

Title: Assessing The Relationship Between Demand And Accessibility For Pediatric Ophthalmology Services By State In The United States

Authors: Benton Chuter¹, MS; BS; Alexander C. Lieu¹, Justin Huynh^{1,2}, BS; Jennifer J. Bu¹, MD; Linda M. Zangwill¹, PhD

Author Affiliations

1. Hamilton Glaucoma Center, Shiley Eye Institute, Viterbi Family Department of Ophthalmology, University of California San Diego

2. School of Medicine, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL, United States.

Author Statement: **Benton Chuter:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Software, Formal Analysis, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing, Visualization **Justin Huynh:** Writing - Review & Editing. **Alexander C. Lieu:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing - Review & Editing. **Jennifer J. Bu:** Writing - Review & Editing. **Linda M. Zangwill:** Supervision, Resources Writing- Reviewing and Editing.

Correspondence to:

Benton Chuter

Email: bentonchuter@gmail.com

Address:

4240 Porte De Merano

Unit 64

San Diego, CA 92122

Running title: Pediatric Ophthalmology: Demand vs. Accessibility in the US

Acknowledgement: This work is supported by National Institutes of Health/National Eye Institute Grants (R01EY034148, R01EY029058, R01EY11008, R01EY19869, R01EY027510, R01EY026574, EY018926, P30EY022589, K99EY030942, R01EY034146, T35EY033704, DP5OD029610); and an unrestricted grant from Research to Prevent Blindness (New York, NY). The sponsor or funding organization had no role in the design or conduct of this research.

Disclosures: B. Chuter and AC. Lieu, UCSD MEDGAP 2023. J. Huynh, T35: Short-Term National Research Service Award (NRSA); L.M. Zangwill, National Eye Institute (F), Carl Zeiss Meditec Inc. (F), Heidelberg Engineering GmbH (F), Optovue Inc. (F), Topcon Medical Systems Inc. (F), Zeiss Meditec (P), AISight Health (P), Abbvie (C), Digital Diagnostics (C);

Funding: This work is supported by National Institutes of Health/National Eye Institute Grants and an unrestricted grant from Research to Prevent Blindness (New York, NY). The sponsor or funding organization had no role in the design or conduct of this research.

LM. Zangwill has received grants from The Glaucoma Foundation, The National Institutes of Health, The National Eye Institute; grants and nonfinancial support from Heidelberg Engineering; nonfinancial support (equipment) from Carl Zeiss Meditec, Optovue, and Topcon. Dr. Zangwill has received consulting fees from AbbVie and Topcon Medical Systems. Dr. Zangwill is co-founder, inventor and board member and equity holder of AISight Health Inc.

Abstract

Purpose: To investigate the relationship between public demand for pediatric ophthalmology services and the accessibility of such services on a statewide basis in the United States, focusing on strabismus care.

Methods: Using Google Trends data, search volumes for "strabismus" were analyzed from January 2014 to December 2023. Pediatric ophthalmologist availability was assessed via the American Academy of Ophthalmology directory, normalized for state population size to create a relative demand index. Additional metrics from the United States Census Bureau and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention provided socioeconomic and health data. Correlation coefficients were used to explore relationships between search volumes, specialist availability, vision screening, socioeconomic factors, and demographic factors.

Results: The data revealed variability in public interest in pediatric ophthalmology across states, with Alaska showing the highest relative search volume for strabismus. The data also indicated notable disparities in pediatric ophthalmologist density, with North Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming having no pediatric ophthalmologists. A significant correlation was identified between pediatric ophthalmologist availability and vision screening ($R = 0.486$, $p < 0.001$). Negative correlations were observed between the relative demand index and urbanization ($R = -0.388$, $p = 0.007$), as well as the strabismus prevalence ($R = -0.455$, $p = 0.001$), indicating that urbanization and specialist distribution influence eyecare demand and access.

Conclusion: The findings highlight disparities in accessibility and demand for pediatric ophthalmology services across the US, influenced by urbanization and distribution of healthcare professionals. The study underscores the need for targeted interventions to improve access to care and bridge gaps in pediatric ophthalmology service provision.

