

Review of the use of SWAP and FDT for the early detection of visual field loss.

ABSTRACT

Background: To review the literature reporting SWAP and FDT for the early detection of visual field loss in glaucoma.
Methods: A review of literature published on Medline, Scopus and Web of Science between 1966 and present was undertaken with only articles in the English language reviewed.
Results: SWAP has high inter and intra subject variability. There is no uniform decision as to what criteria should be applied to define abnormal visual fields. In comparison with standard automated perimetry (SAP) there is controversy as to whether SWAP is reliable in detecting glaucomatous damage. As a screening tool FDT may have potential due to its short testing time and lower test-retest variability. There is a lack of definitive abnormality criteria to define visual field loss with FDT. First and second generation FDT have been found to be comparable to SWAP in terms of diagnostic sensitivity. There is a lack of studies comparing FDT to SAP with longitudinal follow up of visual fields which make it difficult to determine its reliability in identifying pre-perimetric glaucomatous damage.
Conclusion: There is a need for further longitudinal studies on both SWAP and FDT to determine fully their reliability in detecting early visual field loss in glaucoma before SAP.

Keywords: SWAP, FDT, Matrix, SAP, Glaucoma, Visual Field Evaluation

1. INTRODUCTION

Primary open angle glaucoma (POAG) is a chronic, potentially blinding condition caused by death of ganglion cells and their axons within the optic nerve due to increased pressure within the eye[1]. It affects approximately 3% of people over 65 in the UK and with average life expectancy in the UK rising, more people are now living with glaucoma even compared to the mid-90's[2,3]. The cost of treating glaucoma in the UK is more than £300 million per year. This includes both direct (medication, outpatient care, routine assessment and surgical procedures) and indirect treatment (cost of low vision services, loss of earnings resulting from vision loss)[4,5]. Glaucoma also affects quality of life with partial sight or registered severely sight impaired being ultimate possibilities. One of the determinants for a poor visual prognosis is signs of glaucomatous field damage upon presentation to the clinician. This means vision and visual field could be potentially saved if damage could be reliably detected before current visual field analysis is able to[6,7]. Glaucoma diagnosis and progression are determined by three factors; intraocular pressure (IOP) changes, optic disc examination and visual field evaluation.

In early glaucoma larger ganglion cells within the optic nerve are damaged. First the blue-yellow ganglion cells (part of the koniocellular pathway) which are larger than red-green ganglion cells are damaged leading to dyschromatopsia[8]. This effect has been exploited in testing for early glaucoma damage by using short wavelength automated perimetry (SWAP).

SWAP is used with blue points (wavelength 440nm) with a narrow band presented for 200msec on a yellow background (100cd/m^2) to try and detect early colour vision loss[3]. Studies have shown that SWAP perimetry can detect glaucomatous damage 3-5 years

34 before conventional white on white perimetry[9-11]. With current standard white on white
35 perimetry around 30-50% of ganglion cells have been destroyed before detection[12].

36 Frequency doubling technology (FDT) was first described by Kelly over 45 years ago. It is
37 based on the fact that when an achromatic sinusoidal grating of low spatial frequency
38 undergoes flickering at high temporal frequency the apparent spatial frequency of the grating
39 appears to double[13]. The response to this is thought to be mediated by M_y -cells, which are
40 sensitive to low contrast and motion stimulus. M_y cells are again larger than other retinal
41 ganglion cells (part of the magnocellular pathway) and are therefore more prone to damage
42 in early glaucoma[14]. This forms the rationale for using FDT as a potential visual field
43 screening method for early glaucoma detection.

44 There is an alternative theory as to why SWAP and FDT may be able to detect early
45 glaucomatous damage: as a result of the reduction in the redundancy in the visual
46 system[15]. The function-specific tests isolate a subset of ganglion cells which may lead to
47 an increased sensitivity to early ganglion cell loss.

48
49 There has been conflicting evidence regarding the use of SWAP and FDT for early detection
50 of visual field loss. The aim of this review is to evaluate the literature in respect to whether
51 FDT and SWAP perimetry can reliably detect glaucomatous visual field changes before
52 Humphrey SAP.

53

54 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

55

56 The SCOPUS, Web of Science and Medline databases were searched for the following
57 terms: SWAP and glaucoma, Short Wavelength Automated Perimetry and glaucoma, SWAP
58 and ocular hypertension and Short Wavelength Automated Perimetry and ocular
59 hypertension, SWAP and open angle glaucoma, SWAP and closed angle glaucoma,
60 Frequency Doubling Technology and glaucoma, FDT and ocular hypertension, Frequency
61 Doubling Technology and open angle glaucoma, Frequency Doubling Technology and angle
62 closure glaucoma, Frequency Doubling Technology and Short Wavelength Automated
63 Perimetry, Frequency Doubling Technology and screening, Matrix FDT and ocular
64 hypertension, Matrix FDT and glaucoma and Matrix FDT and closed angle glaucoma.

65 Only articles written in English were reviewed due to lack of access to translation facilities.
66 The years included were from the year 1966 to 2013. In this review only studies reporting the
67 use of SWAP and/or FDT for early visual field loss in glaucoma detection are considered.

68 We found 2917 articles from our search, accessed 112 full articles which were assessed as
69 relevant to the review topic and evaluated 79 articles for this review article.

70

71 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

72

73 3.1 Short Wavelength Automated Perimetry (SWAP)

74 SWAP is a type of visual field assessment which is based on the principle that larger
75 ganglion cells within the retina are selectively damaged during early glaucoma. Ten per cent
76 of these larger ganglion cells belong to the blue-yellow pathway: part of the koniocellular
77 pathway[8]. The earlier death of this ganglion cell population has also been confirmed by
78 histological evidence[16-18]. The blue-yellow conditions of SWAP isolate the S cone system
79 (short wavelength cones), reduce the participation of other cone systems (red – long
80 wavelength and green – medium wavelength) and saturate the rods activity through the

81 adaptation to yellow light[19,20]. This phenomenon has been reported to be of use to predict
82 glaucomatous visual field damage up to 4 years before it is detected on standard achromatic
83 perimetry[9,10].

84 SWAP can be performed on the Humphrey Visual Field Analyser (HVF: Carl Zeiss Meditec
85 Inc., Dublin, CA, USA) and the Octopus perimeter (Haag Streit Int., USA). A Goldman size V
86 target (1.74° diameter) is used with a blue filter placed over the source of light allowing only
87 light with a peak transmission of 440nm through. The white background light is replaced by
88 yellow light illuminated at 100cdm² in the perimeter bowl. The targets are presented for
89 200msec in all test locations. The test is performed within the central 30 degrees of the
90 visual field.

91 SWAP has not been introduced routinely into clinical practice due to a number of factors:
92 clinicians are not united on a definition of abnormality criteria[21], the effect of the ageing
93 lens on results[22], lengthy test time[20], patient fatigue and patient's dislike of the test[23]
94 and the large intra and inter-subject variability even with normal subjects[24] which make it
95 difficult to define an abnormal field. Some of the factors causing a barrier to its use in
96 practice will be addressed in more detail: i.e. test time by means of test choice and
97 abnormality criteria.

