saudi adults in Arar city (45.8%) (Parrey and Elmorsy, 2019). An Indian study reported a refractive error prevalence of 60.81% among dental students (Agrawal et al., 2014). It has been well noted that refractive errors in general are directly proportional to the level of the education and intelligence of the study populations, as well as the extent of near-work activities (Alruwaili et al., 2018, Flitcroft, 2014). It has been reported that myopia is associated with near-work causes astigmatism due to incyclotorsion (Hashemi et al., 2018). In our study, astigmatism, 52.6%, was the most frequently encountered refractive error among the participants; followed by myopia, 26.9%; and hypermetropia 2.6%.

### Table 6

| Question                                      | Answer | Normal | RE  | Total | Chi-Square Value | P-Value |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------|--------|-----|-------|------------------|---------|
| History of refractive surgery                 | Yes    | F      | 0   | 1     | 1                | 0.203   | 0.653   |
|                                               |        | P      | 0.0%| 1.3%  | 1.3%             |         |
|                                               | No     | F      | 13  | 64    | 77               |         |
|                                               |        | P      | 16.7%| 82.1% | 98.7%            |         |
| Total                                         | F      | 13    | 65  | 78    |                  |         |
|                                               | P      | 16.7%| 83.3%| 100%  |                  |         |
| Family history of spectacles use              | Yes    | F      | 8   | 54    | 62               | 4.06*   | 0.049   |
|                                               |        | P      | 10.3%| 69.2% | 79.5%            |         |
|                                               | No     | F      | 5   | 11    | 16               |         |
|                                               |        | P      | 6.4%| 14.1% | 20.5%            |         |
| Total                                         | F      | 13    | 65  | 78    |                  |         |
|                                               | P      | 16.7%| 83.3%| 100%  |                  |         |
| Duration of mobile practicing                 | 2 hrs or less | F  | 3   | 2    | 5                | 7.22*   | 0.027   |
|                                               |        | P      | 3.8%| 2.6%  | 6.4%             |         |
|                                               | 3-5 hrs| F      | 3   | 19   | 22               |         |
|                                               |        | P      | 3.8%| 24.4% | 28.2%            |         |
|                                               | more than 5 hrs | F | 7   | 44   | 51               |         |
|                                               |        | P      | 9.0%| 56.4% | 65.4%            |         |
| Total                                         | F      | 13    | 65  | 78    |                  |         |
|                                               | P      | 16.7%| 83.3%| 100%  |                  |         |
| Present history of chronic diseases           | Yes    | F      | 0   | 6     | 6                | 1.30    | 0.254   |
|                                               |        | P      | 0.0%| 7.7%  | 7.7%             |         |
|                                               | No     | F      | 13  | 59    | 72               |         |
|                                               |        | P      | 16.7%| 75.6% | 92.3%            |         |
| Total                                         | F      | 13    | 65  | 78    |                  |         |
|                                               | P      | 16.7%| 83.3%| 100%  |                  |         |
| Past history of chronic diseases              | Yes    | F      | 2   | 2     | 4                | 4.37*   | 0.046   |
|                                               |        | P      | 2.6%| 2.6%  | 5.1%             |         |
|                                               | No     | F      | 11  | 63    | 74               |         |
|                                               |        | P      | 14.1%| 80.8% | 94.9%            |         |
| Total                                         | F      | 13    | 65  | 78    |                  |         |
|                                               | P      | 16.7%| 83.3%| 100%  |                  |         |
| Family history of systemic disease            | Yes    | F      | 9   | 44    | 53               | 0.012   | 0.914   |
|                                               |        | P      | 11.5%| 56.4% | 67.9%            |         |
|                                               | No     | F      | 4   | 21    | 25               |         |
|                                               |        | P      | 5.1%| 26.9% | 32.1%            |         |
| Total                                         | F      | 13    | 65  | 78    |                  |         |
|                                               | P      | 16.7%| 83.3%| 100%  |                  |         |

Notes: F: Frequency; P: Percentage; (*) There is a statistically significant relationship at (0.05) or less.
The current study confirms that refractive error is an important preventable cause of visual impairment and blindness. Astigmatism was the most frequently encountered refractive error among the participants; followed by myopia, and hypermetropia. We recommend periodical screening of undergraduate students of both genders as well as preschool and schoolchildren for refractive errors. Future works and health-measures are recommended to be implemented for improving the visual status in schoolchildren as well as undergraduate students. Further studies should classify refractive errors in both sphere and cylinder forms into high risk groups and low risk groups.
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