INTRODUCTION

Strabismus, a condition characterized by the misalignment of the eyes, affects approximately 2% to 4% of the population in the United States.^{1–6} Strabismus can lead to amblyopia, loss of depth perception, and social stigma if not treated promptly and effectively.^{5,7–12} Medical care for strabismus may vary based on the severity and type, but surgical intervention to realign the eye muscles remains a common form of treatment.^{11,13–17}

Early treatment is crucial for optimal outcomes.^{18,19} Delayed or absent treatment can result in permanent visual impairment, significantly affecting quality of life.²⁰ Despite this, delays in treatment are not uncommon due to various factors, including limited access to specialized care, underdiagnosis, and socioeconomic barriers.¹⁹ Studies suggest that a significant percentage of children with strabismus do not receive timely care, which can exacerbate public health challenges associated with untreated pediatric eye conditions.^{21–25}

Lack of availability of pediatric ophthalmologists can contribute to these delays in strabismus care.^{26–29} Availability of pediatric ophthalmology services is critical, especially for conditions like strabismus that require early intervention for optimal outcomes.^{30,31} Pediatric ophthalmologists are relatively underpaid compared to other ophthalmologic specialties, contributing to this shortage.^{32,33} This financial undervaluation can disincentivize pursuit of pediatric ophthalmology as a specialty, further exacerbating the unmet need for specialized eye care for children.³⁴

This gap between supply and demand for pediatric ophthalmologist services has been previously explored.^{26,28,35} However, there remains significant uncertainty as to the unmet need for strabismus treatment on a statewide basis, and how that relates to various health and demographic factors. Search volumes for the term “strabismus”, as reported by Google Trends data, may provide additional clarity as to the demand for pediatric ophthalmologists. While Google Trends and other tools have been utilized to understand public interest and awareness in ophthalmology broadly³⁶, specific analyses correlating search volumes for strabismus with demographic data and health outcomes as well as pediatric ophthalmologist density on a state-by-state basis has not yet been performed.^{37–39}

This work aims to fill this gap by exploring how medical resources align with patterns in population demographics, economic conditions, and specific health metrics across different states as assessed through online search trends data available through Google Trends, pediatric ophthalmologist availability, and demographic and health outcome measures reported by the Census Bureau and the CDC. State-level data regarding ophthalmology and public health metrics is here explored to understand the relationship between ophthalmological services, public health indicators, and demographic factors.

We hypothesize that there are significant disparities in the availability of pediatric ophthalmology services and public demand for strabismus care across different states in the United States, influenced by urbanization, socioeconomic factors, and healthcare professional distribution.

This study could offer valuable insights into the public's awareness and understanding of strabismus, the demand for healthcare services, and potential barriers to care, contributing to improved public health strategies and resource allocation.

METHODS

Data Compilation

To assess demand, Google Trends data was employed. Accessed from trends.google.com, public search query data for the search term “strabismus” from January 1st, 2014, to December 31st, 2023 was acquired as Relative Search Volume (RSV).⁴⁰ The Google Trends platform calculates the RSV by comparing the monthly search frequency for “strabismus” against the total search volume across all states, subsequently averaging these values over the study duration and adjusting them to a 0-100 scale based on relative interest.⁴¹

To generate data concerning pediatric ophthalmologist availability, the American Academy of Ophthalmology (AAO) online database⁴² was used. The directory's accuracy was also confirmed by comparing listings with the results given by the “Find a Doctor” tool provided by the American Association for Pediatric Ophthalmology and Strabismus (AAPOS)⁴³, as validated by other prior studies.²⁹ In case of disagreement, the number provided by the AAO search tool was used. This data, representing the number of pediatric ophthalmologists (“Pediatric Ophthalmology & Strabismus”) per state, was normalized against the population figures from the 2021 State Census Bureau to calculate the physician density per 100,000 inhabitants.⁴⁴ The Relative Demand Index (RDI) was then calculated by dividing the RSV by the pediatric ophthalmologist density, with a separate RDI classification assigned to states devoid of any pediatric ophthalmologists indicating this status.⁴⁵

Incorporated into the study were additional datasets from the US Census Bureau and the Center for Disease Control (CDC) to assess poverty levels, urbanization, age, vision screening rates, and strabismus prevalence state by state.^{46–50} Poverty metrics were evaluated based on the proportion of individuals residing below 50% of the national poverty level.⁴⁸ Each state's urban or rural designation, alongside age-related demographics, were cataloged, facilitating a nuanced examination of the population structure.^{47,49} Strabismus prevalence data, along with vision screening frequencies, were derived from insurance claims, as reported by the CDC via the Vision and Eye Health Surveillance System (VEHSS)⁵⁰, providing a direct insight into the epidemiological aspects of eye health.⁵¹

These multifaceted data sources enabled a comprehensive evaluation of the intersections between socioeconomic backgrounds, healthcare accessibility, demographic factors, and eye health outcomes at the state level. By integrating search trends with pediatric ophthalmology service distribution, alongside sociodemographic and health surveillance data, this study offers an expansive overview of the determinants influencing eye health care demand and provision within the United States.