98 **3.1.1 Test (Algorithm) Choice**

99 The lengthy test time for SWAP is an important factor and, as stated above, is one of the
100 reasons why SWAP is not routinely used in clinical practice. One way in which test time for
101 SWAP could be reduced is to consider the choice of algorithm. There are a number of test
102 programmes (algorithms) that can be used around which there is debate as to which should
103 be used. Current versions available for SWAP include a full-threshold option whereby a
104 staircase method is used to plot sensitivity at specific test locations[25]. A SITA-FAST
105 (Swedish Interactive Threshold Algorithm) version of the SWAP algorithm was developed
106 which reduced testing time by up to 70% (11 minutes with full threshold and just over three
107 minutes with SITA-SWAP) with no apparent reduction in sensitivity of specificity[26]. It is also
108 reported that the SITA-SWAP algorithm partially reduces the issue of the large inter-subject
109 variability by approximately 14%[25-27].

110 **3.1.2 Abnormality Criteria**

111 The statistical properties of SWAP have been examined extensively, firstly by Wild *et al* [22]
112 who tried to establish a normal database containing probability levels and analysis
113 synonymous to that for SAP. An increased between level variability was found between
114 subjects compared to SAP with the variability increasing with target eccentricity and
115 increasing age. This is relevant as the risk of developing glaucoma increases with age[28].
116 The between subject variation is also important to note when looking at probability maps to
117 define an abnormal field. To use the same level of depression required for SAP would be
118 unwise as this will lead to a large number of false positive results. This adds evidence for the
119 need to design bespoke statistical analyses rather than a cross-over with SAP.

120 This view was also supported by Kwon *et al.* [29] showing a similar amount of variation upon
121 repeated testing. Both studies had a similar number of participants making their results
122 comparable, however, neither provided an indication of what may be an appropriate criterion
123 for what 'normal' may be.

124 Polo and associates[21,30,31] aimed to suggest and refine abnormality criteria for SWAP by
125 addressing the sensitivity and specificity at different probability levels. They suggested that
126 using cluster point criteria (four points clustered at the P<5% level or three points clustered

lower than $P < 1\%$), rather than using global indices, provide the best sensitivity and specificity. A criticism of the classification of the criteria they used to define glaucomatous damage was inclusion of changes in the retinal nerve fibre layer as opposed to the gold standard optic nerve head assessment (optic nerve images taken by photography). NICE guidelines suggest optic nerve changes are more indicative of glaucomatous damage than retinal nerve fibre layer assessment as the latter damage is not always present yet the patient can have other characteristics of glaucoma including raised IOP, optic disc cupping and visual field loss[32].

This view is also supported by Johnson *et al* [33] who suggested four abnormal points at the $P < 5\%$ level are indicative of glaucomatous visual field loss. Johnson and associates [33] used their own controls in their study to define a normative database rather than the parameters provided in the perimeter. However, they did test the validity of their controls before comparing these with their 'abnormal' group and their normative dataset is large and almost double that of Polo and colleagues[21,30,31] Although the normative database is large the visual fields were only performed once on the control subjects who had no prior knowledge of the test whereas the abnormal group had at least four years' experience on both SAP and SWAP. It has been shown that there is a significant learning effect for both SWAP and SAP so it is possible the control subjects performed worse on the perimetry tests which made them more comparable to the abnormal patients showing signs of reduced sensitivity[34-36].

The work by Polo [21,30,31] and Johnson [33] is valuable and upon repeated testing Reus *et al.* [37] found that Polo's [21] criteria for abnormality on SWAP seemed to obtain more positive results compared with Johnson's criteria[33]. There was still a large variation in the amount of positives obtained depending on which criteria were used. Reus *et al.* [37] allowed for the learning effect which appears to improve specificity[38]. No indication was provided regarding the end point of the study and subjects were not followed up to determine if SAP defects persisted or developed.

There is little research to date that has specifically addressed the definition of an abnormality criteria set for SWAP. Many studies use their own normative data and their own diagnostic criteria as to what constitutes a defect. This introduces uncertainty as to whether SWAP can be a clinically useful tool. Further work is required to create a "gold standard" diagnostic criterion for SWAP in order to make direct comparisons between studies. A summary of the studies attempting to define a abnormality criteria set is shown in Table 1.

3.1.3 SWAP and SAP

The initial SWAP studies followed ocular hypertensive and early glaucoma patients for five years to determine whether SWAP was able to predict those patients who would go on to develop glaucomatous visual field damage. Johnson *et al.* [9,10] and Sample *et al.* [39] showed promise in the use of blue-on-yellow perimetry to detect visual field loss before standard white on white perimetry but with a number of limitations. Explicit criteria for a deficit on white on white perimetry was used ($< 5\%$ probability level for mean deviation (MD) or pattern standard deviation (PSD) or more than three points clustered at the $< 5\%$ level).

Table 1. Summary of studies attempting to define abnormality criteria for SWAP.

Study	Sample Size	Control Group Used	Suggested Abnormality Criteria	Follow up Period
Kwon <i>et al.</i> 1998 [29]	31 eyes	33 eyes	None suggested	8 weeks

Polo <i>et al.</i> 2002 [21]	95 eyes	128 eyes	Four clustered points at P<5% level or three clustered points at P<1% level	3 years
Johnson <i>et al.</i> 2002 [33]	479 eyes	348 eyes	Four clustered points at P<5% level	4 years
Reus <i>et al.</i> 2005 [37]	744 eyes	None used	Four clustered points at P<5% level	6 months up to 1 year
Van der Shoot <i>et al.</i> 2009 [41]	416 eyes	None used	None suggested and compared directly with SAP criteria of at least 3 points at P<5% with at least two at P<1% level or corrected PSD <5%	7 to 10 years
Liu <i>et al.</i> 2011 [42]	132 eyes	37 eyes	None defined	Not reported

169

170 No such criterion was implemented for blue-on-yellow as to what actually constituted a
 171 defect. It was evident there was a lot of variance even between tests with defects presenting
 172 and disappearing upon repeated testing. Their initial test conditions did factor in absorption
 173 of yellow light which is important as the ocular media can act as a neutral density filter
 174 particularly in the presence of cataract [40]. Their sample size for which they base their
 175 results on is relatively small for the amount of people potentially available with ocular
 176 hypertension. One issue with the results obtained in the early studies was the reporting of
 177 defects in terms of total deviations rather than pattern deviation which is important. Total
 178 deviation provides an indication of the depression of the hill of vision whereas pattern
 179 deviation gives an indication of the abnormality of the shape of the field. They did however
 180 age match their patients but this was only against a maximum of 22 subjects. Considering
 181 the variability that SWAP produces this may not be an entirely appropriate approximation of
 182 glaucomatous field loss. The results from the papers published by Johnson and colleagues
 183 [10,11] and Sample and colleagues [39] are what have driven subsequent studies.

184 Interestingly the subjects recruited by Polo and colleagues [30] to establish their abnormality
 185 criteria were recalled three years later [31] to determine how many had developed a defect
 186 on SAP. There was a high percentage who were deemed to have a SWAP defect and did
 187 not go onto develop glaucomatous damage after three years indicating the specificity of the
 188 test was not high and in the region of 30%.

