

- 13 Seddon JM, Christen WG, Mansen JE, LaMotte FS, Glynn RJ, Buring JE. *et al.* The use of vitamin supplements and risk of cataract among US male physicians. *Am J Publ Health* 1994; 84: 788–92.
- 14 Mares-Perlman JA, Klein BEK, Klein R, Ritter LL. Relation between lens opacities and vitamin and mineral supplement use. *Ophthalmology* 1994; 101: 315–25.
- 15 Reznick AZ, Cross CE, Hu M. Modification of plasma proteins by cigarette smoke as measured by protein carbonyl formation. *Biochem J* 1992; 286: 607–11.
- 16 Harding JJ. Cigarette smoking and risk of cataract. *JAMA* 1993; 269: 747.
- 17 Crompton M, Rixon KC, Harding JJ. Aspirin prevents carbamylation of soluble lens proteins and prevents cyanate-induced phase-separation opacities in vitro: a possible mechanism by which aspirin could prevent cataract. *Exp Eye Res* 1985; 40: 297–311.
- 18 Beswick HT, Harding JJ. Conformational changes induces in bovine lens α -crystallin by carbamylation. Relevance to cataract. *Biochem J* 1984; 223: 221–7.
- 19 Riley ML, Harding JJ. The reaction of malondialdehyde with lens proteins and the protective effect of aspirin. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 1993; 1158: 107–12.
- 20 Ganea E, Rixon KC, Harding JJ. Binding of glucose, galactose and pyridoxal phosphate to lens crystallins. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 1994; 1226: 286–90.

Automated perimetry in glaucoma – room for improvement?

The objective of static threshold automated perimetry in glaucoma is the efficient detection of visual field defects and the accurate measurement of progressive field loss.

Automated perimetry is a psychophysical test of visual function necessarily dependent upon the subjective response of the patient. The test involves the detection of a stimulus the luminance of which is greater than that of the background of a given constant luminance. Threshold static perimetry expresses the minimum detectable stimulus brightness at individual locations within the visual field in terms of sensitivity units (decibels) and provides a contour of the height and shape of the hill of vision. The numerical information, which is an estimate of the true threshold, is usually compared with that from a database of normal individuals of the same age. Abnormality of the visual field at any single examination can be expressed by a variety of graphical techniques such as the grey scale plot, and by statistical procedures such as the visual field indices,^{1,2} cluster analysis,³ the total and pattern probability plots,⁴ and the glaucoma hemifield test.⁵ Visual field progression can be evaluated for the field as a whole, for any region of the field, or for any stimulus location in terms of comparison with results from previous examinations by using regression analysis techniques.^{2,6,6a} The change in sensitivity at a given stimulus location can also be compared with the expected variation in stable glaucoma patients.⁵ The explanation for any statistically proved progressive field loss should always be compatible with the clinical assessment.

Automated perimetry is limited by the fact that the outcome of any given examination is affected by a large number of factors including those specific to the patient and/or technician and those particular to the measurement technique. Such factors determine the absolute value of sensitivity at the given location and also the variability in the response at that location both within a single visual field examination (that is, the short term fluctuation) and between examinations (that is, the long term fluctuation),^{7,8} and can limit the usefulness of automated perimetry for the evaluation of visual field progression. Indeed, the level of fluctuation can be such that it is often impossible from inspection of the results of two sequential visual field examinations to determine whether progression has occurred. Confirmation of progression often necessitates a repeat examination with the consequent resource implications. Indeed, progression is frequently deemed to have occurred only by retrospective examination of a large series of field plots.

Some factors can be controlled by the clinician, such as the pupil size^{9,10} and the correction of refractive error,^{11,12} but other factors may be more difficult to eliminate.