Statistical Analysis

Using these state-level data, the relationships between search volumes, specialist availability, vision screening, socioeconomic factors, and demographic factors were explored. The correlation between the relative search volume for pediatric ophthalmology and the availability of pediatric ophthalmologists was first evaluated to demonstrate public interest in pediatric eye health

issues relative to the accessibility of specialized care providers. To quantify the nature and extent of these relationships, correlation coefficients (R and R^2) were calculated to assess the strength and direction of linear associations. Corresponding p-values were also determined to judge statistical significance.

Correlations between the density of pediatric ophthalmologists (adjusted for state population) and the previously described socioeconomic and demographic factors were also evaluated. These factors included state poverty estimates, captured as the proportion of the state population living at or below 50 percent of the poverty threshold, urbanization, prevalence of strabismus, and rates of vision screening. This analysis evaluated how the distribution of pediatric eye care professionals correlates with factors such as economic hardship, urban versus rural residency, and key pediatric eye health indicators. Correlations for additional metrics, including 'Relative Search Volume' and 'Relative Demand Index', were each assessed against the same socioeconomic and health variables mentioned above.

RESULTS

Summary data

Data from all sources were compiled into a single reference table (Table 1). There was significant variability in relative search volumes for pediatric ophthalmology across different states, reflecting diverse levels of public interest and concern regarding pediatric eye health issues (Figure 1). Alaska demonstrated the highest public interest as measured by the relative search volume for strabismus, whereas Arizona showed a more modest RSV of 33, suggesting lower interest in pediatric eye health information.

Analysis of the American Academy of Ophthalmology (AAO) search tool data highlighted notable disparities in the number of pediatric ophthalmology and strabismus specialists available across states. This variation underscores the uneven distribution of specialized pediatric eye care professionals, potentially impacting the accessibility and quality of care for children's eye health. For example, California, with 87 specialists, stands out for its high specialist density, contrasting with states like Alaska, which has only 3 specialists, despite a high public interest in pediatric eye health.

Calculating normalized RDI from RSV and specialist density reveals notable differences across various states (Figure 2). In addition to North Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming, which have no pediatric ophthalmologists, West Virginia stands out with the highest normalized RDI value of 1.0, indicating high demand relative to its population size. In contrast, Hawaii registers the lowest with a value of approximately 0.165, showing the least demand in comparison to other states. On average, the states have a normalized RDI of about 0.416, with the median at roughly 0.383.

The Census Bureau data provided critical insights into urbanization, poverty, and the proportion of the population under age 5 across states. These socioeconomic and demographic variables

play a significant role in shaping the demand for pediatric ophthalmology services. The data reveals a complex landscape of urban versus rural residency, varying poverty levels, and the proportion of the population under age 5, all of which are crucial factors influencing access to and the need for pediatric eye care services.

Lastly, data from the VEHSS on strabismus prevalence and vision screening rates offered valuable perspectives on the state of pediatric eye health across the country (Figure 3). The prevalence of strabismus, a common condition affecting eye alignment in children, varied across states, as did the rates of vision screening, an essential preventive measure to detect eye health issues early. These metrics, when considered alongside Google trends data and specialist availability, highlight the intricate interplay between public health efforts, disease prevalence, and healthcare resource allocation in addressing pediatric eye health needs.

Associations with searches for strabismus

In the analysis of state-level data regarding ophthalmology and public health metrics, several key findings emerged (Table 2).

A moderate positive correlation was observed between the number of ophthalmologists and urbanization ($R = 0.302$, $p = 0.033$), indicating that more ophthalmologists are available in states with higher levels of urbanization. Furthermore, the analysis revealed a strong positive correlation between the number of ophthalmologists and the vision screening rate ($R = 0.486$, $p = 0.0003$), suggesting that the availability of ophthalmologists within states is associated with higher rates of vision screening.

