

1 **Effects of multimodal and unimodal physical training interventions on visual** 2 **function in glaucoma and elderly controls – a pilot study**

3

4 Moffack DC¹, Al-Nosairy KO¹, Beyer R¹, Freitag C², Stolle FH¹, Behrens M^{3,4}, Behrendt T²,
5 Prabhakaran GT¹, Thieme H¹, Schega L^{2,*}, Hoffmann MB^{1,5,*}

6 *Shared senior authorship

7

8 ¹Ophthalmic Department, University Hospitals Magdeburg, Leipziger Str. 44, 39120 Magdeburg,
9 Germany.

10 ²Department of Sport Science, Institute III, Otto von Guericke University Magdeburg, Zschokkestraße
11 32, 39104 Magdeburg, Germany

12 ³University of Applied Sciences for Sport and Management Potsdam, Olympischer Weg 7, 14471
13 Potsdam, Germany

14 ⁴Department of Orthopaedics, Rostock University Medical Center

15 ⁵Center for Behavioral Brain Research, Magdeburg

16

17 **Synopsis/Precis:**

18 This study presents a novel approach, which was used to investigate the effects of a
19 multimodal and unimodal physical training intervention on static and dynamic visual function
20 in glaucoma patients and healthy elderly controls, in order to determine whether training may
21 be beneficial for individuals with glaucoma.

22 **Data availability**

23 Data available upon request to the corresponding author.

24 **Acknowledgements**

25 We thank the study participants for their support of the study and gratefully acknowledge
26 support by the German Research Foundation (DFG; Project: 423926179; HO-2002/20-1 &
27 SCHE 1584/5-1). There was no role of the funders in planning, conducting or reporting the
28 current study. We acknowledge support by the Open Access Publication fund of the medical
29 faculty of the Otto-von-Guericke-University Magdeburg.

30

31 **Declaration of competing interests**

32 No competing interest.

33 **Correspondent details:**

34 Michael B. Hoffmann

35 Department of Ophthalmology, Otto-von-Guericke University Magdeburg

36 Section for Clinical and Experimental Sensory Physiology

37 Leipziger Str. 44, 39120 Magdeburg, Germany

38 Phone: +49 391 67 13585

39 Fax: +49 391 67 13570

40 Email: michael.hoffmann@med.ovgu.de

41

42 **Running title:**

43 Effect of physical training interventions on visual function

44 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

45 **Abstract:**

46 **Objective.** To investigate the effect of a 12-week multimodal motor-cognitive and
47 resistance training (MMI) compared to a unimodal resistance training intervention
48 (UMI) on static and dynamic visual function in glaucoma patients (GLA) and healthy
49 controls (HC).

50 **Methods.** Fifteen GLA and 24 age-matched HC participated in this randomized,
51 controlled longitudinal pilot study. Visual function was assessed using clinical
52 parameters and, on a treadmill, (TM) while standing (static, S_0) as well as during
53 walking at 3.5 km/h ($S_{3.5}$) and a self-preferred speed (S_{Self}). The following outcomes
54 were measured pre and post 12-weeks of intervention (MMI or UMI): (a) standard
55 clinical measures and (b) TM-related measures, i.e. (i) best-corrected visual acuity
56 without (VA_s) and with crowding (VA_c), (ii) visual field sensitivity (VF), and (iii)
57 contrast sensitivity (CS). A 4-factorial repeated-measures ANOVA (SPEED [S_0 ; $S_{3.5}$;
58 S_{Self}] x TIME [pre; post] x INTERVENTION [UMI; MMI] x GROUP [GLA; HC]) was
59 applied to determine significant interaction effects ($p \leq 0.05$) and the effect size
60 partial-eta-squared was calculated.

61 **Results.** Post-interventional improvement of visual function was absent or minor.
62 Only for standard clinical measures a main effect of TIME (visual acuity; $p=0.024$)
63 and a TIME x INTERVENTION interaction (foveal sensitivity; $p=0.039$) were found.
64 For S_0 vs $S_{3.5}$ small effects appeared in post-hoc comparisons, but TIME and TIME x
65 SPEED just failed to reach significance for CS ($p=0.059$) and VA_s ($p=0.052$),
66 respectively.

67 **Conclusion.** While trends were evident, the effect of the 12-week interventions on
68 visual function were small and, especially for TM-walking, largely independent of
69 group and intervention type. In future studies a greater sample of more advanced
70 glaucoma cases should be included to probe for significant visual function
71 differences between groups and intervention types.

