

1 **Title:** Automated visual acuity estimation by optokinetic nystagmus using a stepped sweep
2 stimulus.

3 **Authors:**

4 Jason Turuwhenua,^{1,2}

5 Zaw LinTun,¹

6 Mohammad Norouzifard,¹

7 Misty Edmonds,⁴

8 Rebecca Findlay,²

9 Joanna Black,²

10 Benjamin Thompson^{2,3,6,7}

11

12 Corresponding author:

13 Jason Turuwhenua, The Auckland Bioengineering Institute

14 70 Symonds St, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

15 *email:* j.turuwhenua@auckland.ac.nz

16

17 Affiliations:

- 18 1. Auckland Bioengineering Institute, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand
- 19 2. School of Optometry and Vision Science, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New
20 Zealand
- 21 3. School of Optometry and Vision Science, The University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada
- 22 4. Iwi United Engaged Ltd, New Zealand.
- 23 5. Centre for Eye and Vision Research, 17W Science Park, Hong Kong
- 24 6. Liggins Institute, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

25

26 **Financial support:** Health Research Council of New Zealand (HRC 21/514). BT is supported
27 by InnoHK and the Hong Kong Government.

28

29 **Financial disclosures:** The co-authors Turuwhenua and Thompson are co-inventors of the
30 stimulus used in this work (Patent No. 11207023).

31

32 **Word count:**

33 **3655**

1 **ABSTRACT**

2

3 **Purpose:** Measuring visual acuity (VA) can be challenging in adults with cognitive impairment
4 and young children. We developed an automatic system for measuring VA using Optokinetic
5 Nystagmus (OKN).

6

7 **Methods:** VA-OKN and VA by ETDRS (VA-ETDRS) were measured monocularly in healthy
8 participants (n=23, age 30±12). VA was classified as reduced (n=22, >0.2 logMAR) or not
9 (n=24, ≤0.2 logMAR) in each eye. VA-OKN stimulus was an array of drifting (5 deg/sec)
10 vanishing disks presented in descending/ascending size order (0.0 to 1.0 logMAR in 0.1
11 logMAR steps). The stimulus was stepped every 2 seconds, and 10 sweeps were shown per
12 eye. Eye tracking data determined when OKN activity ceased (descending sweep) or began
13 (ascending sweep) to give an automated sweep VA. Sweep traces were randomized and
14 assessed by a reviewer blinded to VA-ETDRS. A final per sweep VA and VA-OKN was thereby
15 determined.

16

17 **Results:** A single randomly selected eye was used for analysis. VA deficit group: There was
18 no significant difference between overall mean VA-OKN and VA-ETDRS ($p>0.05$, paired t-test)
19 and the r^2 statistic was 0.84. The 95% limits of agreement were 0.19 logMAR. No VA deficit
20 group: There was a 0.24 logMAR bias between VA-OKN and VA-ETDRS and no correlation
21 was found ($r^2 = 0.06$). However, the overall sensitivity/specificity for classification was 100%.

22

23 **Conclusions:** A robust correlation between VA-ETDRS and VA-OKN was found. The method
24 correctly detected a VA deficit.

25

1 **Translational relevance:** OKN is a promising method for measuring VA in cognitively
2 impaired adults and pre-verbal children.

3

4 **Keywords:** Optokinetic nystagmus, Visual acuity, Vanishing disk.

1 INTRODUCTION

2
3 Visual acuity (VA) is the quantitative measure of the ability to discriminate fine detail. It is
4 arguably the single-most important functional measure of vision, and it is used to diagnose and
5 monitor a range of visual disorders including refractive error, macular degeneration and
6 amblyopia.^{1,2} However, measuring VA is challenging in people who may lack the cognitive
7 ability to perform standard VA tests, such as adults with neurological impairment or very young
8 children.^{3,4}

9 There are two objective approaches available to estimate VA in such patients: 1) visual evoked
10 potentials (VEPs) or 2) optokinetic nystagmus (OKN).⁵ VEPs are electrical responses
11 measured from the visual cortex that arise in response to structured targets shown to the
12 observer. The stimulus is typically constructed from stripes, gratings or checkboards, which are
13 typically swept in steps from low to high frequency with cortical activity measured at each step.
14 VA is determined by regression applied to higher spatial frequency activities in order to find the
15 x-axis crossing of the activity versus time graph,⁶ the idea being that cortical activity decreases
16 as the stimulus' spatial frequency approaches threshold. However, despite the fact that the
17 sweep VEP is a rapid and well understood method^{7,8} in clinical practice it requires a trained
18 operator and expensive/complex equipment which makes it difficult to implement.^{5,9}

19 OKN is a reflexive oculomotor response of the eye consisting of stereotyped slow tracking (the
20 slow phase or SP) and quick, opposite direction, re-fixation movements (the quick phase or QP)
21 that occur in response to a drifting pattern.¹⁰ OKN manifests as a highly distinctive “beating” of
22 the eye, which appears in eye tracking data as a repeated “sawtooth” pattern on a displacement
23 versus time plot as shown in **Fig.1**. In clinical practice, OKN is elicited by the induction method:
24 a vertically striped drum is rotated in front of the patient. If the stimulus is visible to the observer
25 it will elicit the involuntary OKN response whilst if it is invisible to the patient then it will not.