The study also found a moderate negative correlation between the relative demand index and urbanization ($R = -0.388$, $p = 0.007$), displaying how the demand for ophthalmological services per pediatric ophthalmologist inversely relates to urbanization levels. Moreover, a moderate negative correlation between the relative demand index and the strabismus prevalence ($R = -0.455$, $p = 0.001$) was observed, indicating that higher demand for ophthalmological services per ophthalmologist is associated with lower prevalence of strabismus.

Another notable finding from this analysis is the weak and statistically non-significant correlation between the relative search volume for ophthalmological services and the poverty estimate, defined as 50 percent of the poverty level ($R = -0.081$, $p = 0.577$). This suggests that the search volume for these services does not strongly correlate with the poverty level across states.

DISCUSSION

Overall, this analysis underscores the complex relationship between public interest in pediatric eye health, the distribution of healthcare resources, socioeconomic factors, and health outcomes. By evaluating a total of 16 distinct pairings, this comprehensive approach provided nuanced insights into the dynamics between public demand for information on strabismus, the supply of healthcare resources, and various demographic and health factors. The methodology of this study offered a structured framework to assess the interconnections among healthcare

resource distribution, public interest, and demographic and health variables in pediatric ophthalmology.

The observed variance in search volumes suggests differences in awareness or perceived importance of pediatric eye health across regions. The relationship between urbanization and pediatric ophthalmologist availability relationship also underscores the role of urbanization in access to health care. The negative correlation between relative demand index and urbanization further indicates that urban areas, with their higher concentration of healthcare resources, experience relatively lower demand per provider compared to less urbanized areas. The positive association between availability of ophthalmologists within states and higher rates of vision screening emphasizes the importance of healthcare accessibility. The finding of a negative correlation between the relative demand index and the strabismus prevalence could similarly reflect both underdiagnosis due to a shortage of pediatric ophthalmologists and the impact of healthcare accessibility and resource distribution on managing and reducing the incidence and therefore prevalence of specific health conditions.

These findings provide insights into the distribution and demand for ophthalmological services across different states, highlighting the influence of urbanization and the availability of healthcare professionals on public health outcomes. Demographic factors, varying state by state, play a crucial role in the management and outcomes of strabismus, influencing access to care, treatment adherence, and the ability to afford necessary interventions. Addressing these disparities requires a multifaceted approach, including policy changes, increased funding for public health programs, and community-based initiatives aimed at reducing barriers to eye care. There remains a need for targeted public health interventions and resource allocation strategies to bridge gaps in care and improve pediatric eye health outcomes across diverse communities. Further research is warranted to continue to explore these relationships and their implications for healthcare policy and resource allocation.

Limitations of this study include Google searches for “strabismus” not for the purpose of seeking care; a portion of search volumes may originate from students, researchers, healthcare providers, or individuals with other interest in strabismus. Additionally, the AAO “Find an Ophthalmologist” tool relies on ophthalmologists to self-report their field of practice and location and may be incomplete. Though we use “strabismus” Google relative search volume as a proxy for interest and demand for pediatric ophthalmologists, strabismus is not limited to the pediatric population. Moreover, a decade worth of Google search volumes was analyzed in this study, while trends and demands may fluctuate year-to-year and therefore the relative search volumes spanning the decade may not reflect the relative search volumes in the most recent years. It should also be noted that Google trends search volume data is dynamically updated and subject to change as Google maintains this database. Also, operationalizing demand through search volume assumes that the need or desire for ophthalmologic services is accurately reflected by relative Internet search volume, which may not hold true across different populations. For example, the decrease in adjusted search rates in non-urban areas may not necessarily indicate reduced demand, but could be attributed to different healthcare-seeking behaviors among non-urban populations, among other potential latent structural differences.

Technological advancements present new opportunities for improving strabismus care. Recent developments in teleophthalmology, digital screening tools, and surgical innovations offer promising avenues for enhancing access to diagnostic and treatment services.^{52–54} Exploring the integration of these technologies into current care models could address some of the challenges related to healthcare access and the timely management of strabismus.

Strabismus represents a significant public health issue that requires timely and effective intervention to prevent long-term visual impairment. The challenges faced by pediatric ophthalmology, including issues related to underpayment and the resulting unfilled need for specialized care, compound the difficulties in managing this condition. This research addresses a gap in the scientific literature regarding the demand for pediatric ophthalmologists' services such as strabismus correction as captured by online search volume, and how this relates to physician availability, alongside various demographic and health factors, on a state-by-state basis.