72 **Keywords.** Dynamic Visual Function; Glaucoma; Multimodal Training; Cognitive
73 Training; Mobility

74

75 Introduction

76 Glaucoma, a progressive optic neuropathy, is a leading global cause of irreversible
77 blindness. Current estimates expect an increase of affected individuals from 76
78 million to 112 million by 2040 (Tham et al., 2014). Glaucoma damage impedes
79 activities that are of importance for daily living not exclusively in the visual domain,
80 but also with respect to mobility, e.g. via an increased incidence of falling during
81 walking (Freitag et al., 2023). As a consequence, glaucoma has an impact at the
82 individual level due to quality of life reduction (Fea et al., 2017; Moreno-Montañés et
83 al., 2018) and at the societal level due to health-care cost increase (Allison et al.,
84 n.d.; Feldman et al., 2020). However, these conventional measures often overlook a
85 broader aspect of functional impairment in glaucoma patients, particularly those
86 related to motor and cognitive abilities (Tanabe et al., 2012). It has been shown that
87 resistance training mitigated the risk of falls in elderly (Fragala et al., 2019; Persch et
88 al., 2009) and might also increase cognitive performance (Fiatarone Singh et al.,
89 2014). Recent reports (Herold et al., 2018) also indicated that the combination of
90 motor and cognitive exercise has beneficial effects on motor and/or cognitive
91 function in patients with neurodegenerative diseases, e.g., Alzheimer's disease (
92 Coelho et al., 2013; Puente-González et al., 2021) and in healthy participants with
93 cognitive decline (de Oliveira Silva et al., 2019). Moreover, this interventional
94 approach might reduce the risk of falls (Fragala et al., 2019; Persch et al., 2009).
95 Due to the fact that glaucoma might be associated with cognitive dysfunction (Arrigo
96 et al., 2021), combining motor-cognitive exercises (Herold et al., 2018) with
97 resistance training in glaucoma management might be of promise to improve mobility
98 and cognitive function eventually translating in an increased quality of life. This
99 prompts the question of whether a combination of motor-cognitive and resistance
100 training (i.e., multimodal intervention [MMI]) is superior in improving motor-cognitive
101 function compared to resistance training alone (i.e., unimodal intervention [UMI]) in
102 glaucoma patients, which has, to our knowledge, not been addressed so far.

103 The present study reflects on a subset of data from a larger randomized controlled
104 trial (German clinical trials register: DRKS00022519) examining the effects of two
105 physical training interventions (MMI and UMI) on several primary and secondary
106 outcomes. The primary endpoints include gait kinematics and functional brain
107 connectivity.

108 In the present pilot study, visual function, as a secondary outcome, is addressed.
109 Specifically, we investigated the influence of a 12-week MMI and a UMI on visual
110 function during treadmill (TM) walking in glaucoma patients and healthy elderly
111 controls. The baseline data, i.e. pre-intervention findings, of this study were
112 previously published (Beyer et al., 2024) and indicated that TM walking, compared to
113 standing, reduced visual function similarly in both glaucoma patients and elderly
114 controls (i.e. a visual acuity loss by more than 0.02 logMAR and visual field
115 sensitivity by 1.0 dB visual field mean deviation). Consequently, it is of interest
116 whether MMI or UMI can improve visual function and thus ultimately, reduce the risk
117 of falls. We hypothesized that visual function will be improved after the interventions
118 in glaucoma, especially following MMI, as this intervention specifically targets visuo-
119 cognition compared to UMI.

120

121 **Methods**

122 **Study design**

123 To investigate the effect of MMI and UMI, a two-arm randomized controlled
124 prospective longitudinal study was conducted from August 2020 to December 2022.
125 Patients with glaucoma (GLA) and age-matched healthy control subjects (HC) were
126 recruited and randomly assigned to either MMI or UMI using counterbalanced
127 randomization and allocation ration of 1:1 (Figure 1).

128 The experimental protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Otto-von-
129 Guericke University of Magdeburg in Germany (registration number: 32/18) and all
130 procedures were in line with the Declaration of Helsinki on experiments on human
131 beings. All visual-function related measurements were taken in the Department of
132 Ophthalmology and at the Otto-von-Guericke University Magdeburg, Germany. The
133 interventions were performed in the Department of Sport Science at the Otto-von-
134 Guericke University Magdeburg, Germany. Reporting was performed in accordance
135 with the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials Statement (Consort) for
136 randomized pilot trials (Eldridge et al., 2016). All participants gave written informed
137 consent. The trial was registered at the German clinical trials register
138 (DRKS00022519).


139

140 **Participants**

141 A total of 39 participants, including 15 GLA and 24 HC, were recruited in this study.
142 For GLA, only two of the participants had an advanced stage, two had a mild stage
143 and the rest had a preperimetric stage.