189 There have been contradictions to the supporting evidence for SWAP. Van der Shoot *et al.*
 190 [41] state SWAP is less sensitive than SAP to predict conversion to glaucoma. However, in
 191 their study, no correction criteria were provided for cataract which is known to decrease the
 192 mean sensitivity of SWAP by absorption of the short wavelength light in the lens. This is

important considering that the age range used in their study would include those starting to develop cataract [22]. The conversion to glaucoma, which was the end point of the study, was based purely on visual field analysis. No anatomical correlation (e.g. optic nerve head cupping) was sought that matched with the visual field defect.

Liu *et al.* [42] also supports that SWAP is not as sensitive as SAP for detecting glaucoma. They used a sub analysis of early glaucoma as defined by the CIRRUS OCT which had been modified to 'capture' early glaucoma at the expense of specificity. With this method they may however have included patients that otherwise would not have been considered with solely visual field assessment.

3.2 Frequency Doubling Technology (FDT)

The frequency doubling phenomenon was first described by Kelly over 40 years ago[13]. When a low spatial frequency sinusoidal grating (<1 cycle/°) undergoes high temporal counter phase flickering at 15Hz or greater, gratings appear to double to twice their actual spatial frequency[43]. Essentially there is a rapid contrast reversal which light bars become dark and vice versa.

The frequency doubling phenomenon is thought to be mediated by a subset (five per cent) of ganglion cells within the magnocellular pathway called M_y cells[14,44]. Similar to the blue-yellow pathway cells the M_y cells have larger diameter axons making them more prone to damage in early glaucoma[17,45]. In order for FDT to be effective the spatial frequency should be between 0.1 and 4 c/deg⁻¹ (cycles per degree) and the temporal frequency greater than 15Hz. Both are dependent upon retinal eccentricity in addition to a mean background luminance of 50cd/m²[14,20]. This forms the rationale for the use of FDT to detect glaucomatous field damage earlier than SAP.

3.2.1 Test (Algorithm) choice

FDT first came into use in 1997[46]. The first generation FDT manufactured by Welch Allyn (Skaneateles Falls, New York, USA) used a 10° square stimuli, which was found to be initially problematic as its large size prevented it from detecting small visual field defects[20,47,48]. Second generation FDT was released in 2005 using a 5° square stimuli to overcome this problem using the Humphrey Matrix visual field instrument[49,50]. The Matrix test pattern was designed to be similar to the Humphrey Field analyser and Octopus perimetry using a 0.43° round target on a 6° square matrix[46].

Screening programmes on the first generation FDT included the central 30 degrees of the visual field. These algorithms used a modified binary search (MOBS) strategy. The algorithm presents a grating at a level where 99% of normal subjects of an aged matched control would see. If this is seen the zone is labelled normal, if this is not seen on a repeated presentation then a grating at the 99.5% level is presented and increased until the stimulus is seen[20,51]. The screening tests are performed in a supra-threshold pattern. Supra-threshold is performed whereby the intensity of the stimulus shown is calculated to be above the patient's threshold. Threshold is performed where the stimulus is decreased in intensity using an adaptive staircase procedure until no response is given[52].

Subsequent test programmes have been developed to reduce the test time for FDT. They include rapid efficient binary search (REBS) and zippy estimation of sequential testing (ZEST)[51]. REBS is based on the MOBS strategy but requires two response reversals whereas MOBS requires four[51]. ZEST uses a probability density function at each location

(the probability that each subject will have that threshold) with patient responses modifying the probability density function until the standard deviation of the probability density function becomes sufficiently narrowed[53]. The results of FDT tests have been compared to a normative database of 700 eyes and can be age matched[54].

Isawe and colleagues [55] proposed that FDT could be an effective method of visual field screening due to the short test time, its portability and relatively low-cost. Studies have reported sensitivity for FDT ranging between 83% to 93% and specificities ranging between 55% to 100%[56-61]. FDT also appears to have lower test-retest variability and less of a learning effect which makes it a promising emerging psychophysical test[62].

3.2.2 Abnormality Criteria

FDT is similar to SWAP in that definitive criterion for what is defined as normal and abnormal has not been uniformly decided upon. As Matrix FDT was released in 2005 there remains a lack of large population longitudinal studies to assess what criteria would be most discriminatory for a glaucoma diagnosis. Different criteria have been suggested although the view for abnormal criteria appears to be reaching a more uniform decision compared with SWAP.

Fogagnolo *et al.* [63] propose that the presence of at least one point at the $P < 5\%$ level on the pattern deviation plot (PDP) on the N-30 or C-20 screening programme is the most suitable criteria for detecting glaucoma. Six different classifications of a defect were used and analysed by receiver operator characteristic curves (ROC). A ROC curve plots true-positive rate against the false positive rate[64]. The area under a ROC curve of 1 gives 100% sensitivity and specificity whereas a ROC of 0.5 would indicate no diagnostic value[43]. The more stringent of the criteria did not significantly have a higher sensitivity or specificity for detecting glaucoma which explains the author's choice of defect criteria in order to capture most glaucomatous loss. Patients included in the study had POAG to enable the authors to identify the most sensitive and specific criteria for diagnosing glaucoma. Definitions for glaucoma defects on SAP were in accordance with the guidelines recommended by Hodapp-Parish-Anderson[66] which are also currently used by the National Collaborating Centre for Acute Care [32] in the United Kingdom. The results for sensitivity and specificity for visual field loss was comparable to those of others [59, 67-69] and particularly in moderate and advanced glaucoma cases. Notably the authors found that the screening programmes C-20 and N-30 showed a lower sensitivity for detecting nasal step defects; one of the most common glaucomatous defects[66].

Brusini *et al.* [70] suggest PSD $< 5\%$ and/or at least two areas on the PDP $P < 5\%$ should be used as the cut off criteria for the N-30 programme using the first generation FDT. Their results with these diagnostic criteria were similar to those previously reported by Weinreb, Medeiros & Sample [71] for the same programme.

A small cross sectional comparative study by Hong *et al.* [72] also suggest using more than five points in the PDP at the $P < 5\%$ level to discriminate between glaucomatous and non-glaucomatous fields. This classification is more stringent than those proposed by Fogagnolo *et al.* and Brusini *et al.* [63,70]. Hong and associates allowed for the influence of cataract on visual field testing [73] which had not been accounted for in previous studies. All subjects included in the study had manifest POAG detectable on SAP which were termed as early defects i.e. MD not worse than -6dB. Both the normal and POAG group had a mean age of under 40 which is significant as it is more likely that older individuals than in this age group would be routinely screened for glaucoma[74]. ROC curves were used to analyse the criteria proposed by the authors (MD $P < 1\%$ and PSD $P < 5\%$) and appropriate statistical testing was used. There was however a significant difference in the depth of defect between the control

group and the study group suggesting the criteria may be useful but only in the age range of the population studied. Further work is required using these criteria for predicting visual field loss in at risk groups and for the learning effect to be taken account for when considering a cut-off point.

