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Figure 1. Study flow chart

Total screened: children aged 11-15, urban and rural government schools in and around Bangalore (n=23,345)

Failed screening i.e. VA <6/9 in both eyes (n=694)

- Excluded as 6/9 in one or both eyes after VA retested by optometrist (n=39)
- Excluded for other reasons (n=120)
  - VA does not improve by ≥ 2 lines (n=38)
  - cycloplegic refraction required (n=45)
  - ocular pathology (n=33)
  - other (n=4)

Assessed for ready made spectacles (n=535)

- Excluded on account of prescription (n=71)
  - VA with SE >1 line worse than full prescription (n=55)
  - Anisometropic SphEq (n=16)
- Excluded on account of spectacle frames available (n=4)
- IPD not between 56-62mm (n=4)

Recruited and randomised (n=460)

Allocated to ready-made (n=232)
- Followed up 79.3% (n=184)
- Wearing spectacles at follow-up 75.5% (n=139)

Allocated to custom-made (n=228)
- Followed up 78.1% (n=178)
- Wearing spectacles at follow-up 73.6% (n=131)