1 Varying the spatial frequency of the stimulus (by altering the distance of the drum to the eye),
2 gives an estimate of VA as the minimum grating size that elicited OKN. However, the spinning
3 drum technique is a highly subjective procedure.

4 The general concept of objective estimation of VA using OKN is long established,¹¹⁻¹³ yet its
5 application as an objective probe of visual function is only now receiving renewed interest.¹⁴⁻¹⁹

6 Hyon et. al. incorporated video-oculography and used a high contrast (85%) striped stimulus
7 drifting at 10 deg/sec on a display to test distance vision.²⁰ The induction method was used to
8 measure a minimum stripe size. The suppression method,⁵ in which a fixation target of varying
9 visibility is used to halt the response, was also used to determine the minimum dot size needed
10 to stop the optokinetic response. In that work, r^2 statistics of 0.57 and 0.83 were reported
11 against logMAR VA using induction/suppression paradigms respectively. Shin et al.²¹ used a
12 similar experimental paradigm applied to a range of disease states. The reported correlation
13 coefficients corresponded to r^2 statistics between 0.38-0.88 (induction) and 0.006-0.76
14 (suppression). However, Aleci et al. noted that the precision and accuracy in these previous
15 studies was low,^{14,22} and that the stripe stimulus velocity imposed severe restrictions on the
16 range of acuities that could be tested. Aleci et al. therefore proposed a slowly moving (1.43 and
17 2.86 deg/sec) and low contrast (20%) row of optotypes. Using an induction paradigm an r^2
18 statistic of 0.74 with VA (measured by Sloan optotypes) was reported for co-operative
19 participants, noting also the inclusion of a noise component added to the symbols to lower the
20 visibility of larger optotypes. Using the same paradigm, Aleci et. al.²² subsequently reported r^2
21 statistics of 0.63 and 0.70 with subjective VA for AMD and Cataract patients respectively.

22 Our own approach shares a similar motivation to that of Aleci et al. Firstly, we avoid a striped
23 stimulus. Instead we propose a novel stimulus consisting of an array of slow drifting (5 deg/sec)
24 vanishing disk optotypes. As shown in **Fig. 2(a)**, each disk of the array comprises a brighter

1 central disk (mean contrast 87%) which determines the angular size of the stimulus calibrated
2 in logMAR units. Crucially, the disk has a darker surround (mean contrast -14%) that averages
3 out the central disk at threshold in accordance with the vanishing principle.^{23,24} In doing so, we
4 aim to mitigate the velocity and width restrictions imposed by stripes, avoid very low contrast
5 (20%) stimuli that have been used previously, and remove the need for additional noise.
6 Moreover, an advantage of the logMAR specification is that it avoids reliance on arbitrary units
7 used previously.^{11,20–22}

8 In this work we use repeating stepped ascending and descending sweeps varying the logMAR
9 size of the stimulus at each step as shown in **Fig. 2(b)**. Aleci et al. used a similar adaptive
10 sweep that was subjectively driven by an observer. However we use eye tracking to objectively
11 measure eye displacement data during each sweep, which is processed by an OKN detection
12 system. **Fig. 2(c)** shows eye tracker data for a descending (top panel) and ascending sweep
13 (lower panel). The figure shows OKN activity for the sweep (shown in orange) which is used to
14 determine the OKN drop-off and onset times (the times when OKN stops or starts depending on
15 sweep direction). For a given descending sweep the drop-off point is the last time point of OKN
16 activity, whilst for the ascending sweep the onset time point is the first point of OKN activity.
17 Finally we perform VA scoring as shown in **Fig. 2(d)**. We propose a *per sweep* VA based on
18 standard letter-by-letter scoring used for VA charts.²⁵ Our key modification is to replace letter
19 counting with the drop-off/onset times at which OKN disappears/appears to provide a VA. An
20 overall final VA is found by averaging over all sweeps.

21 We provide proof-of-concept of the overall approach in a small cohort of people with and
22 without a visual deficit. We determine a VA by automation, and then obtain a final VA-OKN after
23 assessment by a reviewer blinded to VA by ETDRS (VA-ETDRS). Final VA-OKN is compared

- 1 to VA-ETDRS measured using the Electronic Visual Acuity (EVA) tester (Emmes, USA).
- 2 Potential improvements to the presented work are provided in the discussion.