References

1. Friedman DS, Repka MX, Katz J, et al. Prevalence of amblyopia and strabismus in white and African American children aged 6 through 71 months the Baltimore Pediatric Eye Disease Study. *Ophthalmology* 2009;116:2128–34.e1.
2. Ahmed N, Fashner J. Eye conditions in infants and children: amblyopia and strabismus. *FP Essent* 2019;484:18–22.
3. Repka MX, Lum F, Burugapalli B. Strabismus, Strabismus Surgery, and Reoperation Rate in the United States: Analysis from the IRIS Registry. *Ophthalmology* 2018;125:1646–1653.
4. Swain T, McGwin G. The Prevalence of Eye Injury in the United States, Estimates from a Meta-Analysis. *Ophthalmic Epidemiol* 2020;27:186–193.
5. Hashemi H, Pakzad R, Heydarian S, et al. Global and regional prevalence of strabismus: a comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis. *Strabismus* 2019;27:54–65.
6. Multi-ethnic Pediatric Eye Disease Study Group. Prevalence of amblyopia and strabismus in African American and Hispanic children ages 6 to 72 months the multi-ethnic pediatric eye disease study. *Ophthalmology* 2008;115:1229–1236.e1.
7. van de Graaf ES, Borsboom GJJM, van der Sterre GW, et al. Differences in quality-of-life dimensions of Adult Strabismus Quality of Life and Amblyopia & Strabismus Questionnaires. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol* 2017;255:1851–1858.
8. Koklanis K, Abel LA, Aroni R. Psychosocial impact of amblyopia and its treatment: a multidisciplinary study. *Clin Experiment Ophthalmol* 2006;34:743–750.
9. Bridge H. Effects of cortical damage on binocular depth perception. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 2016;371.
10. Fieß A, Elflein HM, Urschitz MS, et al. Prevalence of Strabismus and Its Impact on Vision-Related Quality of Life: Results from the German Population-Based Gutenberg Health Study. *Ophthalmology* 2020;127:1113–1122.
11. Oke I, Hall N, Elze T, et al. Adjustable Suture Technique Is Associated with Fewer Strabismus Reoperations in the Intelligent Research in Sight Registry. *Ophthalmology* 2022;129:1028–1033.
12. Leffler CT, Vaziri K, Schwartz SG, et al. Rates of reoperation and abnormal binocularity following strabismus surgery in children. *Am J Ophthalmol* 2016;162:159–166.e9.
13. Gunton KB, Wasserman BN, DeBenedictis C. Strabismus. *Prim Care* 2015;42:393–407.
14. Flanders M, Wise J. Surgical management of strabismus following scleral buckling procedures. *Can J Ophthalmol* 1984;19:17–20.
15. Chang MY, Coleman AL, Tseng VL, Demer JL. Surgical interventions for vertical strabismus in superior oblique palsy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2017;11:CD012447.
16. Catalano JD. Strabismus. *Pediatr Ann* 1990;19:289, 292–7.
17. Heidary G, Aakalu VK, Binenbaum G, et al. Adjustable sutures in the treatment of strabismus: A report by the american academy of ophthalmology. *Ophthalmology* 2022;129:100–109.
18. Wang L, Nelson LB. One muscle strabismus surgery. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol* 2010;21:335–340.
19. Simonsz HJ, Kolling GH, Unnebrink K. Final report of the early vs. late infantile strabismus surgery study (ELISSS), a controlled, prospective, multicenter study. *Strabismus* 2005;13:169–199.
20. Li D, Chan VF, Virgili G, et al. Impact of vision impairment and ocular morbidity and their treatment on quality of life in children: A systematic review. *Ophthalmology* 2024;131:188–207.

