

1           Can ocular dominance plasticity provide a general index to  
2           visual plasticity to personalize treatment in amblyopia?

3

4   Chunwen Tao<sup>1#</sup>, MS; Zhifen He<sup>1#</sup>, MS; Yiya Chen<sup>1#</sup>, BS; Jiawei Zhou<sup>1\*</sup>, PhD; Robert F. Hess<sup>2</sup>,  
5   DSc, PhD

6

7   <sup>1</sup>School of Ophthalmology and Optometry and Eye hospital, and State Key Laboratory of  
8   Ophthalmology, Optometry and Vision Science, Wenzhou Medical University, Wenzhou,  
9   Zhejiang, PR China;

10   <sup>2</sup>McGill Vision Research, Dept. Ophthalmology and Vision Sciences, McGill University,  
11   Montreal PQ, Canada.

12

13   #, Equal contributions

14

15   \*, Corresponding author: [zhoujw@mail.eye.ac.cn](mailto:zhoujw@mail.eye.ac.cn)(JZ)

16   Word count: 4121

17

18

19

20 **Abstract**

21 **Purpose:** Recently, Lunghi et al showed that amblyopic eye's visual acuity per se after 2  
22 months of occlusion therapy could be predicted by a homeostatic plasticity, i.e., the temporary  
23 shift of ocular dominance observed after a 2-hour monocular deprivation, in children with  
24 anisometropic amblyopia([Lunghi et al., 2016](#)). In this study, we assess whether the visual  
25 acuity *improvement* of the amblyopic eye measured after 2 months of occlusion therapy could  
26 be predicted by this plasticity.

27 **Methods:** Seven children ( $6.86 \pm 1.46$  years old; SD) with anisometropic amblyopia  
28 participated in this study. All patients were newly diagnosed and had no treatment history  
29 before participating in our study. They had finished 2 months of refractive adaptation and then  
30 received a 4-hour daily fellow eye patching therapy with an opaque patch for a 2-month period.  
31 Best-corrected visual acuity of the amblyopic eye was measured before and after the patching  
32 therapy. The homeostatic plasticity was assessed by measuring the temporary shift of ocular  
33 dominance observed after 2 hours of occlusion for the amblyopic eye before the treatment  
34 started. A binocular phase combination paradigm was used for this test.

35 **Results:** We found that there was no significant correlation between the temporary shift of  
36 ocular dominance observed after 2 hours of occlusion for the amblyopic eye before the  
37 treatment started and the visual acuity gain obtained by the amblyopic eye from 2-month of  
38 classical patching therapy. This result involving the short-term patching of the amblyopic eye  
39 is consistent with a reanalysis of Lunghi et al' s data.

40 **Conclusions:** Ocular dominance plasticity does not provide an index of cortical plasticity in  
41 the general sense such that it could be used to predict acuity outcomes from longer term  
42 classical patching.

43

44

45

## 46 **Introduction**

47       There is a considerable variability in the response to amblyopic treatment, be it classical  
48 occlusion therapy([Stewart et al., 2005](#)) or binocular therapy([Hess and Thompson, 2015](#))  
49 across a population of amblyopes of all ages. Not all of this variance can be attributed to  
50 differences in compliance([Stewart et al., 2005](#); [Stewart et al., 2007b](#); [Fronius et al., 2014](#)),  
51 leading us to the inescapable conclusion that some amblyopes have brains that are more  
52 capable of change, in other words, more plastic, than others. Unfortunately, there is no way  
53 of knowing which patients are more likely to respond to the treatment before the therapy  
54 begins, in the main (though see, ([Stewart et al., 2007a](#))) it is not until the end that the  
55 responders can be separated from the non-responders. If we had some general measure of  
56 visual cortical plasticity it may be possible to personalize the present treatment and avoid  
57 subjecting patients who are unlikely to respond to months or years of the sort of disruption  
58 that patching the one good eye produces.

59       Ocular dominance plasticity is a recently observed phenomenon([Lunghi et al., 2011](#)),  
60 ([Lunghi et al., 2011](#)) in which the ocular dominance of normal adults can be manipulated by  
61 short-term visual deprivation of one eye. Comparable effects occur in adults with  
62 amblyopia([Zhou et al., 2013c](#)). This has been extensively studied using psychophysics([Lunghi](#)  
63 [et al., 2011](#); [Lunghi et al., 2013](#); [Zhou et al., 2013a](#); [Zhou et al., 2013c](#); [Zhou et al., 2014](#))  
64 ([Lunghi and Sale, 2015](#); [Zhou and Hess, 2016](#); [Zhou et al., 2017a](#); [Zhou et al., 2017b](#)),  
65 electrophysiology ([Lunghi et al., 2015a](#); [Zhou et al., 2015](#)) and brain imaging ([Lunghi et al.,](#)  
66 [2015b](#); [Chadnova et al., 2017](#); [Binda et al., 2018](#)). There is evidence that it involves a  
67 reciprocal change in sensitivity of each eye's input; the previously patched eye becomes more  
68 dominant and the previously unpatched eye becomes less dominant, i.e., a homeostatic form  
69 of plasticity ([Zhou et al., 2013a](#); [Chadnova et al., 2017](#)). It represents a measure of visual  
70 cortical plasticity and it could potentially represent a general index to how modifiable the visual  
71 areas of the brain are and as such could provide a measure that might allow greater

