Correspondence

Depth perception in strabismus

SIR, Recently Henson and Williams published an article entitled 'Depth perception in strabismus.'¹ Regrettably, the authors did not review the literature completely. If they had, they would have noted that Cooper and Warshowsky² scientifically evaluated monocular cues in the Titmus stereo test, and that Cooper and Feldman³⁻⁶ looked at the availability of monocular cues in random dot stereograms. In those studies they found that monocular cues are used by patients when a line stereogram is made up of symmetrical shapes decentered in a small area, i.e., Titmus circle test, and that monocular cues are rarely used by subjects viewing random dot stereograms. Cooper and Feldman also found, as Henson and Williams reported, that small-angle strabismics have real stereopsis on line stereograms, while large-angle strabismics do not.⁶ This is not surprising in light of the fact that fusion is not needed for stereopsis, and that stereopsis has been reported with up to 14° of disparity in normals.

Contrary to Henson and Williams, we have not found any constant strabismics who appreciate random dot stereograms.³ This is consistent with Fender's and Julesz's findings in normals that fusion is needed for appreciation of a random dot stereogram. Another way of saying the same thing is that the deviation *must* be smaller than Panum's area for appreciation of a random dot stereogram. The difference between our findings and Henson and Williams's may be explained if some or all of their subjects were intermittent strabismics. Three of the 7 subjects who had good stereopsis were defined as nonamblyopic, small-angle, constant exotropes. This is an extremely rare situation—one which we have never seen. In addition the esotropes who demonstrated 'good' stereopsis had a mean angle of deviation, 3.3Δ with best optical correction and no real amblyopia. This is such a small angle of deviation that it is possible that all these patients were actually intermittent. (No cover testing was reported by Henson and Williams during actual testing of stereopsis.) It is our clinical and research experience that any patient with 20 seconds of stereoacuity must be bifoveal and cannot have a constant strabismus. Thus we suspect that most of the Henson and Williams subjects were intermittent strabismics, not constant strabismics, as they reported.

In conclusion, we have found that small-angle strabismics have reduced stereoacuity on lined stereograms and no stereopsis on random dot stereograms. Large-angle strabismics possess no stereopsis on either line or random dot stereograms.

State College of Optometry,
State University of New York,
100 East 24th Street,
New York,
NY 10010,
USA.

JEFFREY COOPER
JERRY FELDMAN

References

- 1 Henson D, Williams D. Depth perception in strabismus. *Br J Ophthalmol* 1980; **64**: 349-53.

- 2 Cooper J, Warshowsky J. Lateral displacement as a response cue in the Titmus stereo test. *Am J Optom Physiol Opt* 1977; **54**: 537-41.
- 3 Cooper J, Feldman J. Operant conditioning and assessment of stereopsis in children. *Am J Optom Physiol Opt* 1978; **55**: 532-42.
- 4 Cooper J, Feldman J. Random dot stereogram performances by strabismic, amblyopic and ocular pathology patients in an operant discrimination task. *Am J Optom Physiol Opt* 1978; **55**: 599-609.
- 5 Cooper J, Feldman J, Medlin D. Comparing stereoscopic performance of children using the Titmus, TNO, and Randot stereo tests. *J Am Optom Assoc* 1979; **50**: 821-5.
- 6 Cooper J, Feldman J. Assessing the Frisby stereo test under monocular conditions. *J Am Optom Assoc* 1979; **50**: 807-9.

Spasmus nutans or congenital nystagmus? Classification according to objective criteria

SIR, Several years ago in this journal we and colleagues published recordings of head and eye movements obtained from a child who was presumed to be an example of spasmus nutans.¹ The essential features of this case were the presence of a high frequency oscillatory nystagmus in the horizontal plane and that during fixation of targets of interest the child shook his head from side to side in order to improve visual acuity. During the head shaking the nystagmus was suppressed or 'turned off' in some way, and the child was left with a normal 'doll's head' reflex eye movement which stabilised gaze during the head oscillation.

It was obviously dangerous at the time to make an inductive generalisation on the basis of one example. However, we were motivated to do so and to publish because it was apparently the first time that recordings had been obtained in this condition, and they had revealed a mechanism which accounted for the combination of head and eye movements.

Since that time we have encountered 2 similar cases. One reported to us by Dr David Zee, of the Johns Hopkins Hospital, was by all accounts identical to the one we reported. A third child referred by Dr John Lee, of the Moorfields Eye Hospital, was examined in the MRC Neurotology Laboratory. The patient was a Sudanese child of 3 years of age with no family history of visual or neurological abnormalities. Her parents reported that at the age of 6 months they noticed that her eyes had begun to oscillate to and fro and were definite that this abnormality had not been present before that age. Some time between 6 months and 1 year of age it was noticed that when she looked at an object intently she held her head down with eyes deviated upwards in the orbit, and her head shook rhythmically from side to side. Examination confirmed the parents' observations. There was no manifest strabismus. Recordings of head and eye movements revealed a sinusoidal conjugate nystagmus which was intermittent and of variable amplitude. When the oscillation persisted its frequency was 10 to 11 Hz. During head shaking with the eyes in the upwards deviated position the nystagmus ceased, and the child had normal compensatory eye movements. When the head shaking occurred, it was at a frequency of exactly 4 Hz.

There is a possibility that our 3 cases should be classified with congenital nystagmus, but, if so, they would form a