21. Wen G, McKean-Cowdin R, Varma R, et al. General health-related quality of life in preschool children with strabismus or amblyopia. *Ophthalmology* 2011;118:574–580.
22. Sharma IP. The pediatric eye health challenge beyond 2020. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2021;105:555–556.
23. Hatt SR, Leske DA, Castañeda YS, et al. Association of Strabismus With Functional Vision and Eye-Related Quality of Life in Children. *JAMA Ophthalmol* 2020;138:528–535.
24. Kuo AA, Etzel RA, Chilton LA, et al. Primary care pediatrics and public health: meeting the needs of today's children. *Am J Public Health* 2012;102:e17–23.
25. Robaei D, Rose KA, Ojaimi E, et al. Causes and associations of amblyopia in a population-based sample of 6-year-old Australian children. *Arch Ophthalmol* 2006;124:878–884.
26. Bernstein BK, Nelson LB. Workforce issues in pediatric ophthalmology. *J Pediatr Ophthalmol Strabismus* 2020;57:9–11.
27. Lee KE, Sussberg JA, Nelson LB, Thuma TBT. Unanswered questions pertaining to the economic and workforce issues in pediatric ophthalmology. *J Pediatr Ophthalmol Strabismus* 2023;60:163–169.
28. Lee PP, Relles DA, Jackson CA. Subspecialty distributions of ophthalmologists in the workforce. *Arch Ophthalmol* 1998;116:917–920.
29. Paul ME, Frempong T. Treatment rate of strabismus and amblyopia is associated with the location of pediatric ophthalmologists in the United States. *J AAPOS* 2024:103868.
30. Saxena R, Singh D, Jethani J, et al. Pediatric ophthalmology, strabismus and neuro-ophthalmology practice in the COVID-19 era: All India Ophthalmological Society guidelines. *Indian J Ophthalmol* 2020;68:1300–1305.
31. Peters GB, Simon JW, Zabal-Ratner J, Malone A. Developmental delay and poverty in the strabismus clinic. *J AAPOS* 1999;3:363–365.
32. Simon JW, Bradfield Y, Smith J, et al. Recruitment and manpower in pediatric ophthalmology and strabismus. *J AAPOS* 2007;11:336–340.
33. Dombrow M, Engel HM. Rates of strabismus surgery in the United States: implications for manpower needs in pediatric ophthalmology. *J AAPOS* 2007;11:330–335.
34. Dotan G, Karr DJ, Levin AV. Pediatric ophthalmology and strabismus fellowship Match outcomes, 2000-2015. *J AAPOS* 2017;21:181.e1-181.e8.
35. Walsh HL, Parrish A, Hucko L, et al. Access to pediatric ophthalmological care by geographic distribution and US population demographic characteristics in 2022. *JAMA Ophthalmol* 2023;141:242–249.
36. Akosman S, Tran E, Rosenberg S, et al. Patient demand for ophthalmologists in the united states: A google trends analysis. *Ophthalmic Epidemiol* 2023:1–7.
37. Skrzypczak T, Jany A, Michałowicz J, et al. Public Interest in Cataract Surgery: Analysis and Implications of Google Trends Data from 14 European Countries. *Ophthalmic Epidemiol* 2022;29:108–115.
38. Ahuja AS, Rahimy E, Sridhar J. Tracking online interest in artificial intelligence in ophthalmology using google trends. *Semin Ophthalmol* 2023;38:644–647.
39. Pradeep T, Ravipati A, Melachuri S, Fu R. More than just a stye: identifying seasonal patterns using google trends, and a review of infodemiological literature in ophthalmology. *Orbit* 2023;42:130–137.
40. Nuti SV, Wayda B, Ranasinghe I, et al. The use of google trends in health care research: a systematic review. *PLoS ONE* 2014;9:e109583.
41. Vaughan L, Chen Y. Data mining from web search queries: A comparison of google trends and baidu index. *J Assoc Inf Sci Technol* 2015;66:13–22.