Choi, Lee & Park [62] examined the use of the Humphrey Matrix perimeter for the detection of pre-perimetric glaucoma and to define a clinically useful cut-off point. A strength of the study is that the learning effect was allowed for both SAP and FDT by giving each patient two practice attempts. Their initial ophthalmic investigation also included all gold standard tests as defined by the National Collaborating Centre for Acute Care[32]. ROC curves were used to determine which parameter (MD or PSD) provided the best discriminating power. PSD was found to be the best discriminator which is in agreement with Hong *et al.*[72].

Abnormality criteria are essential for defining a glaucomatous visual field when screening. As is the current situation with SWAP, definitive criteria have not been agreed upon. However evidence currently published does not show as much variation as what 'abnormal' should be defined as on FDT when compared to defining SWAP abnormality criteria. There is a need for more longitudinal studies taking into account for the variances that occur in the screening population, the age of patients performing the test and where the criteria produce repeatable defects. A summary of the studies attempting to define abnormality criteria is shown in Table 2 for direct comparison.

Table 2. Summary of studies attempting to define abnormality criteria for FDT.

Study	First Generation or Matrix FDT	Sample Size	Control Group Used	Suggested Abnormality Criteria	Follow up Period
Fogagnolo <i>et al.</i> 2005 [63]	First generation	40 eyes	40 eyes	At least one point at P<5% on the PDP	Not reported
Brusini <i>et al.</i> 2006 [51]	First generation	258 eyes	60 eyes	PSD <5% and/or at least two areas on PDP at P<5%	Not reported
Hong <i>et al.</i> 2007 [72]	Matrix	36 eyes	24 eyes	More than 5 points on PDP at P<5%	Not reported
Choi, Lee & Park 2009 [62]	Matrix	99 eyes	122 eyes	PSD of greater than -3.14dB	Not reported

3.2.3 FDT and SAP

Few studies exist that longitudinally compare FDT with SAP in respect to whether a subject who presents with a defect on FDT would proceed to develop a defect on SAP. Many of the early studies looking at agreement between FDT and SAP were conducted with subjects who already had detectable manifest glaucoma[75,76].

A small prospective study by Quaranta *et al.* [77] examined the concordance of first generation FDT with SAP in 25 manifest glaucoma patients and 25 ocular hypertensives using MD plots; a measure of overall sensitivity loss. Although the study indicated a

315 significant correlation between MD in the glaucoma and ocular hypertensive group, they also
 316 compare PSD but with no results presented other than 'it was significant between groups'.
 317 There was no classification given as to what defines a visual field as glaucomatous or not
 318 which makes it difficult to draw conclusions from. No follow up was performed in this study to
 319 ascertain whether the defects persisted on repeated testing or whether the subjects showing
 320 FDT defects in the ocular hypertensive group went on to produce defects on SAP.

321 In a larger study by Racette *et al.* [78] on 80 eyes, they found that first generation FDT was
 322 better able to detect early glaucomatous damage than SAP using ROC analysis. Mean
 323 deviation for SAP and PSD <5% for first generation FDT were found to be the best indicators
 324 of early glaucomatous damage. However, there are issues with their definition of their
 325 normal pressure. Routinely a pressure under 21mmHg is considered normal yet a cut-off
 326 upper pressure of 23mmHg was used. The study has an advantage over the smaller study
 327 by Quaranta and colleagues as they provide parameters to classify glaucomatous loss and
 328 check for persistence of defects. Furthermore, they acknowledge the limitations of their
 329 study and for longitudinal change, further studies are required.

330 Medeiros and associates[79] reported that first generation FDT defects were predictive of
 331 future SAP defects in a longitudinal observational study over 17 months. The subjects were
 332 retrospectively taken from a larger study (Diagnostic Innovations in Glaucoma Study) but
 333 were not taken at random from the study group: the purpose being to include only subjects
 334 at risk of developing POAG and not from secondary causes e.g. pigment dispersion
 335 syndrome. This potentially introduces selection bias. It is interesting to note that the age
 336 range of the sample taken is not given yet the authors found a statistically significant
 337 difference between the age of subjects who converted and those who did not. The lack of
 338 age range renders it difficult to consider the results for the population at risk. However, gold
 339 standard tests were used to exclude manifest glaucoma as per National Collaborating
 340 Centre for Acute Care guidelines [32] and allowances were made for learning effect[80].
 341 More importantly the fields were repeated at follow up to determine if the defects persisted.
 342 To reduce the influence of intra test variability and for a defect to be confirmed on SAP the
 343 field was repeated three times. A normal database was used from a previous study
 344 conducted by the authors in normal individuals and found 94% specificity upon using their
 345 definition of an abnormal FDT (two points on MD $P < 5\%$ level or a PSD of $P < 0.05\%$).
 346 Fourteen out of the 105 eyes studied progressed to repeatable defects on both SAP and
 347 FDT with the locations of the defects correlating. The results of this study show promise in
 348 terms of a possible prediction of the development of SAP defects by location of repeatable
 349 defects on FDT.

350 Spry, Hussin & Sparrow[76] compared the use of matrix FDT 24-2 threshold strategy with
 351 the 24-2 SITA-Fast programme available on the HVF. The study was larger than that of
 352 Quaranta *et al.* [77] and all patients went through gold standard assessment for detection of
 353 glaucoma (SAP, gonioscopy, tonometry and optic nerve head examination)[32]. A strength
 354 of the study was the classification of subjects into subgroups based on clinical examination
 355 separating out the different types of glaucoma and suspects. In contrast to the Quaranta
 356 study[77] the mean age of the study group was more representative of the patients
 357 undergoing glaucoma testing. Upon comparison of MD and PSD moderate agreement was
 358 found between the two techniques by means of a ROC analysis. The criteria used to define
 359 a glaucomatous field were liberal and based upon clinical decision in order for it to be
 360 applied to the clinical environment and the authors acknowledge that this may have led to
 361 the high sensitivity found. Spry and associates[76] suggest that for the purposes of
 362 glaucoma screening sensitivity should be compromised in order to optimise the specificity
 363 and positive predictive value of FDT. In order to confirm the results further follow up is
 364 required to consider whether individuals who are screened with matrix FDT with the 24-2 test
 365 pattern do develop defects that are synonymous with SAP.

366 3.3 FDT and SWAP

367 Both SWAP and FDT have been recognised as potential methods for the detection of early
368 glaucoma. Studies have looked at the comparability of FDT with SWAP with respect to
369 sensitivity and specificity and concordance with each other[23,42,81-84].

370 Landers and associates[81] reported that FDT and SWAP are comparable in terms of
371 sensitivity, specificity and concordance. Spry *et al.* [76] examined the diagnostic capability of
372 both SWAP and FDT. They reported that FDT had a lower test-retest variability (39% SWAP
373 compared to 34% FDT) but both methods had similar abilities in detecting early glaucoma.
374 One issue with the comparison is that FDT was not performed using the Welch Allyn nor
375 matrix FDT perimeter but on a 'custom device'. Thus it is difficult to compare their results
376 with other studies using standard rather than customised assessments. Specifically, the 24-2
377 test pattern used for their FDT was a 4° diameter square which is not used in either the
378 Welch Allyn or matrix perimeter[46,47]. Gold standard tests were used however to classify
379 glaucoma and pattern deviation was used to classify defects rather than total deviation; the
380 latter providing a generalised impression of field loss. The use of PD or PSD is also
381 supported by Leeprechanon *et al.* [23] who found that, for matrix FDT, this provided the best
382 sensitivity and specificity. As for SWAP there is not a definitive definition of 'abnormal' as
383 previously discussed.