72 predictability for more long-term procedures such as amblyopia patching therapy which is  
73 currently associated with a high level of variability in terms of its effectiveness across a  
74 population of amblyopes. If this was the case, patching therapy could be personalized using  
75 the measure, ocular dominance plasticity in terms of hours per day and total duration. One  
76 study has addressed this very interesting question using the measure, short-term ocular  
77 dominance plasticity, and concluded that children who exhibit a higher degree of short-term  
78 ocular dominance plasticity (determined after a 2-hour period of patching session) go on to  
79 obtain larger amblyopic eye “recovery rate” after a long-term (months) patching procedures  
80 ([Lunghi et al., 2016](#)). It should be noted that, the amblyopic eye “recovery rate” was defined  
81 as the absolute final visual acuity after the long-term patching in Lunghi et al’s study ([Lunghi  
82 et al., 2016](#)). It would be interesting to further investigate whether large changes in ocular  
83 dominance plasticity were able to predict large *improvements* (i.e., difference between initial  
84 acuity before occlusion therapy and that found after occlusion therapy) in visual acuity (i.e.,  
85 the effects of patching therapy) as a result of long-term patching.

86 We directly tested this idea in this study. Initially we measured ocular dominance plasticity  
87 by patching the amblyopic eye for 2 hours. Second, classical occlusion therapy with an opaque  
88 patch occluding the fellow eye (4hrs/day for 2 months) was undertaken in 7 newly diagnosed  
89 patients. Any patient who needed an update to the spectacle correction was allowed a 2-  
90 month period before undertaking the experiment.

91

## 92 **Methods**

### 93 **Participants**

94 Seven children ( $6.86 \pm 1.46$  years old; SD) who had anisometropic or ametropic  
95 amblyopia and were able to perform the binocular phase combination task after practice  
96 participated in this study. All patients were newly diagnosed and had no treatment history  
97 before participated in our study. The clinical details of the patients and their visual acuity before

98 and after 2 months of treatment are provided in Table 1. All participants were naive to the  
 99 purpose of the study. Written informed consent was obtained from their parents or guardians  
 100 before the start of the experiment. This study followed the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki  
 101 and was approved by the Ethics Committee of Wenzhou Medical University and McGill  
 102 University.

103 **Table 1. Visual acuity before and after 2 months of treatment**

ID	Age	Cycloplegic refractive errors (OD/OS)	Visual acuity (logMAR)				Balance point (AE/FE) before treatment
			Before treatment		2 months of treatment		
			OD	OS	OD	OS	
S1	5	- 1.00/ - 1.00 ×180 - 6.00/ - 2.00 ×180	0.275	0.575	0.175	0.375	0.432
S2	6	+ 1.50 + 5.00	-0.025	0.575	-0.025	0.275	0.285
S3	8	Plano + 2.50/ +1.75 × 80	-0.025	0.575	-0.025	0.475	0.192
S4	6	+ 3.50 + 4.00/ + 0.75 × 95	0.175	0.675	0.175	0.275	0.158
S5	8	+ 4.50 Plano	0.475	-0.025	0.275	-0.025	0.329
S6	9	+ 4.00 Plano	0.575	-0.125	0.4	-0.125	0.135
S7	6	Plano + 2.00/ + 1.75 × 85	-0.025	0.875	-0.025	0.775	0.234


104

## 105 **Apparatus**

106       The stimuli for the short-term monocular deprivation measurement were generated and  
107 controlled by a PC computer running Matlab (MathWorks, Natick, MA) with PsychTool Box  
108 3.0.9 extension ([Brainard, 1997](#); [Pelli, 1997](#)). The stimuli were presented on a gamma-  
109 corrected LG D2342PY 3D LED screen (LG Life Science, Korea) with a 1920 × 1080 resolution  
110 and a 60 Hz refresh rate. Subjects viewed the display dichoptically with polarized glasses in  
111 a dimly lit room at a viewing distance of 136 cm. The background luminance was 46.2 cd/m<sup>2</sup>  
112 on the screen and 18.8 cd/m<sup>2</sup> through the polarized glasses. Patients' best-corrected visual  
113 acuity was measured monocularly using the Logarithmic Tumbling E Chart ([Mou, 1966](#)) at 5  
114 m.

## 115 **Design**

116       In this study, the treatment effect of 2 months patching therapy (4-hour daily fellow eye  
117 patching with an opaque patch) was tested after a 2-month of refractive adaptation. The short-  
118 term monocular deprivation effect was quantified in an initial experiment by the shift of ocular  
119 dominance in binocular phase combination after 2-hour of amblyopic eye patching([Zhou et al.,](#)  
120 [2013c](#)). An illustration of the experimental design is provided in Figure 1.