Indeed, the coexistence of cataract (which may be progressing) also affects the quality of the recorded information and confounds interpretation of the data at any given examination and during follow up.^{13,14} Probably the single most important factor influencing the quality of the visual field examination, and yet largely ignored by current perimetric software, is the interaction of the nature of the patient response with the demands of the examination procedure. Some evidence as to the quality of patient performance is given by the reply to the catch trials which assess the number of fixation losses, and the number of false positive and false negative responses. Nevertheless, the performance of the patient is likely to be governed by factors such as motivation and anxiety. Furthermore, the current psychophysical determination of perimetric threshold using a bracketing technique is generated from substantially more stimulus presentations than the clinical ideal. Indeed, the initial lack of familiarity with the requirements of the task and the relatively long duration of the examination have been manifested in the learning and fatiguing effects respectively. The learning effect – namely, an improvement in sensitivity at a given stimulus location, can occur within a single examination of a given eye,¹⁵ between eyes at the same visit,¹⁵ and between subsequent examinations.^{15,16} The improvement is particularly noticeable over short follow up periods, and is more pronounced at the extremities of the central 30 degree field.^{4,17} The fatiguing effect, whereby sensitivity decreases during the examination, becomes more pronounced as the length of the examination increases,^{18,19} is greater in the second eye examined,²⁰ and increases with age.²¹

To date, attempts to enhance the quality of the patient response have largely centred on the development of methods for improving data acquisition. The introduction of faster thresholding strategies has reduced the duration of the perimetric examination largely at the expense of increased variability compared with the standard threshold strategy.^{22–25} Other approaches for improving data acquisition have included the use of fewer stimulus locations,²⁶ larger stimuli,^{27,28} or repeated thresholding of the given stimulus locations.²⁹ No attempt has been made to enhance the quality of the recorded data. The contribution of Fitzke and colleagues, published in this issue (p 207), illustrates the potential of filtering techniques (frequently used in image processing) to reduce the variability, inherent in static threshold automated perimetry and hence improve the quality of the data. Indeed the index of spatial variability, also reported in this issue by Crabb and colleagues (p 213), based on filtering techniques, provides a further statistical tool for the evaluation of glaucomatous loss. The advent of new thresholding strategies based on

decision making theory³⁰ is likely to offer improvements in data acquisition. Such developments in the manner of data acquisition, combined with the potential for improved data processing as suggested by Fitzke *et al*, will help to reduce the 'noise' (that is, fluctuation) in threshold estimation. Taken together, they offer an exciting prospect for automated perimetry to achieve the goals of efficient detection and accurate measurement of visual field loss in glaucoma.

C O'BRIEN

Princess Alexandra Eye Pavilion,
Chalmers Street,
Edinburgh EH3 9HA

J M WILD

Department of Vision Sciences,
Aston University,
Aston Triangle,
Birmingham B4 7ET