384 A prospective study by Horn *et al.* [83] attempted to overcome the limitations of previous
385 studies in order to determine whether SWAP and first generation FDT are able to detect pre
386 perimetric glaucoma, with interesting results. A double-bagging technique was used in the
387 study. The previous studies by Landers *et al.*, Soliman *et al.* and Spry *et al.* [43,76,81] relied
388 upon making a clinical judgement regarding the outcome of the visual field testing. By using
389 the double bagging technique this standardises the outcome for all participants with all fields
390 being treated in the same way. Horn *et al.* [83] recognised that the numbers assessed in
391 their study might not be sufficient to produce the most accurate, reliable or efficient algorithm
392 and therefore requires a larger study. The method itself may facilitate future study and allow
393 this area of research to finally move forward.

394 Matrix FDT was compared with SWAP in a prospective case-control study by Leeprechanon
395 *et al.* [23]. The results showed a significant correlation between FDT and SWAP using MD
396 and PSD with FDT showing a higher sensitivity of detecting glaucoma (72% versus 54%).
397 The sample size was small, however the 24-2 test pattern used for both FDT and SWAP
398 allowed for a more direct comparison of results. A strength of the study was that
399 concordance of the location of the defect was investigated with a 72% agreement reported.
400 When considering the indices PSD and PD at the P<5% level they were significantly higher
401 in the early glaucoma group versus the normal group on FDT but not on SWAP suggesting
402 that FDT may be better at filtering out the generalised noise which is known to occur in
403 SWAP.

404 More recently Liu *et al.* [42] found matrix FDT to be more sensitive than SWAP in detecting
405 glaucoma at comparable levels of specificity. The criteria used for defining an abnormal
406 visual field for FDT and SWAP was the same as that for SAP for which there is contention as
407 to whether SAP criteria can be used for other visual field assessment methods[22,62].
408 Furthermore, the confidence intervals overlapped for matrix FDT and SWAP results which
409 may indicate that there is little difference in the diagnostic abilities of SWAP and matrix FDT.
410 A subgroup analysis was performed with patients with 'early glaucoma' but no definition of
411 early glaucoma was provided. The results reported by Liu *et al.* [42] were in agreement with
412 those of Leeprechanon *et al.* [23] in their larger sample size.

413

414 4. CONCLUSION

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

With an aging population and the rise in the prevalence of glaucoma worldwide there is a clear need for rapid diagnosis to commence treatment early to preserve both vision and visual field. The need for rapid diagnosis however does need to be considered from an economic perspective i.e. is the time and money spent on diagnosing glaucoma earlier clinically useful providing the best cost: benefit ratio.

There is evidence available to show that SWAP, first generation and matrix FDT have potential as psychophysical tests for earlier glaucoma detection. SWAP has been investigated at a greater length than the more recently emerging FDT methods. Both SWAP and FDT lack defined abnormality criteria like those that exist for SAP. Until this is established it is difficult to determine whether or not the tests have a role in either glaucoma screening in the community or at the first visit to the hospital eye service. SWAP has the issue of a large inter and intra subject variability requiring up to five attempts before the patient becomes sufficiently reliable. This has time and economic implications which need to be considered. FDT shows less variability with more repeatable results and lesser learning effect. The testing time is also short with FDT which again may make it a more favourable test than SWAP.

SWAP and FDT on direct comparison have been found to have similar sensitivity and specificity in predicting glaucomatous visual field loss and show moderate agreement with SAP for detecting field loss. Few studies however consider whether the defects correlate between tests and, in SWAP and FDT, whether the defects develop in the same location as that in SAP. There is a lack of longitudinal studies addressing persistence of defects and anatomical correlation of defects to be able to definitively ascertain the clinical application of both FDT and SWAP. Further research is thus recommended to answer these outstanding questions.

To conclude both SWAP and FDT could potentially be used as methods for earlier glaucoma detection but require well-defined, consistent abnormality criteria within specified testing algorithms.

447 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Financial Disclosure: No funding was provided for the conduct of this review.

453 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

454

455 The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

456

457

458 **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS**

459

460 Author JMB designed the study, performed the review and wrote the drafts of the
461 manuscript. Author FR provided oversight for the review and contributed to the drafts of the
462 manuscript.

463

464 **CONSENT**

465

466 Not applicable.

467

468

469 **ETHICAL APPROVAL**

470

471 Not applicable.

472

473 **REFERENCES**

474

- 475 1. Grehn, F. & Stamper, R.L. Glaucoma [electronic book] / editors, Franz Grehn,
476 Robert Stamper, Berlin : Springer, c2009.
- 477 2. Minassian, D.C., Reidy, A., Coffey, M. & Minassian, A. "Utility of predictive equations
478 for estimating the prevalence and incidence of primary open angle glaucoma in the
479 UK", The British Journal of Ophthalmology, 2000, vol. 84, no. 10, pp. 1159-1161.
- 480 3. Tafreshi, A., Sample, P.A., Liebmann, J.M., Girkin, C.A., Zangwill, L.M., Weinreb,
481 R.N., Lalezary, M. & Racette, L. "Visual Function-Specific Perimetry to Identify
482 Glaucomatous Visual Loss Using Three Different Definitions of Visual Field
483 Abnormality", Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science, 2009, vol. 50, no. 3,
484 pp. 1234-1240.
- 485 4. Rouland, J., Berdeaux, G. & Lafuma, A. "The economic burden of glaucoma and
486 ocular hypertension: implications for patient management: a review", Drugs & Aging,
487 2005, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 315-321.
- 488 5. Schmier, J.K., Halpern, M.T. & Jones, M.L. "The Economic Implications of
489 Glaucoma: A Literature Review", Pharmacoeconomics, 2007, vol. 25, no. 4, pp.
490 287-308.
- 491 6. Ang, G.S. & Eke, T. "Lifetime visual prognosis for patients with primary open-angle
492 glaucoma", Eye, 2007, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 604-608.
- 493 7. Forsman, E., Kivelä, T. & Vesti, E. "Lifetime visual disability in open-angle glaucoma
494 and ocular hypertension", Journal of Glaucoma, 2007, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 313-319.
- 495 8. Dacey, D.M. & Lee, B.B. "The Blue-on Opponent Pathway in Primate Retina
496 Originates from a Distinct Bistratified Ganglion-Cell Type", Nature, 1994, vol. 367,
497 no. 6465, pp. 731-735.
- 498 9. Johnson, C.A., Adams, A.J., Casson, E.J. & Brandt, J.D. "Blue-on-yellow perimetry
499 can predict the development of glaucomatous visual field loss", Archives of
500 Ophthalmology, 1993, vol. 111, no. 5, pp. 645-650.
- 501 10. Johnson, C.A., Adams, A.J., Casson, E.J. & Brandt, J.D. "Progression of early
502 glaucomatous visual field loss as detected by blue-on-yellow and standard white-on-