144 Participants underwent complete ophthalmological examination, which is described
145 in detail by (Freitag et al., 2024). Briefly, we assessed best corrected visual acuity,
146 refractive correction for far (at 5 m) with early treatment diabetic retinopathy study
147 charts (ETDRS), slit-lamp exam, fundus exam, and standard tests for visual field
148 (VF) and retinal structure. The following inclusion criteria were applied: (i) ≥ 60 years,
149 (ii) diagnosis of open-angle glaucoma (i.e., cup disc ratio of ≥ 0.7 , disc notching,
150 and/or nerve fiber defect), (iii) patients are under intraocular pressure medications,
151 (iv) best corrected visual acuity (BCVA) ≥ 0.8 decimal unless glaucoma-related in
152 the GLA group, (v) normal visual function parameters unless glaucoma related, (vi)
153 no other conditions affecting visual function such as age-related macular
154 degeneration or retinal detachment, (vii) ability to walk at least 6 min without walking
155 support, and (viii) visual field defects classified according to Hodapp-parish
156 Anderson criteria (Hodapp et al., 1993) in GLA with defects. Exclusion criteria were
157 as follows: i) neurological disorders, (ii) rheumatism, (iii) cardiovascular disorders,
158 (iv) stroke, (v) orthopedic diseases including arthrosis (grade II or higher),
159 musculoskeletal impairment, tendinitis, tenosynovitis, myositis, prosthesis in the
160 lower extremities, and joint replacements.

161



162

163 Figure 1. CONSORT flow chart for the recruitment process showing the number of
 164 participants and dropouts through the study phases. GLA = glaucoma participants; HC =
 165 healthy participants

166

167 **Interventions**

168 The training (i.e., MMI and UMI) was conducted twice a week on non-consecutive
169 days for 12 weeks resulting in a total of 24 sessions. Each session lasted 60 min and
170 was supervised by experienced instructors.

171 The MMI was split into i) motor-cognitive training, ii) resistance training, and iii) cool-
172 down (i.e., static stretching). Over the course of the intervention, the proportion of
173 time spent on motor-cognitive and resistance training changed (see Table 1). The
174 motor-cognitive exercises consisted of simultaneously performed motor, cognitive,
175 and visual tasks based on the LifeKinetik program (Lutz, 2021). The exercises were
176 designed in such a way that it is almost impossible to perform them without making
177 mistakes. If the exercises were performed correctly in 6 out of 10 attempts, the
178 instructor continued with a more difficult exercise. As examples, two exercises are
179 briefly explained below: (i) balls of different colors (e.g. yellow, green, red) are
180 thrown in a circle, whereby a corresponding name must be said for each color (e.g.,
181 yellow = persons own name, green = name of the person to whom the ball is to be
182 thrown. (ii) participants line up next to each other and after an announcement (e.g.,
183 left, right, front, back) they walked in the corresponding direction (line of vision
184 remained the same, i.e. no returns), whereby a corresponding name for each
185 direction were varied (e.g. right = "1", left = "2", front = "3", back = "4").

186 The UMI consisted of i) 10-min standardized warm-up (i.e., 5 min fast walking and
187 dynamic stretching), ii) 40-min resistance exercises, and iii) 10-min cool-down (i.e.,
188 static stretching). The resistance training included multiple-set (2 x 7 repetitions, 30 s
189 rest between sets, time under tension: 2 s concentric and eccentric) circuit training
190 using free weights and weight machines (e.g., dumbbell seated front raise and
191 seated leg press) (Table 2). External training load was adjusted by increasing the
192 weight and controlled via individuals' rating of perceived exertion (RPE) using the
193 Borg CR 10 Scale (i.e., RPE = 3-4 (moderate to somewhat severe)).

194 Table 1. Multimodal training schedule

Training components	Course of Intervention		
	Week 1-4	Week 5-8	Week 9-12
Motor-Cognitive Training	10 min	20 min	30 min
Resistance Training	40 min	30 min	20 min
Cool Down	10 min	10 min	10 min

195

196 Resistance training was carried out in the same way as the MMI, although the
 197 number of exercises and its duration varied (see Table 1 and Table 2). All exercises
 198 were performed while sitting because exercising in a supine or other positions affects
 199 the intraocular pressure (Al-Nosairy et al., 2020; Lara et al., 2023). Both
 200 interventions ended with a 10-min cool-down consisting of static stretching for the
 201 major muscle groups (e.g., standing side stretch, standing forward fold, overhead
 202 triceps stretch).

203 Table 2. Resistance exercises

Week	UMI	MMI
Weeks 1 – 4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seated leg press 2. Lever pulldown 3. Lever seated twist 4. Lever chest press 5. Cable curl 6. Lever back extension 7. Cable pushdown 8. Cable upright row 9. Seated leg curl 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seated leg press 2. Lever pulldown 3. Lever seated twist 4. Lever chest press 5. Cable curl 6. Lever back extension 7. Cable pushdown 8. Cable upright row 9. Seated leg curl
Weeks 5 – 8	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seated leg press 2. Cable straight back seated row 3. Lever seated twist 4. Lever chest press 5. Cable curl 6. Lever back extension 7. Cable pushdown 8. Cable upright row 9. Lever leg extension 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seated leg press 2. Cable straight back seated row 3. Lever seated twist 4. Lever pec deck fly 5. Cable upright row 6. Cable curl
Weeks 9 – 12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seated leg press 2. Cable straight back seated row 3. Lever chest press 4. Lever seated twist 5. Reverse cable curl 6. Dumbbell seated front raise 7. Seated leg curl 8. Lever back extension 9. Cable pushdown 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seated leg press 2. Dumbbell seated front raise 3. Reverse cable curl 4. Lever chest press 5. Lever seated twist

