

Table S6. Comparison of characteristics of participants in the MI-SIGHT program by who returned for a repeat screening

	In-person		Phone Call		No Repeat Screening		
	Repeat Screening (n=766)		Repeat Screening (n=177)		(n=1720)		
Continuous Variable	N	Mean (SD), Median	N	Mean (SD), Median	N	Mean (SD), Median	Holm P-value*
Initial Visit Age (years)	766	55.8 (14.2), 57.7	177	55.5 (14.8), 57.7	1720	54.3 (15.8), 56.5	0.3756
Initial Visit LogMAR VA - Better Eye	765	0.09 (0.16), 0.00	177	0.12 (0.17), 0.00	1719	0.13 (0.23), 0.00	0.0012 ^a
Categorical Variable	#/total (Column %)		#/total (Column %)		#/total (Column %)		Holm P-value*
Site							0.0220 ^b
Free Clinic	354/766 (46.2)		56/177 (31.6)		753/1720 (43.8)		
FQHC	412/766 (53.8)		121/177 (68.4)		967/2730 (56.2)		
Sex - Male	250/760 (32.9)		67/174 (38.5)		675/1702 (39.7)		0.0580
Race							1.0000
White	226/703 (32.2)		54/163 (33.1)		509/1545 (32.9)		
Black	397/703 (56.5)		95/163 (58.3)		833/1545 (53.9)		
Asian	30/703 (4.3)		5/163 (3.1)		90/1545 (5.8)		
Other/Multiracial	50/703 (7.1)		9/163 (5.5)		113/1545 (7.3)		

Ethnicity - Hispanic	81/643 (12.6)	18/153 (11.8)	210/1445 (14.5)	1.0000
Education				
<HS	47/752 (6.3)	11/174 (6.3)	189/1684 (11.2)	
HS or Equivalent	214/752 (28.5)	61/174 (35.1)	563/1684 (33.4)	
Some College	241/752 (32.1)	60/174 (34.5)	527/1684 (31.3)	<0.0001 ^c
College Degree	140/752 (18.6)	16/174 (9.2)	248/1684 (14.73)	
Graduate/Professional Degree	110/752 (14.6)	26/174 (14.9)	157/1684 (9.3)	
Income				
<\$10k	108/626 (17.3)	29/158 (18.4)	360/1334 (27.0)	
\$10k-\$19,999	131/626 (20.9)	34/158 (21.5)	288/1334 (21.6)	
\$20k-\$29,999	141/626 (22.5)	34/158 (21.5)	243/1334 (18.2)	
\$30k-\$49,999	133/626 (21.3)	35/158 (22.2)	248/1334 (18.6)	0.0060 ^d
\$50k-\$69,999	63/626 (10.1)	10/158 (6.3)	97/1334 (7.3)	
\$70k+	50/626 (8.0)	16/158 (10.1)	98/1334 (7.4)	
Unemployed/Retired/Disable/ Homemaker/Student	413/753 (54.9)	92/175 (52.6)	1014/1685 (60.2)	0.1168
No Health Insurance	142/750 (18.9)	27/175 (15.4)	411/1673 (24.6)	0.0091 ^e
Primary Language not English	96/760 (12.6)	14/177 (7.9)	292/1712 (17.1)	0.0060 ^f

Diabetes	204/744 (27.4)	60/174 (34.5)	463/1671 (27.7)	0.7450
Hypertension	361/739 (48.9)	94/171 (55.0)	789/1659 (47.6)	0.7450
Current Smoker	104/753 (13.8)	35/174 (20.1)	337/1700 (19.8)	0.0168
Self-reported Glaucoma	37/616 (6.0)	6/159 (3.8)	71/1361 (5.2)	1.0000
Family History Glaucoma	193/616 (31.3)	46/159 (28.9)	340/1361 (25.0)	0.1026
Last dilated eye exam >2 year/Never	326/579 (56.3)	89/131 (67.9)	812/1315 (61.8)	0.1183

MI-SIGHT, Michigan Screening & Intervention for Glaucoma and Eye Health through Telemedicine; FQHC, Federally Qualified Health Center; SD, Standard Deviation; VA, Visual Acuity; HS, High School; k, \$1000

*P-value testing differences between groups, including ANOVA (age), Kruskal-Wallis test (presenting logMAR VA), Chi-square tests (categorical variables with cell counts >5), and Fisher's exact tests (categorical variables with cell counts <5)

^aDSCF pairwise comparisons show that participants with in-person repeat screenings had significantly better presenting VA than those with phone call repeat screenings (p=0.0254) or those who did not have a repeat screening (p<0.0001)

^bPost-hoc pairwise comparisons show that a significantly larger percentage of participants with repeat screenings via phone call were from the FQHC than participants whose repeat screening was in-person (p=0.0004) or those who did not have a repeat screening (p=0.0019)

^cPost-hoc pairwise comparisons show that a significantly larger percentage of participants with in-person repeat screenings had a college education than participants with phone call repeat screenings ($p=0.0028$); a significantly smaller percentage of participants with in-person repeat screenings had less than a high school education ($p=0.0001$) or a high school education ($p=0.0149$), but a significantly larger percentage had a college ($p=0.0154$) or graduate education ($p=0.0001$) than participants who did not have a repeat screening; a significantly smaller percentage of participants with a phone call repeat screening had less than a high school education ($p=0.0470$), but a significantly larger percentage had a college ($p=0.0466$) or graduate education ($p=0.0179$) than participants who did not have a repeat screening.

^dPost-hoc pairwise comparisons show that a significantly smaller percentage of participants with in-person repeat screenings reported income of $< \$10,000$ ($p<0.0001$) but a significantly larger percentage reported income of $\$20,000-\$29,999$ ($p=0.0251$) or $\$50,000-\$69,999$ ($p=0.0353$) than participants that did not have a repeat screening; a significantly smaller percentage of participants with phone call repeat screenings reported income of $< \$10,000$ than participants that did not have a repeat screening ($p=0.0194$)

^ePost-hoc pairwise comparisons show that a significantly larger percentage of participants with in-person repeat screenings ($p=0.0023$) and phone call repeat screenings ($p=0.0068$) had health care than participants who did not have a repeat screening

^fPost-hoc pairwise comparisons show that a significantly smaller percentage of participants with in-person repeat screenings ($p=0.0053$) or phone call repeat screenings ($p=0.0017$) reported their primary language was not English than participants who did not have a repeat screening