1 DESCRIPTION OF PROCESSING PIPELINE

2

3 ***VA scoring for OKN***

4 Our scoring is based on the Early Treatment of Diabetic Retinopathy Study (ETDRS) chart. The
5 chart consists of 5 letters per line. Each line differs by 0.1 logMAR, and each letter has a value
6 of 0.02 logMAR. In a standard letter-by-letter scoring method²⁵ the patient reads out aloud
7 each letter from the largest logMAR line (VA_{max}) to the smallest (VA_{min}). VA_{\downarrow} is then given by,

8

$$9 \quad VA_{\downarrow} = 0.1 + VA_{max} - 0.02n \quad (1)$$

10

11 where n is the number of correctly identified letters, and the arrow indicates the direction of
12 reading (from largest to smallest letters). It is also possible to move from the smallest letters of
13 size VA_{min} to the largest. In this case we have,

14

$$15 \quad VA_{\uparrow} = VA_{min} + 0.02m \quad (2)$$

16

17 where m is now the number of incorrectly counted letters, and the up arrow indicates the
18 direction of reading (from smallest to largest letters).

19

20 Crucially, our approach proposes to replace letters in Eqns. (1) and (2) by the *time* at which the
21 OKN response to stimulus of decreasing/increasing size either *stops*, t_{\downarrow} or commences t_{\uparrow}
22 (descending and ascending sweeps respectively). Eqn (1) now becomes

23

$$24 \quad VA_{\downarrow} = 0.1 + VA_{max} - \kappa t_{\downarrow} \quad (3)$$

25

26 for the descending sweep, and Eqn. (2) becomes

27

$$28 \quad VA_{\uparrow} = \kappa t_{\uparrow} + VA_{min} \quad (4)$$

29

30 for the ascending sweep. Here κ is the absolute step-rate in logMAR/sec. It is noted here that
31 using the earliest/latest time to replace letter counting is a convenient heuristic that we test
32 empirically. The methods for determining t_{\downarrow} and t_{\uparrow} that we implemented will be described
33 further below.

34

35 If a sweep did not generate detectable OKN then the VA was set to the upper limit $VA_{max}+0.1$
36 on the understanding that it would be greater than or equal to this result. This could be
37 expected if a participant did not see the stimulus, or did not generate detectable OKN during
38 the test, or if there was an OKN detection/measurement failure.

39

40 ***OKN detection***

41 Objective OKN detection was facilitated, in this work, by an already published method. The
42 reader is encouraged to consult that work for further details.²⁶ In brief, this approach
43 segmented the signal in the incoming eye tracking signal into SP-QP pairs. The SP was found
44 by looking for a ramping displacement in the known stimulus direction. The QP was then found
45 as a quick re-setting in the opposite direction subsequent to the SP. Candidate OKN was
46 thresholded based on criteria such as amplitude, duration and velocity²⁶ to eliminate unlikely
47 detections. At this point, if remaining OKN was found to be repeating (2 or more consecutive
48 detections) it was considered to be *valid* OKN. The “repeating OKN” criterion has proven to be

49 a strong feature in work to date and also appears in the work of others.^{18,26,27} We also detected
50 groups of at least three unconnected instances of OKN that fell within a sliding 2-second
51 window. We observed that this situation could arise if OKN was present but was missed by the
52 detector (e.g., low amplitude OKN). This “intermittent” OKN rule was used to mitigate cases
53 where the “repeating OKN” criterion was not activated. Any OKN points found by these criteria
54 were labelled as *valid* OKN.

55

56 ***OKN activity & VA estimation***

57 The two empirical criteria of the previous section together give an instantaneous *OKN activity*,

58

$$p_{\downarrow/\uparrow}(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \textit{valid} \text{ OKN} \\ 0 & \text{if not } \textit{valid} \text{ OKN} \end{cases}$$

59

60 where the arrows specify an descending or ascending sweep respectively. Given a
61 descending sweep, we define the OKN drop-off point t_{\downarrow} as the point at which OKN ceases.

62 More formally this is

63

$$64 \quad t_{\downarrow} = \max_t [p_{\downarrow}(t)] \text{ such that } p_{\downarrow}(t) = 1$$

65 (5)

66

67 which is the *maximum* time point t_{\downarrow} of *OKN activity*. If no drop-off time is found then $VA_{\downarrow} \geq$
68 $0.1 + VA_{max}$ as determined by substituting $t_{\downarrow} = 0$ in Eqn (3). Given an ascending sweep, the
69 OKN onset time t_{\uparrow} occurs at the *minimum* time of OKN activity,

70

$$71 \quad t_{\uparrow} = \min_t [p_{\uparrow}(t)] \text{ such that } p_{\uparrow}(t) = 1 \tag{6}$$

72

73 If this point does not exist then we set t_{\uparrow} to the time corresponding to the end of the last
74 presentation, and VA will also be $VA_{\uparrow} \geq 0.1 + VA_{max}$. In any case, given any otherwise found
75 t_{\uparrow} or t_{\downarrow} value, we enter the result of Eqn. (5) into Eqn. (3) for VA_{\downarrow} , or Eqn. (6) into Eqn (4) for
76 VA_{\uparrow} .