204

205 **Outcome parameters**

206 At the start of this study, participants' demographic and anthropometric data as well
207 as their physical activity level, and visual function were recorded. Standard
208 ophthalmology tests included: i) standard automated perimetry (SAP) for visual field
209 estimation with 24-2 SITA-Fast test (Humphrey Field Analyzer, Carl Zeiss Meditec
210 AG, Jena, Germany) and ii) optical coherence tomography (OCT) of macula and disc
211 using a spectral-domain OCT device with Glaucoma Module Premium Edition
212 (Heidelberg Spectralis®, Heidelberg Engineering, Heidelberg, Germany). Of note,
213 single- and dual-task gait performance (i.e. stride length, gait velocity) as well as
214 gaze behavior (i.e. saccade duration, fixation duration) were also assessed at the
215 beginning of the study (Freitag et al., 2024, 2023). Effects of the interventions were
216 scrutinized for (A) the standard clinical tests including BCVA, VF parameters, e.g.,
217 foveal sensitivity and VF MD and for (B) TM walking testing. For TM walking testing,
218 four visual function tests were performed binocularly [BCVA without crowding (VA_s),
219 BCVA with crowding (VA_c), contrast sensitivity (CS) and binocular visual field (Bin-
220 VF)] as detailed below.

221 **Visual function during TM walking**

222 Visual function was tested at 5 m and to account for variable viewing distance during
223 TM walking as a confound factor, visual functions were corrected using a distance
224 sensor (Vivior® sensor) as detailed in Beyer et al. 2024.

225 **TM walking testing procedure**

226 Visual functions were tested for 3 speed conditions in a fixed order: i) static (S_0); ii)
227 TM speed of 3.5 km/h ($S_{3.5}$) and iii) a self-preferred TM speed (S_{Self}).

228 **Visual function testing procedure**

229 For each speed condition, three binocular visual tests were performed respectively
230 using Freiburg Vision Test (FrACT®) (Bach, 1996) in a dimly-lit room at 5-m distance
231 and repeated twice in the following order: i) VA_s ii) VA_c , and iii) CS. This was
232 followed by one Bin-VF test using Ocusweep (Ocusweep®, Ocuspecto Ltd, Turku,
233 Finland) in an ambient room light. Total experiments duration was about 75 min.

- 234 i) VA_S: An 8-alternative-forced choice (AFC) single Landolt ring I was presented to
235 estimate VA and reported as a logarithmized minimal angle of resolution (logMAR).
- 236 ii) VA_C: The same applies to VA_C but with using a single optotype surrounded by a
237 circle ('©').
- 238 iii) CS: An 8-alternative-forced choice (AFC) optotype with varying contrasts was
239 used to determine the weber contrast (logCS).
- 240 iv) Bin-VF: A square stimulus comprised of 9 LEDs (5.2 mm x 5.2 mm) was
241 presented at near distance (~40 cm) without proximity sensor to estimate the mean
242 deviation of VF sensitivity (MD). Ocusweep® allowed for VF testing while TM walking
243 since it requires no fixed head or chin rest. The device adjusts to ambient light levels
244 using light sensors. The outcome measure was the binocular VF mean deviation
245 (Bin-VF-MD).
- 246 All visual functions were performed using BCVA except for Bin-VF where near
247 refractive correction is not mandatory as long as the VA < 0.1 logMAR.

248

249 **Statistical Analysis:**

250 After testing for normal distribution (Shapiro-Wilk test) and for assumptions for
251 repeated measures analysis of variance (RM-ANOVA), data were analyzed and
252 presented accordingly. The analyses of standard clinical test outcomes were
253 performed employing a 3-way RM-ANOVA with the factors TIME (pre and post),
254 INTERVENTION type (MMI and UMI), and GROUP (GLA AND HC). In addition, data
255 of the specific visual tests performed during the different TM walking conditions were
256 analyzed using a 4-way RM-ANOVA with the factors: TIME, INTERVENTION,
257 GROUP, as well as SPEED (S₀], S_{3.5} and S_{Self}) as detailed in Table 4. If a violation of
258 sphericity was detected, the Greenhouse-Geisser correction was applied. In case of
259 significant interactions or main effects, post-hoc tests with Sidak-correction were
260 performed. The effect size partial eta-squared (η_p^2) was calculated and interpreted as
261 small (0.01-0.05), medium (0.06-0.13), and large effect (≥ 0.14) according to Cohen
262 (1988). Effects were classified as significant if $p \leq 0.05$ and relevant, if at least a
263 medium effect size was observed. Data analysis was conducted in R (R Core Team,
264 2023) and SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences; IBM, Armonk, NY,
265 USA).