- 503 white automated perimetry", Archives of Ophthalmology, 1993, vol. 111, no. 5, pp.
504 651-656.
- 505 11. Johnson, C.A., Brandt, J.D., Khong, A.M. & Adams, A.J. "Short-wavelength
506 automated perimetry in low-, medium-, and high-risk ocular hypertensive eyes: Initial
507 baseline results", Archives of Ophthalmology, 1995, vol. 113, no. 1, pp. 70-76.
- 508 12. Harwerth, R.S., Carter-Dawson, L., Shen, F., Smith, E.L., 3 & Crawford, M.L.
509 "Ganglion cell losses underlying visual field defects from experimental glaucoma",
510 Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science, 1999, vol. 40, no. 10, pp. 2242-2250.
- 511 13. Kelly, D.H. "Frequency Doubling in Visual Responses", Journal of the Optical
512 Society of America, 1966, vol. 56, no. 11, pp. 1628-1633.
- 513 14. Maddess, T. & Henry, G.H. "Performance of nonlinear visual units in ocular
514 hypertension and glaucoma", Clinical Vision Sciences, 1992, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 371-
515 383.
- 516 15. Johnson, C.A. "Selective versus non-selective losses in glaucoma", Journal of
517 Glaucoma 1994, vol. 3 pp. S32-S44.
- 518 16. Kerrigan-Baumrind, L., Quigley, H.A., Pease, M.E., Kerrigan, D.F. & Mitchell, R.S.
519 "Number of ganglion cells in glaucoma eyes compared with threshold visual field
520 tests in the same persons", Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science, 2000,
521 vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 741-748.
- 522 17. Glovinsky, Y., Quigley, H.A. & Dunkelberger, G.R. "Retinal ganglion cell loss is size
523 dependent in experimental glaucoma", Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual
524 Science, 1991, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 484-491.
- 525 18. Wild, J.M. "Short wavelength automated perimetry", Acta Ophthalmologica
526 Scandinavica, 2001, vol. 79, no. 6, pp. 546-559.
- 527 19. Wild, J.M., Kim, L.S., Pacey, I.E. & Cunliffe, I.A. "Evidence for a learning effect in
528 short-wavelength automated perimetry", Ophthalmology, 2006, vol. 113, no. 2, pp.
529 206-215.
- 530 20. Delgado, M.F., Nguyen, N., Cox, T.A., Singh, K., Lee, D.A., Dueker, D.K., Fechtner,
531 R.D., Juzych, M.S., Lin, S.C., Netland, P.A., Pastor, S.A., Schuman, J.S. &
532 Samples, J.R. "Automated perimetry - A report by the American Academy of
533 Ophthalmology", Ophthalmology, 2002, vol. 109, no. 12, pp. 2362-2374.
- 534 21. Polo, V., Larrosa, J.M., Pinilla, I., Pablo, L., Fernandez, F.J. & Honrubia, F.M.
535 "Short-wavelength automated perimetry: Abnormality criteria", Annals of
536 Ophthalmology, 2002, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 30-33.
- 537 22. Wild, J.M., Moss, I.D., Whitaker, D. & O'Neill, E.C. "The statistical interpretation of
538 blue-on-yellow visual field loss", Investigative Ophthalmology and Visual Science,
539 1995, vol. 36, no. 7, pp. 1398-1410.
- 540 23. Leeprechanon, N., Giaconi, J.A., Manassakorn, A., Hoffman, D. & Caprioli, J.
541 "Frequency Doubling Perimetry and Short-Wavelength Automated Perimetry to
542 Detect Early Glaucoma", Ophthalmology, 2007, vol. 114, no. 5, pp. 931-937.
- 543 24. Hutchings, N., Hosking, S.L., Wild, J.M. & Flanagan, J.G. "Long-term fluctuation in
544 short-wavelength automated perimetry in glaucoma suspects and glaucoma
545 patients", Investigative Ophthalmology and Visual Science, 2001, vol. 42, no. 10, pp.
546 2332-2337.
- 547 25. Bengtsson, B. "New rapid threshold algorithm for short-wavelength automated
548 perimetry", Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science, 2003, vol. 44, no. 3, pp.
549 1388-1394.
- 550 26. Bengtsson, B. & Heijl, A. "Original Article: Diagnostic Sensitivity of Fast Blue Yellow
551 and Standard Automated Perimetry in Early Glaucoma. A Comparison between
552 Different Test Programs", Ophthalmology, 2006, vol. 113, pp. 1092-1097.
- 553 27. Ng, M., Racette, L., Pascual, J.P., Liebmann, J.M., Girkin, C.A., Lovell, S.L.,
554 Zangwill, L.M., Weinreb, R.N. & Sample, P.A. "Comparing the full-threshold and