77

78 **Fig 2(c)** demonstrates this process in the case of two subsequent sweeps
79 (descending/ascending respectively). The green/red regions indicate all instances of *potential*
80 OKN. Our process identifies these as *valid* OKN (or not) to yield the OKN activity. The OKN
81 activity is shown in orange along the base of each sweep (presence corresponds to activity).
82 The drop-off and onset-points are the times of last activity (top panel) and first activity (bottom
83 panel) respectively as marked as dotted lines. These are then transformed into logMAR VAs
84 using Eqns. (3) and (4), and are reported in the top right corner of each panel.

1 **METHODS**

2

3 ***Participants***

4 The research followed the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki. The study was approved by the
5 University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee (UAHPEC20318). Participants
6 (n=11) with reduced VA due to refractive error were recruited, as were participants with no
7 refractive error (n=12). Both eyes of the participants were measured monocularly without
8 refractive correction with occlusion of the non-tested eye.

9

10 ***VA-ETDRS***

11 Participants' VAs were measured using the EVA system in single-letter presentation mode.
12 Letters were flanked by crowding bars. Testing distance was 3m. VA-ETDRS was the average
13 of up to 5 repeated measurements taken consecutively within a single measurement session.
14 Participants with a logMAR VA-ETDRS of ≤ 0.2 logMAR were classified as "no VA deficit".
15 Those with a VA of >0.2 logMAR were classified as belonging to a "reduced VA" group.²⁹
16 These groups were analysed separately.

17

18 ***VA-OKN***

19 ***Equipment***

20 The viewing distance was 3 meters. The stimulus was presented on a 27-inch monitor (Dell
21 S2716DG). This monitor had the nVidia Ultra-Low Motion Blur (ULMB) function engaged to
22 minimize the presence of motion blur inherent to light-emitting diode displays.²⁸ The refresh
23 rate was 85 Hz. Eye tracking data was measured using Pupil Invisible glasses (Pupil Labs,
24 Berlin, Germany) with sampling at 200Hz and down-sampling to 50Hz. The stimulus was

25 written using the jsPsych framework for behavioural experiments, and the experiment was
26 presented using the Chrome web-browser window running in full-screen mode. The system
27 was co-ordinated by a standard desktop PC using a combination of Javascript and Python.
28 Further offline analysis of this data after data collection was performed using Matlab (Natick,
29 VA).

30

31 ***Stepped sweep stimulus***

32 The average contrast (with respect to the background) was 87% (central disk) and -14%
33 (annulus). The angular size of the central disk was the central disk size in logMAR units. A
34 sweep stepped through 11 logMAR levels from 0.0 to 1.0 in 0.1 logMAR steps in
35 descending/ascending order. The stimulus stepped every 2 seconds (step rate κ was 0.05
36 logMAR/sec) and stimulus drift speed was 5 deg/sec for the entirety of a sweep. The total
37 presentation time for a single sweep was 22 seconds. The first/last presentations were
38 extended before the start and end of the measurement interval by 0.75 sec (giving a total
39 presentation time of 23.5 seconds) to allow some time for OKN to either initiate before or pass
40 beyond the analysis interval. These appear as the blue regions on either side of a sweep
41 presented in **Fig 2(b)** and were not included for analysis. As mentioned already, the stimulus
42 was shown as 5 descending/ascending interleaved sweeps (a total of 10 sweeps). The time to
43 test an eye was about 4 minutes.

44

45 ***VA estimation***

46 An automated per sweep VA (VA_{\uparrow} or VA_{\downarrow}) was determined using the objective analysis
47 described in the previous section. OKN detection was performed using a single “best set” of
48 OKN detection parameters that were found empirically and applied across all data collected.

49 The total number of sweeps processed was 460 (23 participants * 10 sweeps* 2 eyes = 460).
50 Automated VA-OKN was averaged over the 10 sweeps per eye. Sweep data was reviewed at
51 the time of data-collection. Measurement of an eye could be repeated if unwanted artefacts
52 (e.g., due to excessive blinking, or noisy signal) were identified.

53

54 After this stage of analysis, a further assessment step was performed by a reviewer blinded to
55 VA-ETDRS. Measured sweeps were randomized and resulting sweep data traces (for example
56 as shown in **Fig 2(c)**) were provided to the reviewer. The reviewer was asked to identify their
57 own estimate of a final per sweep VA starting with the automated sweep results. The average
58 of these reviewed sweep VAs provided a final VA-OKN.

1 RESULTS

3 **Results for final VA-OKN**

4 A summary of results is presented in **Table 1** and **Table 2** for the “reduced VA” group and “no
5 VA deficit” groups respectively (n=23 participants and a total of 46 eyes). Results below are
6 reported for a randomly selected eye, noting that the right eyes for P-02 and P-04 were
7 purposefully excluded from analysis because their final VA-OKN results were unbounded.