266 **Results**

267 Participants (18 GLA and 30 HC) were randomly assigned to either a MMI (GLA: n =
268 8, HC: n = 12) or UMI group (GLA: n = 7; HC: n = 12). There was no age difference
269 between groups ($p = 0.276$, Table 3). Three GLA and 6 HC had dropped out during
270 the intervention period due to personal reasons. Baseline and demographic
271 characteristics of the included participants are given in Table 3.

272 We next detailed the effects of the 12-week intervention on A) standard clinical tests
273 and B) the TM based visual functional tests.

274 **A) Effect of the interventions on standard clinical tests**

275 Main effects: We observed a significant TIME effect with regard to ETDRS BCVA
276 ($p = 0.024, \eta_p^2 = 0.15$), i.e., an improvement by 0.03 logMAR after the 12-week
277 interventions. Interaction effects: There was a significant TIME x INTERVENTION
278 interaction effect for the VF parameter 'foveal sensitivity' ($p = 0.035, \eta_p^2 = 0.12$).
279 Post-hoc tests indicated an improvement of foveal mean sensitivities only for UMI, by
280 1.07 dB compared to the pre-intervention foveal sensitivities (35.2 dB), $p = 0.024$,
281 (Table 4A).

282 **B) Effects of the interventions on TM walking visual function**

283 **(1) TM walking SPEED effects (S_0 vs $S_{3.5}$ and S_{Self})**

284 Some of the results of the pre-intervention data-set have previously been reported by
285 Beyer et al. (2024). Of note, the present study analyzed data of a smaller sample
286 due to dropouts during the intervention period (GLA: 3, HC: 6). Main effects
287 (significant effects detailed in Table 4B): For VA_s , the mean BCVA static (mean \pm
288 SD: -0.015 ± 0.11 logMAR) was better than dynamic readings (mean ΔS_0 - $S_{3.5}$ [ΔS_0 -
289 S_{Self}] \pm SD: -0.03 ± 0.04 , $p < 0.001$ [-0.05 ± 0.04 , $p = 0.001$]), see Figure 2A.
290 Participants also had better VA_c at S_0 (0.031 ± 0.09 logMAR) than $S_{3.5}$ [S_{Self}] (mean
291 S_0 - $S_{3.5}$ [S_0 - $S_{3.5}$] difference \pm SD: -0.02 ± 0.05 , $p = 0.10$ [-0.04 ± 0.06 , $p <$
292 0.001])). Bin-VF were reduced during dynamic compared to static viewing (S_0 :
293 0.12 ± 0.183 dB) by a mean deviation loss of -0.9 ± 0.44 dB during both $S_{3.5}$ and
294 S_{Self} , $p < 0.001$, see Figure 2C. For CS there was no effect of speed. (comparable
295 CS across different speeds with an average of 1.65 ± 0.16 logCS), see Figure 2B.

296 **(2) TIME effects**

297 Overall, visual function did not differ significantly after the 12-week intervention. Main
298 effects: We observed a non-significant small trend of CS improvement after
299 intervention (by $0.04 \pm 0.1 \log CS$, $p = 0.059$, $\eta^2 = 0.10$). Interaction effects: For
300 VAs, there was a non-significant trend of TIME x SPEED interaction effect, $p =$
301 0.052 , $\eta^2 = 0.08$;

302 (3) INTERVENTION effects (MMI vs UMI)

303 The intervention effects were not differentially affected by the two intervention types
304 (MMI or UMI). Main and interaction effects: There were no significant effects.

305 (4) GROUP effects (GLA vs HC)

306 GROUP main effect: Only for Bin-VF, VF mean deviations were reduced for GLA, as
307 expected from the pathology, $-1.20 \pm 2.4 \text{ dB}$ than HC, $0.25 \pm 0.91 \text{ dB}$, $p = 0.016$.
308 Interaction effects: None detected.

309 Table.3 Patients demographic and clinical results before and after the 12-week interventions

			HC (n = 24)	GLA (n = 15)	p-value
			Mean \pm SD (median, range)		
Age			71.6 \pm 1.1	69.8 \pm 1.1	0.276
Sex		m	11.0	8.0	0.45
		f	13.0	7.0	
SAP foveal sensitivity [#]	OS	Pre	(36.0, 8.0)	(34.5, 12.0)	0.1
		Post	(35.4, 7.0)	(35.3, 7.0)	0.95
	OD	Pre	(36.1, 8.0)	(36.1, 15.0)	0.72
		Post	(36.9, 16.0)	(36.6, 6.0)	0.95
SAP-MD [#]		Pre	(0.1, 5.9)	(-1.0, 22.0)	0.054
		Post	(0.0, 2.9)	(-1.0, 21.2)	0.016
		Pre	(0.3, 5.1)	(-0.0, 14.0)	0.103
		Post	(0.2, 3.4)	(-0.4, 14.2)	0.028
BCVA [logMAR] [#]	OS	Pre	(-0.1, 0.2)	(-0.2, 0.5)	0.22
		Post	(-0.1, 0.2)	(-0.0, 0.3)	0.09
	OD	Pre	(-0.1, 0.3)	(0.0, 0.3)	0.04
		Post	(-0.1, 0.2)	(-0.1, 0.4)	0.29
VAs [logMAR]	Bin	Pre	0.0 \pm 0.1	0.0 \pm 0.1	0.21
		Post	0.0 \pm 0.2	0.0 \pm 0.1	0.76
VAc [logMAR]	Bin	Pre	0.1 \pm 0.1	0.1 \pm 0.1	0.32
		Post	0.1 \pm 0.0	0.0 \pm 0.1	0.043
CS [logCS]	Bin	Pre	1.7 \pm 0.1	1.6 \pm 0.2	0.76
		Post	1.7 \pm 0.2	1.7 \pm 0.2	0.8
VF [#] [dB]	Bin	Pre	(0.8, 3.3)	(-0.4 \pm 9.6)	0.006
		Post	(0.6, 3.2)	(-0.4 \pm 7.6)	0.005