- 555 Swedish interactive thresholding algorithms for short-wavelength automated
556 perimetry", *Investigative Ophthalmology and Visual Science*, 2009, vol. 50, no. 4, pp.
557 1726-1733.
- 558 28. Coleman, A.L. & Miglior, S. "Risk Factors for Glaucoma Onset and Progression",
559 *Survey of Ophthalmology*, 2008, vol. 53, pp. S3-S10.
- 560 29. Kwon, Y.H., Park, H.J., Jap, A., Ugurlu, S. & Caprioli, J. "Test-retest variability of
561 blue-on-yellow perimetry is greater than white-on-white perimetry in normal
562 subjects", *American Journal of Ophthalmology*, 1998, vol. 126, no. 1, pp. 29-36.
- 563 30. Polo, V., Abecia, E., Pablo, L.E., Pinilla, I., Larrosa, J.M. & Honrubia, F.M. "Short-
564 wavelength automated perimetry and retinal nerve fiber layer evaluation in
565 suspected cases of glaucoma", *Archives of Ophthalmology*, 1998, vol. 116, no. 10,
566 pp. 1295-1298.
- 567 31. Polo, V., Larrosa, J.M., Pinilla, I., Perez, S., Gonzalvo, F. & Honrubia, F.M.
568 "Predictive value of short wavelength automated perimetry: A 3-year follow-up
569 study", *Ophthalmology*, 2002, vol. 109, no. 4, pp. 761-765.
- 570 32. National Collaborating Centre for Acute Care. Glaucoma: Diagnosis and
571 management of chronic open angle glaucoma and ocular hypertension, National
572 Institute for Health & Clinical Excellence, 2009, United Kingdom.
- 573 33. Johnson, C.A. "Recent developments in automated perimetry in glaucoma diagnosis
574 and management", *Current Opinion in Ophthalmology*, 2002, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 77-
575 84.
- 576 34. Wild, J.M., Kim, L.S., Pacey, I.E. & Cunliffe, I.A. "Original Article: Evidence for a
577 Learning Effect in Short-Wavelength Automated Perimetry", *Ophthalmology*, 2006,
578 vol. 113, pp. 206-215.
- 579 35. Rossetti, L., Fogagnolo, P., Miglior, S., Centofanti, M., Vetrugno, M. & Orzalesi, N.
580 "Learning effect of short-wavelength automated perimetry in patients with ocular
581 hypertension", *Journal of Glaucoma*, 2006, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 399-404.
- 582 36. Fogagnolo, P., Tanga, L., Rossetti, L., Oddone, F., Manni, G., Orzalesi, N. &
583 Centofanti, M. "Mild learning effect of short-wavelength automated perimetry using
584 SITA program", *Journal of Glaucoma*, 2010, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 319-323.
- 585 37. Reus, N.J., Colen, T.P. & Lemij, H.G. "The prevalence of glaucomatous defects with
586 short-wavelength automated perimetry in patients with elevated Intraocular
587 pressures", *Journal of Glaucoma*, 2005, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 26-29.
- 588 38. Wild, J.M., Cubbidge, R.P., Pacey, I.E. & Robinson, R. "Statistical aspects of the
589 normal visual field in short-wavelength automated perimetry", *Investigative*
590 *Ophthalmology and Visual Science*, 1998, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 54-63.
- 591 39. Sample, P.A., Taylor, J., Martinez, G.A., Lusky, M. & Weinreb, R.N. "Short-
592 Wavelength Color Visual-Fields in Glaucoma Suspects at Risk", *American Journal of*
593 *Ophthalmology*, 1993, vol. 115, no. 2, pp. 225-233.
- 594 40. Sample, P.A., Johnson, C.A., HaegerstromPortnoy, G. & Adams, A.J. "Optimum
595 parameters for short-wavelength automated perimetry", *Journal of Glaucoma*, 1996,
596 vol. 5, no. 6, pp. 375-383.
- 597 41. Van der Schoot, J., Reus, N.J., Colen, T.P., Lemij, H.G., Choi, J.A., Lee, N.Y., Park,
598 C.K., Prema, R., Ronnie, G., Hemamalini, A., Ve, R.S., Baskaran, M. & Vijaya, L.
599 "Original article: The Ability of Short-Wavelength Automated Perimetry to Predict
600 Conversion to Glaucoma", *Indian Journal of Ophthalmology*, 2009, vol. 117; 53; 57,
601 no. 1; 3, pp. 30; 24; 207-34; 30; 211.
- 602 42. Liu, S., Lam, S., Weinreb, R.N., Ye, C., Cheung, C.Y., Lai, G., Lam, D.S.-. & Leung,
603 C.K.-. "Comparison of standard automated perimetry, frequency-doubling
604 technology perimetry, and short-wavelength automated perimetry for detection of
605 glaucoma", *Investigative Ophthalmology and Visual Science*, 2011, vol. 52, no. 10,
606 pp. 7325-7331.

- 607 43. Soliman, A.E., DeJong, L.A.M.S., Ismaeil, A.-A., Van den Berg, T.J.T.P. & De Smet,
608 M.D. "Standard achromatic perimetry, short wavelength automated perimetry, and
609 frequency doubling technology for detection of glaucoma damage", *Ophthalmology*,
610 2002, vol. 109, no. 3, pp. 444-454.
- 611 44. Sample PA, Bosworth CF, Weinreb RN. The loss of visual function in glaucoma.
612 *Seminars in Ophthalmology*. 2000, vol. 15, pp 182-93.
- 613 45. Quigley, H.A. "Identification of glaucoma-related visual field abnormality with the
614 screening protocol of frequency doubling technology", *American Journal of*
615 *Ophthalmology*, 1998, vol. 125, no. 6, pp. 819-829.
- 616 46. Lan, Y.W., Hsieh, J.W. & Sun, F.J. "Comparison of matrix perimetry with octopus
617 perimetry for assessing glaucomatous visual field defects", *Journal of Glaucoma*,
618 2011, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 126-132.
- 619 47. Anderson, A.J. & Johnson, C.A. "Frequency-doubling technology perimetry",
620 *Ophthalmology Clinics of North America*, 2003, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 213-225.
- 621 48. Landers, J.A., Goldberg, I. & Graham, S.L. Detection of Early Visual Field Loss in
622 Glaucoma Using Frequency-Doubling Perimetry and Short-Wavelength Automated
623 Perimetry", *Archives of Ophthalmology*, 2003, "vol. 121, no. 12, pp. 1705-1710.
- 624 49. Anderson, A.J., Johnson, C.A., Fingeret, M., Keltner, J.L., Werner, J.S., Spry,
625 P.G.D. & Wall, M. "Characteristics of the normative database for the Humphrey
626 Matrix perimeter", *Investigative Ophthalmology and Visual Science*, 2005, vol. 46,
627 no. 4, pp. 1540-1548.
- 628 50. Artes, P.H., Hutchison, D.M., Nicoleta, M.T., LeBlanc, R.P. & Chauhan, B.C.
629 "Threshold and variability properties of matrix frequency-doubling technology and
630 standard automated perimetry in glaucoma", *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual*
631 *Science*, 2005, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 2451-2457.
- 632 51. Brusini, P. & Busatto, P. "Frequency doubling perimetry in glaucoma early
633 diagnosis", *Acta Ophthalmologica Scandinavica*, 1998, Supplement, vol. 76, no.
634 227, pp. 23-24.
- 635 52. Henson, D.B. & Artes, P.H. "New developments in supra-threshold perimetry",
636 *Ophthalmic & Physiological Optics: The Journal Of The British College Of*
637 *Ophthalmic Opticians (Optometrists)*, 2002, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 463-468.
- 638 53. McKendrick, A.M. "Recent developments in perimetry: test stimuli and procedures",
639 *Clinical & Experimental Optometry: Journal Of The Australian Optometrical*
640 *Association*, 2005, vol. 88, no. 2, pp. 73-80.
- 641 54. Adams, C.W., Bullimore, M.A., Wall, M., Fingeret, M. & Johnson, C.A. "Normal aging
642 effects for frequency doubling technology perimetry", *Optometry and Vision Science*,
643 1999, vol. 76, no. 8, pp. 582-587.
- 644 55. Iwase, A., Tomidokoro, A., Araie, M., Shirato, S., Shimizu, H. & Kitazawa, Y.
645 "Original Article: Performance of Frequency-Doubling Technology Perimetry in a
646 Population-Based Prevalence Survey of Glaucoma. The Tajimi Study",
647 *Ophthalmology*, 2006, vol. 114, pp. 27-32.
- 648 56. Johnson, C.A. & Samuels, S.J. "Screening for glaucomatous visual field loss with
649 frequency-doubling perimetry", *Investigative Ophthalmology and Visual Science*,
650 1997, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 413-425.
- 651 57. Quigley, H.A., Dunkelberger, G.R. & Green, W.R. "Chronic human glaucoma
652 causing selectively greater loss of large optic nerve fibers", *Ophthalmology*, 1988,
653 vol. 95, no. 3, pp. 357-363.
- 654 58. Paczka, J.A., Friedman, D.S., Quigley, H.A., Barron, Y. & Vitale, S. "Diagnostic
655 capabilities of frequency-doubling technology, scanning laser polarimetry, and nerve
656 fiber layer photographs to distinguish glaucomatous damage", *American Journal of*
657 *Ophthalmology*, 2001, vol. 131, no. 2, pp. 188-197.