8
9 Reduced VA group: VA-OKN was 0.52 ± 0.37 logMAR (mean \pm 2SD). VA-ETDRS was
10 0.54 ± 0.45 logMAR. There was no significant difference between the two measures ($p=0.55$
11 >0.05 , $t=-0.61$, paired t-test). **Fig 3(a)** presents a scatter plot comparing VA-OKN and VA-
12 ETDRS for the “deficit” group only. The r-squared value (r^2) was 0.84. The corresponding
13 Bland-Altman diagram in **Fig 3(b)** plots the differences between VA-OKN and VA-ETDRS
14 against their means. The limits of agreement (LoA) were 0.19 logMAR and the mean
15 difference was -0.02 logMAR. The mean difference was not significantly different from zero
16 by the result comparing VA-OKN and VA-ETDRS above.

17
18 No VA deficit group: VA-OKN was 0.05 ± 0.10 logMAR. VA-ETDRS was -0.19 ± 0.13 logMAR.
19 There was a significant difference between the two groups ($p=0.00 <0.05$, $t=8.50$, paired t-
20 test). This value was also lower/better than the floor of the OKN measurement device (0.0 to
21 1.1 logMAR). **Fig 4(a)** presents a scatter plot that directly compares VA-ETDRS and VA-OKN
22 directly against each other for the “no deficit” group. The r^2 statistic was 0.06 indicating no
23 correlation between the two VA measures. The Bland-Altman diagram in **Fig 4(b)** produced an
24 LoA of 0.14 logMAR and mean difference of 0.24 logMAR. The mean difference was
25 significant as already determined by the result comparing VA-OKN to VA-ETDRS.

26

27 Screening performance: There were no instances in which VA-OKN misclassified the
28 presence/absence of VA deficit as determined by VA-ETDRS. Overall the sensitivity/specificity
29 for detecting a VA deficit was 100%.

30

31 ***The effect of an expert review of automated VA-OKN***

32 Reduced VA group: The overall mean for the deficit group found by automation was $0.54 \pm$
33 0.36 logMAR. This was not changed significantly by an expert review of the results
34 ($p=0.80>0.05$, $t=3.67$, paired t-test). The r^2 for final VA-OKN vs VA-ETDRS was 0.02 higher
35 than the automated result alone. The LoA for final VA-OKN vs VA-ETDRS was 0.1 logMAR
36 lower than the automated result.

37

38 No VA deficit group: The no VA deficit group mean was 0.07 ± 0.10 logMAR by automation. The
39 automated VA-OKN result was not changed significantly by the manual review ($p=0.21>0.05$,
40 $t=-1.32$, paired t-test). The r^2 and LoAs were unchanged.

41

42 Screening performance: The pre-review sensitivity was 92%. The specificity was 100%. The
43 reduced sensitivity occurred because a single eye was incorrectly classified as having VA
44 deficit (VA-OKN= $0.21>0.2$ logMAR) by automation.

45

1 DISCUSSION

2
3 In this paper we presented an automated pipeline for measurement of VA by OKN. The final
4 VA-OKN results were encouraging. For those in the “VA deficit” group, for which the range of
5 VA-ETDRS results fell within the measurement range of the VA-OKN measurement system,
6 we observed a strong correlation ($r^2=0.84$) between VA-OKN and VA-ETDRS. This r^2 value
7 compares favourably to results reported previously for VA by OKN between 0.53-0.83.^{14,22,30}

8
9 Previous work has been somewhat limited by the use of arbitrary units,^{11,14,20,21} which have
10 constrained comparisons between OKN-induction stimuli spatial characteristics and standard
11 letter based VA. In this work, Bland-Altman analysis indicated a degree of agreement between
12 VA-OKN and VA-ETDRS. The LoAs for the VA deficit group were 0.19 logMAR. These limits
13 are comparable to results from VEP based VA assessment noting two studies by Bach et. al.
14 ^{7,31} which indicated an accuracy of about 0.3 logMAR. Although not a direct comparison, the
15 results are on the order of the inherent (test-retest) variability found for ETDRS charts of 0.11
16 to 0.25.^{29,32} Whilst the present results are encouraging, we also recognize as with VEP,³³ that
17 OKN based testing is not the same as recognition VA measured with a chart. The exploration
18 of these differences in healthy participants and those with ocular disease would characterize
19 the method more fully and would be the subject of further work.

20
21 For the “no VA deficit” group we found a significant bias of 0.24 logMAR between VA-OKN and
22 VA-ETDRS. VA-ETDRS was significantly better/lower than VA-OKN. Whilst the lowest/best
23 VA-OKN that could be measured by our device was 0.0 logMAR, it is likely that there was also
24 an inherent bias due to the stimulus itself. Hamilton et. al.⁸ reported similar biases between
25 sweep VEP and recognition VA of 0.03 to 0.3 log units for normally sighted participants.

1 Extending the range of the stimulus to provide direct comparison in the lower/better logMAR
2 range is a possibility for future work. A larger cohort with a wider spread of VA-ETDRS values
3 should provide a clearer picture of performance overall.

4
5 VA-OKN accurately classified all participants as “no VA deficit” or “reduced VA” using a
6 screening threshold of 0.2 logMAR. This result suggests that VA-OKN may provide a viable
7 screening option, particularly for adults and children who are unable to engage with current
8 vision screening techniques, which frequently involve measurement of visual acuity using
9 symbols or letters.