SEM: standard error of the mean; SAP: standard automated perimetry; BCVA: best corrected visual acuity using ETDRS charts; VAs: best corrected visual acuity without crowding (VAs) and with crowding (VAc); CS: contrast sensitivity; VF-MD: mean deviation of visual field; OD: right eye; OS: left eye; bin: binocular. [#]Mann-Whitney Test. Significant p-values are given in bold.


310

311

312 Table 4. Overview of statistical outcomes of the RM-ANOVAs including all significant effects
 313 of SPEED, TIME, and INTERVENTION type on visual function parameters for the study
 314 GROUPs.

Effect	F	p-value	partial eta-squared
(A) Clinical parameters			
ETDRS BCVA			
TIME	1, 33 = 5.6	0.024	0.15
Foveal sensitivity [dB]			
TIME x INTERVENTION type	1, 34 = 4.6	0.039	0.12
(B) Dynamic visual function			
VAs [logMAR]			
SPEED	2, 70 = 19.0	< 0.001	0.35
TIME x SPEED	2, 70 = 3.1	0.052	0.08
VAc [logMAR]			
SPEED	2, 70 = 9.1	< 0.001	0.21
CS [logCS]			
TIME	1, 35 = 3.8	0.059	0.10
Bin-VF mean deviations [dB]			
SPEED	2, 66 = 124.9	< 0.001	0.79
GROUP	1, 33 = 6.49	0.016	0.16
TIME x GROUP	1, 33 = 3.6	0.066	0.10
INTERVENTION type x TIME x SPEED	2, 66 = 2.34	0.105	0.07
F: F-value of repeated measures ANOVA. For abbreviations, see Table 3. As shown in methods we used either $p < 0.05$ or effect size of 0.06 as a cutoff for any significant. For further details, refer to results.			

315



316

317 Figure 2. Visual performance before (pre) and after (post) the 12-week interventions (MMI &
 318 UMI) for 3 TM walking speeds. A) TIME (pre- and post-intervention) effects across different
 319 TM walking speeds for best corrected visual acuity with (VAc, upper panel) and without (VAs,
 320 lower panel) crowding. B) TIME (pre- and post-intervention) effects on contrast sensitivity
 321 (CS). C) TIME (pre- and post-intervention) effects on binocular visual field mean deviations
 322 (VF-MD) in decibels (dB). INTERVENTION types are combined for these effects. For
 323 statistics, see Table 4. Dotted line indicates zero-read-out. Intervention types' effects are
 324 pooled due to lack of significant differences.

325 **Discussion**

326 The present study investigated the effect of MMI and UMI on visual function (i) tested
327 with clinical parameters and (ii) during TM walking at different speeds. While trends
328 were evident, the effect of the 12-week interventions on visual function were small
329 and largely independent of group and intervention type.

330 **Intervention effects on visual performance**

331 The observed intervention effects were marginal and reached (weak) significance
332 only for the standard clinical measures of BCVA and foveal luminance sensitivity.
333 This absence of strong effects is likely due to the early stage-nature of most of the
334 included patients. Accordingly, Lee et al., investigating more advanced glaucoma
335 cases, reported a 10% improvement of glaucomatous VF following 1-week of
336 moderate-vigorous physical exercise (Lee et al., 2019). Even in healthy athletes,
337 exercise, namely ocular-motor, has beneficial effects on dynamic visual acuity
338 (Minoonejad et al., 2019). These positive effects are not confined to visual function,
339 but also extended to cerebral health and cognition as shown for healthy elderly
340 (Intzandt et al., 2021). In patients with mild cognitive impairment, aerobic and
341 resistance training has been shown to improve measures of brain function and
342 structure (Huang et al., 2022). Thereby, the higher cognitive function seems
343 independent of the intervention type (Intzandt et al., 2021) meaning that both
344 physical and cognitive training have beneficial effects. In fact, these interventions are
345 of high relevance to diseases, such as glaucoma and Alzheimer's, upon validation in
346 larger cohorts.