42. American Academy of Ophthalmology. Find an Ophthalmologist. 2024. Available at: <https://secure.aao.org/aao/find-ophthalmologist> [Accessed March 19, 2024].
43. The American Association for Pediatric Ophthalmology and Strabismus. Find a Doctor. 2024. Available at: https://secure.aapos.org/i4a/memberDirectory/index.cfm?directory_id=7&pageID=3322 [Accessed March 19, 2024].
44. Barreto T, Jetty A, Eden AR, et al. Distribution of physician specialties by rurality. *J Rural Health* 2021;37:714–722.
45. Doepker CP, Pakhchanian H, Raiker R, et al. Google trends data of radiologists who accept medicare: A potential tool for predicting state demand. *Curr Probl Diagn Radiol* 2022;51:46–50.
46. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, Health and Medicine Division, Board on Population Health and Public Health Practice, Committee on Public Health Approaches to Reduce Vision Impairment and Promote Eye Health. Making eye health a population health imperative: vision for tomorrow. (Welp A, Woodbury RB, McCoy MA, Teutsch SM, eds.). Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2016.
47. U.S. Census Bureau. Decennial Census, DEC 116th Congressional District Summary File, Table H2. URBAN AND RURAL. 2010. Available at: <https://www.google.com/url?q=https://data.census.gov/table/DECENNIALCD1162010.H2?q%3Durbanization&sa=D&source=docs&ust=1711327368394090&usg=AOvVaw2256qJPf0TtFb603U516DH> [Accessed March 19, 2024].
48. U.S. Census Bureau. American Community Survey, ACS 1-Year Estimates Subject Tables, Table S1701. Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months. 2022. Available at: <https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST1Y2022.S1701?q=poverty> [Accessed March 19, 2024].
49. U.S. Census Bureau. American Community Survey, ACS 1-Year Estimates Subject Tables, Table S0101. Age and Sex. 2022. Available at: <https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST1Y2022.S0101?q=population> [Accessed March 24, 2024].
50. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Vision Health Initiative. Vision & Eye Health Surveillance System (VEHSS). 2024. Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/visionhealth/vehss/project/index.html> [Accessed March 19, 2024].
51. Elam AR, Tseng VL, Rodriguez TM, et al. Disparities in vision health and eye care. *Ophthalmology* 2022;129:e89–e113.
52. Sreelatha OK, Ramesh SV. Teleophthalmology: improving patient outcomes? *Clin Ophthalmol* 2016;10:285–295.
53. Kalavar M, Hua H-U, Sridhar J. Teleophthalmology: an essential tool in the era of the novel coronavirus 2019. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol* 2020;31:366–373.
54. Conway MP, Forristal MT, Treacy MP, Duignan ES. Investigating the role of optometrists in teleophthalmology and the implications of increasing access to advanced imaging techniques and digital referral: A systematic search and review. *Telemed J E Health* 2021;27:974–981.

Figure 1. Google Trends Relative Search Volumes (RSVs) for search term “strabismus” from 1/1/14 - 1/31/23 displayed for each state, with increased color density corresponding to increased RSV.




Figure 2. Normalized Relative Demand Index (RDI) as calculated from Relative Search Volume (RSV) and specialist density, with increased color density corresponding to increased RDI.




Figure 3. Insurance claims data as reported by the CDC displayed per state, with increased color density corresponding to increased rate or prevalence for **A)** Patient screening rates, captured as percent of total population each year and **B)** Strabismus prevalence (%) per state, for population under age 18.




Table 1: All Google trend, pediatric ophthalmologist density, and other demographic and socioeconomic data, displayed per state.