10
11 It should be noted that the automated pipeline *did* require operator supervision. The expert
12 review detected a misclassification error, and improved r^2 and LoA overall. We observed that
13 OKN detection could fail because of excessive blinking, false detections caused by noisy
14 signal or incorrect classification of saccades as OKN; none of which were handled directly by
15 the present method. Fortunately, we had the opportunity to address such issues by re-
16 measuring our co-operative adult participants. Our system was not tested on adults with
17 cognitive impairment or young children in this work, and we recognize that the opportunity to
18 remediate measurement problems may not be available to the operator in such subjects.
19 Improvements could be made to defend against unwanted artefacts (e.g., by pausing the
20 experiment in the presence of excessive blinking), or to improve the robustness of data
21 acquisition/analysis (e.g., by explicit detection and removal of purely saccadic movements). It
22 may be that we could skip a given logMAR level if it was robustly detected (descending sweep)
23 or, simply stop the sweep altogether similarly (ascending sweep) when OKN commenced.
24 Recently, work has been done in improving the classification of OKN by machine learning
25 methods^{35,36} which we expect will have significant benefits for such efforts described here. For

1 now, we can only emphasize the need for supervision and caution when interpreting results
2 produced by the system.

3
4 Finally, we note that the parameters of the sweep such as stimulus velocity, step duration, and
5 specific contrasts used in the construction of the stimulus were chosen largely empirically.
6 Although the resulting stimulus presented here appeared to be effective, there remains a large
7 parameter space for the OKN induction stimulus, and the optimum combination of spatial and
8 temporal parameters is still being established.

9

10 **CONCLUSION**

11 We have presented a clinically inspired method for determining VA threshold using an
12 automated response. The results support the concept of objective assessment of VA using
13 OKN. Overall, the method here aims to progress toward clinically applicable objective
14 estimation of VA using the optokinetic response. Results to date are encouraging, but further
15 investigation into OKN based VA is warranted.

16

17 A simplified demonstration of the sweeping vanishing disk stimulus is available at:
18 bit.ly/4ayJhwg

19 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

20 Support is acknowledged from the Health Research Council of New Zealand (HRC21/514).

21

1 REFERENCES

- 2 1. Ariyasu, R. G. *et al.* Sensitivity, Specificity, and Predictive Values of Screening Tests for
3 Eye Conditions in a Clinic-based Population. *Ophthalmology* **103**, 1751–1760 (1996).
- 4 2. Holmes, J. M. & Clarke, M. P. Amblyopia. *Lancet Lond. Engl.* **367**, 1343–1351 (2006).
- 5 3. Hoyt, C. S. Objective techniques of visual acuity assessment in infancy. *Aust. N. Z. J.*
6 *Ophthalmol.* **14**, 205–209 (1986).
- 7 4. Anstice, N. S. & Thompson, B. The measurement of visual acuity in children: an evidence-
8 based update. *Clin. Exp. Optom.* **97**, 3–11 (2014).
- 9 5. Aleci, C. & Rosa, C. Psychophysics in the ophthalmological practice—I. visual acuity. *Ann.*
10 *Eye Sci.* **7**, 37–37 (2022).
- 11 6. Almoqbel, F., Leat, S. J. & Irving, E. The technique, validity and clinical use of the sweep
12 VEP. *Ophthalmic Physiol. Opt.* **28**, 393–403 (2008).
- 13 7. Bach, M., [Link to external site, this link will open in a new tab](#) & Farmer, J. D. Evaluation of
14 the “Freiburg Acuity VEP” on Commercial Equipment. *Doc. Ophthalmol.* **140**, 139–145
15 (2020).
- 16 8. Hamilton, R. *et al.* VEP estimation of visual acuity: a systematic review. *Doc. Ophthalmol.*
17 *Adv. Ophthalmol.* **142**, 25–74 (2021).
- 18 9. Schwob, N. & Palmowski-Wolfe, A. Objective measurement of visual acuity by optokinetic
19 nystagmus suppression in children and adult patients. *J. Am. Assoc. Pediatr. Ophthalmol.*
20 *Strabismus* **23**, 272.e1-272.e6 (2019).
- 21 10. Waddington, J. & Harris, C. M. Human optokinetic nystagmus: A stochastic analysis. *J. Vis.*
22 **12**, 5–5 (2012).
- 23 11. Reinecke, R. D. & Cogan, D. G. Standardization of Objective Visual Acuity Measurements:
24 Opticokinetic Nystagmus us. Snellen Acuity. *AMA Arch. Ophthalmol.* **60**, 418–421 (1958).