347 Several factors might explain the lack of relevant positive effects from our
348 interventions on visual function readouts, including the low sample size and the early
349 stage of disease progression in glaucoma patients as detailed below. In fact, the
350 intervention effects in early glaucoma might be better captured by other outcomes
351 related to visuo-cognitive-motor skills, including kinematic measures during physical
352 locomotion, rather than basic visual function.

353

354 **Limitations and Outlook**

355 When interpreting the results of the present pilot study, several limitations have to be
356 considered. First, the sample size was small mainly due to the impact of the COVID-
357 19 pandemic on the recruitment and regular study/intervention participation, as
358 reflect in the "pilot study" nature of our report. Second, most glaucoma patients were
359 in the early stages of glaucoma, which may have resulted in the small magnitude of
360 the observed effects of the interventions as one might have expected in the later
361 stages. This is confirmed by our previous findings (Beyer et al., 2024) that healthy
362 elderly and early glaucoma participants have comparable visual function loss during
363 TM walking. Hence, to realistically capture intervention impacts, in future studies
364 more advanced glaucoma stages should be included where functional deficits are
365 larger and might benefit from our training programs.

366

367 **Conclusion**

368 In summary, while the intervention approach of the present study established a
369 foundation for a novel movement-related intervention regime for glaucoma, the effect
370 of the 12-week interventions specifically on visual function were small. Based on the
371 data of the present study, future trials should recruit a larger sample size and
372 participants with more severe glaucoma stages in order to identify the effects MMI
373 und UMI on visual function to prevent glaucoma-induced loss of quality of life.

374

375

376 References

- 377 Allison K, Patel D, Alabi O. Epidemiology of Glaucoma: The Past, Present, and Predictions for the Future. *Cureus*
378 n.d.;12:e11686. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.11686>.
- 379 Al-Nosairy KO, Bosch JJON van den, Pennisi V, Mansouri K, Thieme H, Choritz L, et al. Use of a novel telemetric
380 sensor to study interactions of intraocular pressure and ganglion-cell function in glaucoma. *Br J Ophthalmol*
381 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjophthalmol-2020-316136>.
- 382 Arrigo A, Aragona E, Saladino A, Arrigo D, Fantaguzzi F, Battaglia Parodi M, et al. Cognitive Dysfunctions in
383 Glaucoma: An Overview of Morpho-Functional Mechanisms and the Impact on Higher-Order Visual Function.
384 *Front Aging Neurosci* 2021;13:747050. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2021.747050>.
- 385 Bach M. The Freiburg Visual Acuity test--automatic measurement of visual acuity. *Optom Vis Sci Off Publ Am*
386 *Acad Optom* 1996;73:49–53. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006324-199601000-00008>.
- 387 Beyer R, Al-Nosairy KO, Freitag C, Stolle FH, Behrens M, Prabhakaran GT, et al. Treadmill-walking impairs
388 visual function in early glaucoma and elderly controls. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol* 2024.
389 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00417-024-06530-w>.
- 390 Coelho FG de M, Andrade LP, Pedrosa RV, Santos-Galduroz RF, Gobbi S, Costa JLR, et al. Multimodal exercise
391 intervention improves frontal cognitive functions and gait in Alzheimer's disease: A controlled trial. *Geriatr*
392 *Gerontol Int* 2013;13:198–203. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1447-0594.2012.00887.x>.
- 393 Cohen J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. L. Erlbaum Associates; 1988.
- 394 Eldridge SM, Chan CL, Campbell MJ, Bond CM, Hopewell S, Thabane L, et al. CONSORT 2010 statement:
395 extension to randomised pilot and feasibility trials. *BMJ* 2016;355:i5239. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.i5239>.
- 396 Fea AM, Hengerer F, Lavia C, Au L. Glaucoma Quality of Life. *J Ophthalmol* 2017;2017:4257151.
397 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/4257151>.
- 398 Feldman RM, Cioffi GA, Liebmann JM, Weinreb RN. Current Knowledge and Attitudes Concerning Cost-
399 Effectiveness in Glaucoma Pharmacotherapy: A Glaucoma Specialists Focus Group Study. *Clin Ophthalmol*
400 *Auckl NZ* 2020;14:729–39. <https://doi.org/10.2147/OPTH.S236030>.
- 401 Fiatarone Singh MA, Gates N, Saigal N, Wilson GC, Meiklejohn J, Brodaty H, et al. The Study of Mental and
402 Resistance Training (SMART) study—resistance training and/or cognitive training in mild cognitive impairment: a
403 randomized, double-blind, double-sham controlled trial. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2014;15:873–80.
404 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2014.09.010>.
- 405 Fragala MS, Cadore EL, Dorgo S, Izquierdo M, Kraemer WJ, Peterson MD, et al. Resistance Training for Older
406 Adults: Position Statement From the National Strength and Conditioning Association. *J Strength Cond Res*
407 2019;33:2019–52. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000003230>.
- 408 Freitag CW, Behrens M, Bielitzki R, Al-Nosairy KO, Stolle FH, Prabhakaran GT, et al. Gaze behavior in open-
409 angle glaucoma patients during visuo-cognitive-motor tasks: a cross-sectional study. *Sci Rep* 2024;14:20978.
410 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-70987-2>.
- 411 Freitag CW, Behrens M, Menrad T, Al-Nosairy KO, Stolle FH, Prabhakaran GT, et al. Single- and Dual-Task Gait
412 Performance in Patients With Open-Angle Glaucoma: A Cross-sectional Study. *Transl Vis Sci Technol*
413 2023;12:31. <https://doi.org/10.1167/tvst.12.11.31>.
- 414 Herold F, Hamacher D, Schega L, Müller NG. Thinking While Moving or Moving While Thinking – Concepts of
415 Motor-Cognitive Training for Cognitive Performance Enhancement. *Front Aging Neurosci* 2018;10:228.
416 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2018.00228>.
- 417 Hodapp E, Parrish RK, Anderson DR. *Clinical Decisions in Glaucoma*. Mosby; 1993.
- 418 Huang X, Zhao X, Cai Y, Wan Q. The cerebral changes induced by exercise interventions in people with mild
419 cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease: A systematic review. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* 2022;98:104547.
420 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archger.2021.104547>.
- 421 Intzandt B, Vranceanu T, Huck J, Vincent T, Montero-Odasso M, Gauthier CJ, et al. Comparing the effect of
422 cognitive vs. exercise training on brain MRI outcomes in healthy older adults: A systematic review. *Neurosci*
423 *Biobehav Rev* 2021;128:511–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2021.07.003>.
- 424 Lara PM, Redondo B, Jerez-Mayorga D, Martínez-García D, García-Ramos A, Vera J. Influence of the body
425 positions adopted for resistance training on intraocular pressure: a comparison between the supine and seated
426 positions. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol* 2023;261:1971. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00417-023-06009-0>.
- 427 Lee MJ, Wang J, Friedman DS, Boland MV, De Moraes CG, Ramulu PY. Greater Physical Activity Is Associated
428 with Slower Visual Field Loss in Glaucoma. *Ophthalmology* 2019;126:958–64.
429 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ophtha.2018.10.012>.