59. Cello, K.E., Nelson-Quigg, J. & Johnson, C.A. "Frequency doubling technology perimetry for detection of glaucomatous visual field loss", *American Journal of Ophthalmology*, 2000, vol. 129, no. 3, pp. 314-322.
60. Cioffi, G.A., Mansberger, S., Spry, P., Johnson, C. & Van Buskirk, E.M. "Frequency doubling perimetry and the detection of eye disease in the community", *Transactions of the American Ophthalmological Society*, 2000, vol. 98, pp. 195-199.
61. Fingeret, M., Smith, E., Reminick, L. & Johnson, C.A. "Frequency doubling technology perimetry as a screening tool in the general ophthalmic elderly population", *Perimetry Update*, 2001, eds. M. Wall & R.P. Mills, Kugler, , pp. 271.
62. Choi, J.A., Lee, N.Y. & Park, C.K. "Interpretation of the Humphrey Matrix 24-2 test in the diagnosis of preperimetric glaucoma", *Japanese Journal of Ophthalmology*, 2009, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 24-30.
63. Fogagnolo, P., Mazzolani, F., Rossetti, L. & Orzalesi, N. "Detecting glaucoma with frequency-doubling technology perimetry: A comparison between N-30 and C-20 screening programs", *Journal of Glaucoma*, 2005, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 485-491.
64. Medeiros, F.A., Sample, P.A., Zangwill, L.M., Liebmann, J.M., Girkin, C.A. & Weinreb, R.N. "A statistical approach to the evaluation of covariate effects on the receiver operating characteristic curves of diagnostic tests in glaucoma", *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, 2006, vol. 47, no. 6, pp. 2520-2527.
65. Hodapp, E., Parrish, R.I. & Anderson, D. *Clinical Decisions in Glaucoma*, 1993, Mosby, St Louis.
66. Sihota, R., Gupta, V., Tuli, D., Sharma, A., Sony, P. & Srinivasan, G. "Classifying patterns of localized glaucomatous visual field defects on automated perimetry", *Journal of Glaucoma*, 2007, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 146-152.
67. Ravi T, Bhat S, Muliyl JP et al. Frequency doubling perimetry in glaucoma. *Journal of Glaucoma* 2002, vol. 11 pp. 46-50.
68. Tribble JR, Schultz RO, Robinson JC, Rothe TL. Accuracy of glaucoma detection with Frequency-Doubling Perimetry. *American Journal of Ophthalmology* 2000, vol. 129 pp. 740-745.
69. Lester M, Mermoud A, Schnider C. Frequency doubling technique in patients with ocular hypertension and glaucoma. *Ophthalmology* 2000, vol. 107 pp. 288-294.
70. Brusini, P., Salvétat, M.L., Zeppieri, M. & Parisi, L. "Frequency doubling technology perimetry with the Humphrey Matrix 30-2 test", *Journal of Glaucoma*, 2006, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 77-83.
71. Weinreb, R.N., Medeiros, F.A. & Sample, P.A. "Corneal thickness measurements and frequency doubling technology perimetry abnormalities in ocular hypertensive eyes", *Ophthalmology*, 2003, vol. 110, no. 10, pp. 1903-1908.
72. Hong, S., Ahn, H., Ha, S.J., Yeom, H.Y., Seong, G.J. & Hong, Y.J. "Early Glaucoma Detection Using the Humphrey Matrix Perimeter, GDx VCC, Stratus OCT, and Retinal Nerve Fiber Layer Photography", *Ophthalmology*, 2007, vol. 114, no. 2, pp. 210-215.
73. Casson, R.J. & James, B. "Effect of cataract on frequency doubling perimetry in the screening mode", *Journal of Glaucoma*, 2006, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 23-25.
74. Quigley, H.A. & Broman, A.T. "The number of people with glaucoma worldwide in 2010 and 2020", *British Journal of Ophthalmology*, 2006, vol. 90, no. 3, pp. 262-267.
75. Burnstein Y, Ellish NJ, Magbalon M, Higginbotham EJ. Comparison of frequency doubling perimetry with Humphrey visual field analysis in a glaucoma practice. *American Journal of Ophthalmology*. 2000, vol. 129, pp. 328-33.
76. Spry, P.G.D., Hussin, H.M. & Sparrow, J.M. "Clinical evaluation of frequency doubling technology perimetry using the Humphrey Matrix 24-2 threshold strategy", *British Journal of Ophthalmology*, 2005, vol. 89, no. 8, pp. 1031-1035.

- 709 77. Quaranta, G.M., Vetrugno, M., Trabucco, T., Cantatore, F. & Cardia, L. "The role of
710 frequency doubling technology (FDT) in glaucoma screening", *Acta Ophthalmologica*
711 *Scandinavica*, 2000, Supplement, vol. 78, no. 232, pp. 21-23.
- 712 78. Racette, L., Medeiros, F.A., Zangwill, L.M., Ng, D., Weinreb, R.N. & Sample, P.A.
713 "Diagnostic Accuracy of the Matrix 24-2 and Original N-30 Frequency Doubling
714 Technology Tests Compared with Standard Automated Perimetry" *Investigative*
715 *Ophthalmology and Visual Science*, 2008, vol. 49 no.3 pp. 954-960.
- 716 79. Medeiros, F.A., Sample, P.A. & Weinreb, R.N. "Frequency doubling technology
717 perimetry abnormalities as predictors of glaucomatous visual field loss", *American*
718 *Journal of Ophthalmology*, 2004, vol. 137, no. 5, pp. 863-871.
- 719 80. Joson, P.J., Kamantigue, M.E.G. & Chen, P.P. "Learning effects among perimetric
720 novices in frequency doubling technology perimetry", *Ophthalmology*, 2002, vol.
721 109, no. 4, pp. 757-760.
- 722 81. Landers, J., Goldberg, I. & Graham, S. "A comparison of short wavelength
723 automated perimetry with frequency doubling perimetry for the early detection of
724 visual field loss in ocular hypertension", *Clinical and Experimental Ophthalmology*,
725 2000, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 248-252.
- 726 82. Bayer, A.U. & Erb, C. "Short wavelength automated perimetry, frequency doubling
727 technology perimetry, and pattern electroretinography for prediction of progressive
728 glaucomatous standard visual field defects", *Ophthalmology*, 2002, vol. 109, no. 5,
729 pp. 1009-1017.
- 730 83. Horn, F.K., Brenning, A., Junemann, A.G. & Lausen, B. "Glaucoma detection with
731 frequency doubling perimetry and short-wave length perimetry", *Journal of*
732 *Glaucoma*, 2007, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 363-371.
- 733 84. Ferreras, A., Polo, V., Larrosa, J.M., Pablo, L.E., Pajarin, A.B., Pueyo, V. &
734 Honrubia, F.M. "Can frequency-doubling technology and short-wavelength
735 automated perimetries detect visual field defects before standard automated
736 perimetry in patients with preperimetric glaucoma?", *Journal of Glaucoma*, 2007, vol.
737 16, no. 4, pp. 372-383.