- 1 12. Lewkonia, I. Objective assessment of visual acuity by induction of optokinetic nystagmus.
2 *Br. J. Ophthalmol.* **53**, 641–644 (1969).
- 3 13. Wester, S. T., Rizzo, J. F., Balkwill, M. D. & Wall, C. Optokinetic Nystagmus as a Measure
4 of Visual Function in Severely Visually Impaired Patients. *Invest. Ophthalmol. Vis. Sci.* **48**,
5 4542–4548 (2007).
- 6 14. Aleci, C., Scaparrotti, M., Fulgori, S. & Canavese, L. A novel and cheap method to
7 correlate subjective and objective visual acuity by using the optokinetic response. *Int.*
8 *Ophthalmol.* (2017) doi:10.1007/s10792-017-0709-x.
- 9 15. Dakin, S. C. & Turnbull, P. R. Similar contrast sensitivity functions measured using
10 psychophysics and optokinetic nystagmus. *Sci. Rep.* **6**, (2016).
- 11 16. Sangi, M. Automated Optokinetic Nystagmus Detection for Use with Young Subjects.
12 (University of Auckland, 2017).
- 13 17. Ohnsman, C. M. *et al.* Pilot Study of Novel Optokinetic Nystagmus-Based Visual Acuity
14 Test in Children with CLN2 Disease. *Invest. Ophthalmol. Vis. Sci.* **62**, 3141 (2021).
- 15 18. Essig, P., Sauer, Y. & Wahl, S. Contrast Sensitivity Testing in Healthy and Blurred Vision
16 Conditions Using a Novel Optokinetic Nystagmus Live-Detection Method. *Transl. Vis. Sci.*
17 *Technol.* **10**, 12 (2021).
- 18 19. Doustkouhi, S. M., Turnbull, P. R. K. & Dakin, S. C. The effect of refractive error on
19 optokinetic nystagmus. *Sci. Rep.* **10**, 20062 (2020).
- 20 20. Han, S. B. *et al.* Measurement of distance objective visual acuity with the computerized
21 optokinetic nystagmus test in patients with ocular diseases. *Graefes Arch. Clin. Exp.*
22 *Ophthalmol.* **249**, 1379–1385 (2011).
- 23 21. Shin, Y. J. *et al.* Objective measurement of visual acuity by optokinetic response
24 determination in patients with ocular diseases. *Am. J. Ophthalmol.* **141**, 327–332 (2006).

- 1 22. Aleci, C., Cossu, G., Belcastro, E. & Canavese, L. The optokinetic response is effective to
2 assess objective visual acuity in patients with cataract and age-related macular
3 degeneration. *Int. Ophthalmol.* (2018) doi:10.1007/s10792-018-1001-4.
- 4 23. Shah, N., Dakin, S. C., Redmond, T. & Anderson, R. S. Vanishing optotype acuity:
5 repeatability and effect of the number of alternatives. *Ophthalmic Physiol. Opt.* **31**, 17–22
6 (2011).
- 7 24. Frisén, L. Vanishing optotypes: new type of acuity test letters. *Arch. Ophthalmol.* **104**,
8 1194–1198 (1986).
- 9 25. Vanden Bosch, M. E. & Wall, M. Visual acuity scored by the letter-by-letter or probit
10 methods has lower retest variability than the line assignment method. *Eye* **11**, 411–417
11 (1997).
- 12 26. Norouzifard, M., Black, J., Thompson, B., Klette, R. & Turuwhenua, J. A Real-Time Eye
13 Tracking Method for Detecting Optokinetic Nystagmus. in *Pattern Recognition* (eds.
14 Palaiiahnakote, S., Sanniti di Baja, G., Wang, L. & Yan, W. Q.) 143–155 (Springer
15 International Publishing, 2020). doi:10.1007/978-3-030-41299-9_12.
- 16 27. Turuwhenua, J., Yu, T. Y., Mazharullah, Z. & Thompson, B. A method for detecting
17 optokinetic nystagmus based on the optic flow of the limbus. *Vision Res.* **103**, 75–82
18 (2014).
- 19 28. Ito, H., Ogawa, M. & Sunaga, S. Evaluation of an organic light-emitting diode display for
20 precise visual stimulation. *J. Vis.* **13**, (2013).
- 21 29. Rosser, D. A., Cousens, S. N., Murdoch, I. E., Fitzke, F. W. & Laidlaw, D. A. H. How
22 Sensitive to Clinical Change are ETDRS logMAR Visual Acuity Measurements? *Invest.*
23 *Ophthalmol. Vis. Sci.* **44**, 3278–3281 (2003).