- 430 Lutz H. Life Kinetik® - Gehirnttraining durch Bewegung. 1., Edition. München: BLV Buchverlag; 2021.
- 431 Minoonejad H, Barati AH, Naderifar H, Heidari B, Kazemi AS, Lashay A. Effect of four weeks of ocular-motor
432 exercises on dynamic visual acuity and stability limit of female basketball players. *Gait Posture* 2019;73:286–90.
433 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2019.06.022>.
- 434 Moreno-Montañés J, Antón-López A, Duch-Tuesta S, Corsino Fernández-Vila P, García-Feijó J, Millá-Griñó E,
435 et al. Lifestyles guide and glaucoma (i). *Sports and activities. Arch Soc Espanola Oftalmol* 2018;93:69–75.
436 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oftal.2017.09.005>.
- 437 de Oliveira Silva F, Ferreira JV, Plácido J, Sant'Anna P, Araújo J, Marinho V, et al. Three months of multimodal
438 training contributes to mobility and executive function in elderly individuals with mild cognitive impairment, but not
439 in those with Alzheimer's disease: A randomized controlled trial. *Maturitas* 2019;126:28–33.
440 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.maturitas.2019.04.217>.
- 441 Persch LN, Ugrinowitsch C, Pereira G, Rodacki ALF. Strength training improves fall-related gait kinematics in the
442 elderly: a randomized controlled trial. *Clin Biomech Bristol Avon* 2009;24:819–25.
443 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2009.07.012>.
- 444 Puente-González AS, Sánchez-Sánchez MC, Fernández-Rodríguez EJ, Hernández-Xumet JE, Barbero-Iglesias
445 FJ, Méndez-Sánchez R. Effects of 6-Month Multimodal Physical Exercise Program on Bone Mineral Density, Fall
446 Risk, Balance, and Gait in Patients with Alzheimer's Disease: A Controlled Clinical Trial. *Brain Sci* 2021;11:63.
447 <https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci11010063>.
- 448 R Core Team. R: The R Project for Statistical Computing. R Lang Environ Stat Comput R Found Stat Comput
449 Vienna Austria 2023. <https://www.r-project.org/>.
- 450 Tanabe S, Yuki K, Ozeki N, Shiba D, Tsubota K. The association between primary open-angle glaucoma and fall:
451 an observational study. *Clin Ophthalmol Auckl NZ* 2012;6:327. <https://doi.org/10.2147/OPHTH.S28281>.
- 452 Tham Y-C, Li X, Wong TY, Quigley HA, Aung T, Cheng C-Y. Global prevalence of glaucoma and projections of
453 glaucoma burden through 2040: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ophthalmology* 2014;121:2081–90.
454 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ophtha.2014.05.013>.
- 455