- 1 Flammer J. The concept of visual field indices. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol* 1986; **224**: 389–92.
- 2 Heijl A, Lindren G, Olsson J. A package for the statistical analysis of visual fields. *Doc Ophthalmol Proc Series* 1987; **49**: 153–68.
- 3 Asman P, Heijl A. Arcuate cluster analysis in glaucoma perimetry. *J Glaucoma* 1993; **2**: 13–20.
- 4 Heijl A, Lindren G, Olsson J, Asman P. Visual field interpretation with empiric probability maps. *Arch Ophthalmol* 1989; **107**: 204–8.
- 5 Heijl A, Lindren G, Lindren A, Olsson J, Asman P, Myers S, *et al*. Extended empirical statistical package for the evaluation of single and multiple fields in glaucoma. In: Mills RP, Heijl A, eds. *Perimetry Update 1990–1991*. Amsterdam: Kugler and Ghedini 1991: 305–15.
- 6 Wild JM, Hussey MK, Flanagan JG, Trope GE. Pointwise topographical and longitudinal modeling of the visual field in glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 1993; **34**: 1907–16.
- 6a O'Brien C, Schwartz B, Takamoto T, Wu DC. Intraocular pressure and the rate of visual field loss in chronic open angle glaucoma. *Am J Ophthalmol* 1991; **111**: 491–500.
- 7 Beble H, Fankhauser F, Spahr J. Static perimetry: accuracy and fluctuations. *Acta Ophthalmol* 1976; **54**: 339–48.
- 8 Flammer J, Drance SM, Zulauf M. Differential light threshold. Short- and long-term fluctuation in patients with glaucoma, normal controls and patients with suspected glaucoma. *Arch Ophthalmol* 1984; **102**: 704–6.
- 9 Lindenmuth KA, Skuta GL, Rabbian R, Musch DC. Effects of pupillary constriction on automated perimetry in normal eyes. *Ophthalmology* 1989; **96**: 1298–301.
- 10 Lindenmuth KA, Skuta GL, Rabbian R, Musch DC, Bergstrom TJ. Effects of pupillary dilation on automated perimetry in normal subjects. *Ophthalmology* 1990; **97**: 367–70.
- 11 Weinreb RN, Perlman JP. The effect of refractive correction on automated perimetric thresholds. *Am J Ophthalmol* 1986; **101**: 706–9.
- 12 Heuer DK, Anderson DR, Feuer WJ, Gressel MG. The influence of refractive accuracy on automated perimetric thresholds. *Ophthalmology* 1987; **94**: 1550–3.
- 13 Wood JM, Wild JM, Smerdon DL, Crews SJ. Alterations in the shape of the automated perimetric profile arising from cataract. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol* 1989; **227**: 157–61.
- 14 Dengler-Harles M, Wild JM, Cole MD, O'Neill EC, Crews SJ. The influence of forward light scatter on the visual field indices in glaucoma. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol* 1990; **228**: 326–31.
- 15 Searie AET, Wild JM, Shaw DE, O'Neill EC. Time-related variation in normal automated static perimetry. *Ophthalmology* 1993; **98**: 701–7.
- 16 Heijl A, Lindren G, Olsson J. The effect of perimetric experience in normal subjects. *Arch Ophthalmol* 1989; **107**: 81–6.
- 17 Wood JM, Wild JM, Hussey MK, Crews SJ. Serial examination of the normal visual field using Octopus automated projection perimetry. Evidence for a learning effect. *Acta Ophthalmol* 1987; **65**: 326–33.
- 18 Heijl A, Drance SM. Changes in differential light threshold in patients with glaucoma during prolonged perimetry. *Br J Ophthalmol* 1983; **67**: 512–6.
- 19 Johnson CA, Adams CW, Lewis RA. Fatigue effects in automated perimetry. *Applied Optics* 1988; **27**: 1030–7.
- 20 Hudson C, Wild JM, O'Neill EC. Fatigue effects during a single session of automated static threshold perimetry. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 1994; **35**: 268–80.
- 21 Langerhorst CT, van den Berg TJTP, Veldman E, Greve EL. Population study of global and local fatigue with prolonged threshold testing in automated perimetry. *Doc Ophthalmol Proc Series* 1987; **49**: 657–62.
- 22 Flanagan JG, Wild JM, Trope GE. Evaluation of FASTPAC, a new strategy for threshold estimation with the Humphrey field analyser, in a glaucomatous population. *Ophthalmology* 1993; **100**: 949–54.
- 23 Flanagan JG, Moss ID, Wild JM, Hudson C, Prokopitch L, Whitaker D, *et al*. Evaluation of FASTPAC: a new strategy for threshold estimation with the Humphrey field analyser. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol* 1993; **231**: 465–9.
- 24 O'Brien C, Poinosawmy D, Wu J, Hitchings R. Evaluation of the Humphrey FASTPAC threshold program in glaucoma. *Br J Ophthalmol* 1994; **78**: 516–9.
- 25 Weber J. Eine neue strategie fur die automatisierte statische perimetrie. *Fortschr Ophthalmol* 1990; **87**: 37–40.
- 26 Weber J, Diestelhorst M. Perimetric follow-up in glaucoma with a reduced set of test points. *Germ J Ophthalmol* 1992; **1**: 409–14.
- 27 Gilpin LB, Stewart WC, Hunt HH, Broom CD. Threshold variability using different Goldmann stimulus sizes. *Acta Ophthalmol* 1990; **68**: 674–6.
- 28 Wall M, Kardon R, Moore P. Effect of stimulus size on test-retest variability. In: Mills RP, ed. *Perimetry Update 1992/93*. Amsterdam: Kugler and Ghedini, 1993: 371–6.
- 29 Heijl A. Perimetric point density and detection of glaucomatous visual field loss. *Acta Ophthalmol* 1993; **71**: 445–50.
- 30 Olsson J, Bengtsson B, Heijl A, Rootzen H. New thresholding algorithms for automated static perimetry. In: Mills RP, Wall M, eds. *Perimetry Update 1994/95*. Amsterdam: Kugler and Ghedini, 1995.