- 1 30. Hyon, J. Y. *et al.* Objective measurement of distance visual acuity determined by
2 computerized optokinetic nystagmus test. *Invest. Ophthalmol. Vis. Sci.* **51**, 752–757
3 (2010).
- 4 31. Bach, M., Maurer, J. P. & Wolf, M. E. Visual evoked potential-based acuity assessment in
5 normal vision, artificially degraded vision, and in patients. *Br. J. Ophthalmol.* **92**, 396–403
6 (2008).
- 7 32. Siderov, J. & Tiu, A. L. Variability of measurements of visual acuity in a large eye clinic.
8 *Acta Ophthalmol. Scand.* **77**, 673–676 (1999).
- 9 33. Zheng, X. *et al.* Assessment of Human Visual Acuity Using Visual Evoked Potential: A
10 Review. *Sensors* **20**, 5542 (2020).
- 11 34. Beck, R. W. *et al.* A computerized method of visual acuity testing: Adaptation of the early
12 treatment of diabetic retinopathy study testing protocol. *Am. J. Ophthalmol.* **135**, 194–205
13 (2003).
- 14 35. Newman, J. L., Phillips, J. S. & Cox, S. J. 1D Convolutional Neural Networks for Detecting
15 Nystagmus. *IEEE J. Biomed. Health Inform.* **25**, 1814–1823 (2021).
- 16 36. Ben Slama, A. *et al.* A deep convolutional neural network for automated vestibular disorder
17 classification using VNG analysis. *Comput. Methods Biomech. Biomed. Eng. Imaging Vis.*
18 **8**, 334–342 (2020).
- 19
- 20

1 **FIGURE 1**

2




3

4 **FIGURE 1.** Optokinetic nystagmus. Automatically detected slow phases are shown in green,
5 and quick phases are shown in red.

1 **FIGURE 2**

2




3

4

5 **FIGURE 2.** (a) The VA for the vanishing disk stimulus is determined by the angular size (α) of
6 the central brighter disk. (b) The stimulus is a horizontally drifting array of vanishing disks,
7 which is swept in descending/ascending order. (c) Analysis of eye tracking data. Top panel
8 shows results for a descending sweep whilst bottom panel shows results for an ascending
9 sweep. The OKN activity is shown in orange along the bottom. The OKN drop-off point/onset
10 point determines a VA for a sweep. (d) Final VA-OKN is the average of a total of 10 sweeps.

1 **FIGURE 3**




2

3 **FIGURE 3.** (a) The correlation plot for the reduced VA group. The regression line is a solid
4 line, the ideal line is dotted. (b) Bland-Altman diagram shows difference between VA-OKN and
5 VA-ETDRS against their means.

1 **FIGURE 4**

2



3

4 **FIGURE 4.** (a) The correlation plot for the no VA deficit group. The regression line is a solid
5 line, the ideal line is dotted. Red line shows the floor of the OKN device (0.0 logMAR). (b)
6 Bland-Altman diagram shows difference between VA-OKN and VA-ETDRS against their
7 means.

1 **TABLE 1**

Reduced VA group

Participant	OD			OS		
	VA-ETDRS	VA-OKN	Random	VA-ETDRS	VA-OKN	Random
P0-1	0.52	0.48	-	0.56	0.48	✓
P0-2	1.06	1.02	-	0.8	0.82	✓
P0-3	0.5	0.54	-	0.5	0.42	✓
P0-4	1.01	1.01	-	0.11	0.23	✓
P0-5	0.52	0.47	✓	0.52	0.51	-
P0-6	0.74	0.73	-	0.73	0.65	✓
P0-7	0.75	0.81	✓	0.84	0.84	-
P0-8	0.72	0.56	✓	0.71	0.66	-
P0-9	0.3	0.41	-	0.37	0.41	✓
P0-10	0.21	0.34	✓	0.79	0.63	-
P0-11	0.88	0.73	-	0.62	0.53	✓
<i>Summary</i>	Mean VA-ETDRS=0.54±0.45 logMAR; Mean VA-OKN=0.52±0.37 logMAR					

2

3 **TABLE 1.** VA-ETDRS and VA-OKN for the reduced VA cohort. Data is shown for both eyes,
 4 but only a randomly selected eye was used for reported comparisons (indicated by a tick).

1 **TABLE 2**

No VA deficit group

Participant	OD			OS		
	VA-ETDRS	VA-OKN	Random	VA-ETDRS	VA-OKN	Random
P1-12	-0.26	0.03	✓	-0.24	0.02	-
P1-13	-0.21	0	✓	-0.14	0.03	-
P1-14	-0.18	0.01	✓	-0.11	0	-
P1-15	-0.16	0.12	-	-0.22	0.12	✓
P1-16	-0.12	0.05	-	-0.16	0.06	✓
P1-17	-0.05	0.07	✓	-0.07	0.01	-
P1-18	-0.14	0.05	-	-0.19	0.13	✓
P1-19	-0.14	0.02	-	-0.19	0.01	✓
P1-20	-0.1	0.03	✓	0	0.02	-
P1-21	-0.22	0	-	-0.22	0.01	✓
P1-22	-0.3	0.02	✓	-0.3	0.02	-
P1-23	-0.15	0.13	✓	-0.16	0.04	-
<i>Summary</i>	Mean VA-ETDRS=-0.19±0.13 logMAR; Mean VA-OKN=0.05±0.1 logMAR					

2

3 **TABLE 2.** VA-ETDRS and VA-OKN for the no VA deficit cohort. Data is shown for both eyes,
 4 but only a randomly selected eye was used for reported comparisons (indicated by a tick).