State	Relative Search Volume	POaS Specialists	Specialist Density	Normalized RDI	Population Under Age 5	Rate of Vision Screening	Strabismus Prevalence (%)	Urbanization Index	Poverty Index
Alabama	40	7	0.137	0.687	0.056	0.050	1.580	0.673	0.073
Alaska	100	3	0.409	0.575	0.063	0.070	2.320	0.668	0.053
Arizona	33	13	0.175	0.444	0.053	0.460	1.680	0.721	0.063
Arkansas	38	4	0.130	0.686	0.058	0.020	1.200	0.664	0.080
California	39	87	0.223	0.411	0.054	0.310	1.330	0.680	0.059
Colorado	31	22	0.374	0.195	0.052	0.180	1.580	0.689	0.047
Connecticut	45	12	0.332	0.319	0.049	0.330	3.480	0.773	0.049
Delaware	36	4	0.388	0.219	0.053	0.270	2.090	0.722	0.046
Florida	36	50	0.221	0.383	0.050	0.100	1.580	0.760	0.059
Georgia	29	17	0.154	0.443	0.057	0.130	1.570	0.645	0.061
Hawaii	39	8	0.557	0.165	0.055	0.140	2.320	0.686	0.053
Idaho	36	2	0.102	0.832	0.058	0.040	1.150	0.568	0.045
Illinois	37	45	0.359	0.243	0.054	0.050	2.140	0.793	0.061
Indiana	35	9	0.131	0.628	0.058	0.120	1.260	0.706	0.061
Iowa	41	7	0.218	0.442	0.056	0.030	2.020	0.681	0.052
Kansas	37	4	0.136	0.640	0.060	0.190	1.700	0.726	0.055
Kentucky	39	7	0.155	0.594	0.058	0.100	1.700	0.673	0.073
Louisiana	37	12	0.262	0.332	0.059	0.060	1.900	0.743	0.083
Maine	45	2	0.143	0.739	0.044	0.010	1.770	0.697	0.048
Maryland	39	32	0.518	0.177	0.057	0.410	2.970	0.720	0.048
Massachusetts	41	31	0.443	0.218	0.049	0.270	2.610	0.768	0.051
Michigan	35	22	0.219	0.376	0.053	0.140	2.430	0.776	0.064
Minnesota	39	18	0.314	0.293	0.057	0.160	1.900	0.695	0.044
Mississippi	37	4	0.136	0.640	0.058	0.040	0.830	0.647	0.085
Missouri	41	14	0.226	0.427	0.057	0.090	1.470	0.742	0.061
Montana	37	4	0.353	0.247	0.051	0.120	1.240	0.649	0.056
Nebraska	43	5	0.253	0.401	0.062	0.090	1.970	0.688	0.050
Nevada	34	6	0.188	0.426	0.054	0.110	0.830	0.711	0.064
New Hampshire	45	6	0.428	0.248	0.045	0.110	2.330	0.684	0.034
New Jersey	35	33	0.355	0.232	0.055	0.350	2.820	0.746	0.044
New Mexico	38	6	0.284	0.315	0.050	0.070	1.560	0.747	0.077
New York	41	79	0.404	0.239	0.054	0.340	3.970	0.769	0.073
North Carolina	36	23	0.212	0.399	0.055	0.350	1.510	0.657	0.057
North Dakota	50	0	0.000	Max	0.061	0.040	0.950	0.637	0.054
Ohio	40	34	0.288	0.326	0.056	0.060	2.680	0.781	0.063
Oklahoma	35	11	0.271	0.304	0.060	0.020	1.610	0.680	0.071
Oregon	32	11	0.260	0.290	0.047	0.260	1.710	0.710	0.058
Pennsylvania	48	40	0.309	0.366	0.052	0.220	2.430	0.763	0.055
Rhode Island	44	5	0.456	0.227	0.048	0.170	1.940	0.805	0.050
South Carolina	36	10	0.186	0.455	0.053	0.060	1.920	0.663	0.064
South Dakota	41	3	0.326	0.296	0.063	0.070	1.290	0.614	0.055
Tennessee	37	12	0.168	0.517	0.057	0.240	1.670	0.654	0.060
Texas	39	42	0.138	0.667	0.063	0.520	1.430	0.599	0.064
Utah	38	6	0.176	0.510	0.068	0.150	1.270	0.535	0.038
Vermont	44	0	0.000	Max	0.043	0.120	1.750	0.663	0.042
Virginia	37	29	0.333	0.262	0.055	0.130	1.920	0.668	0.052
Washington	33	15	0.192	0.405	0.054	0.090	1.890	0.674	0.053
West Virginia	48	2	0.113	1.000	0.049	0.070	1.700	0.738	0.080
Wisconsin	34	15	0.254	0.315	0.052	0.060	1.710	0.739	0.049
Wyoming	26	0	0.000	Max	0.052	0.020	0.940	0.727	0.048

POaS - Pediatric Ophthalmology and Strabismus.

RDI - Relative Demand Index

Table 2: Associations with Pediatric Ophthalmologist Density, Relative Search Volume, and Relative Demand Index. All calculated correlation coefficients (R), determination coefficients (R²), and associated p-values.

Variable 1	Variable 2	R	R ²	p-value
Relative Search Volume	Pediatric Ophthalmologist Density	-0.102	0.010	0.497
Pediatric Ophthalmologist Density	Poverty Index	-0.407	0.166	0.005
-	Population Under Age 5	-0.232	0.054	0.117
-	Urbanization Index	0.380	0.144	0.008
-	Strabismus Prevalence	0.389	0.151	0.007
-	Vision Screening Rate	0.227	0.052	0.125
Relative Search Volume	Poverty Index	-0.089	0.008	0.553
-	Population Under Age 5	0.140	0.020	0.347
-	Urbanization Index	0.018	0.000	0.902
-	Strabismus Prevalence	0.237	0.056	0.109
-	Vision Screening Rate	-0.118	0.014	0.430
Relative Demand Index	Poverty Index	0.357	0.127	0.014
-	Population Under Age 5	0.218	0.047	0.141
-	Urbanization Index	-0.388	0.150	0.007
-	Strabismus Prevalence	-0.455	0.207	0.001
-	Vision Screening Rate	-0.256	0.065	0.083