122 **Figure 1. An illustration of the experimental design.**

123 Seven newly diagnosed child amblyopes ( $6.86 \pm 1.46$  years old; SD) participated, in which the treatment  
124 effect of 2 months patching therapy (4-hour daily patching with an opaque patch) was tested after a 2-  
125 month of refractive adaptation. The short-term monocular deprivation effect was quantified by the shift  
126 of ocular dominance in binocular phase combination after 2-hour of amblyopic eye patching before the  
127 initial of the treatment.

### 128 **Procedure and stimuli**

129 Similar to our previous studies (Zhou et al., 2013a), the short-term monocular deprivation  
130 effect was tested with a binocular phase combination task. In the measure, two horizontal  
131 sine-wave gratings (1 cycle/°,  $2^\circ \times 2^\circ$ ), with equal and opposite phase shifts ( $+22.5^\circ$  and -  
132  $22.5^\circ$ ) relative to the center of the screen were dichoptically presented to the two eyes. The  
133 perceived phase of fused stimuli was  $0^\circ$  when the two eyes contributed equally to binocular  
134 fusion. The interocular contrast ratio at that condition was the balance point in binocular phase  
135 combination. We firstly tested this balance point for each patient with the contrast of the stimuli  
136 in the amblyopic eye set as 100%. This was achieved by measuring individual's binocularly  
137 perceived phase at interocular contrast ratios of 0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.4, 0.8 and 1; and the binocularly  
138 perceived phase vs. interocular contrast ratio (PvR) curve was fitted with a contrast-gain

139 control model([Ding and Sperling, 2006](#); [Zhou et al., 2013b](#)). One to three hours of practice  
140 trials were provided before we conducted of the main study to make sure patients understood  
141 the task and had a reliable performance in the binocular phase combination task. Individuals'  
142 PvR curves measured before treatment are provided in Figure 1. The balance points of  
143 patients before treatment are provided in Table 1.


144 We then fixed the contrast of the stimuli in the two eyes based on individual's balance  
145 point and tested individuals' binocularly perceived phase before and after a 2-hour of  
146 monocular deprivation of the amblyopic eye with an opaque patch. Two stimuli configurations  
147 were used for measuring the binocularly perceived phase to account for positional bias:  $+22.5^\circ$   
148 phase in the amblyopic eye and  $-22.5^\circ$  phase in the fellow eye and  $-22.5^\circ$  phase in the  
149 amblyopic eye and  $+22.5^\circ$  phase in the fellow eye. The half of the difference between these  
150 two configurations was calculated as the binocularly perceived phase. Each session of  
151 binocularly perceived phase measurement contains 16 trials (2 configurations \* 8 repetitions).  
152 The two configurations were randomly assigned in different trials. In each trial, observers were  
153 asked to adjust the position of a flanking reference line to locate the middle of the dark strip of  
154 the binocularly perceived grating to indicate its phase. A high-contrast frame ( $0.11^\circ$  in width  
155 and  $6^\circ$  in length) with four white diagonal lines ( $0.11^\circ$  in width and  $2.83^\circ$  in length) was  
156 continually presented surrounding the grating in each eye to help observers maintain fusion.  
157 Subjects normally needed around 3 minutes to finish one measurement session. We tested 3  
158 sessions of binocularly perceived phase within 10 minutes after patients finished the 2-hour  
159 of monocular deprivation. We averaged the results of these 3 sessions and then calculated  
160 the difference between the average post-patching perceived phase and the baseline to get  
161 the ocular dominance difference index after the 2-hour of monocular deprivation. We also  
162 normalized individuals' ocular dominance difference index to the largest one in this group. This  
163 normalization ensured that the normalized ocular dominance difference index ranged from -  
164 0.5 to 1, similar to the range reported in Lunghi et al's ([Lunghi et al., 2016](#)). The normalization  
165 itself would not change any correlation analysis we conducted in this study.

166 For the best-corrected visual acuity measure, we asked patients to read the optotypes  
167 one after another and stopped when they could not respond within 10 s. We calculated their  
168 percentage correct at different lines of the Logarithmic visual acuity Chart. We then used linear  
169 interpolation to calculate the score associated with 75% correct judgments. This score was  
170 defined as patients' visual acuity.

171

## 172 Results

173 In Figure 2, we plot individual's binocularly perceived phase as a function of the  
174 interocular contrast ratio measured before the treatment. The contrast-gain control model fits  
175 well to the data, with an average goodness-of-fit of  $0.941 \pm 0.054$  (mean  $\pm$  SD). This is similar  
176 to our previous observation([Zhou et al., 2013b](#)) in adults with amblyopia ( $0.951 \pm 0.022$ ),  
177 indicating that our patients in this study were able to make reliable measurements with the  
178 binocular phase combination task before the treatment. Also, similar to our previous  
179 observation([Zhou et al., 2013b](#)), there was a trend toward decreasing contrast ratios being  
180 associated with increasing interocular visual acuity differences ( $r = -0.59, P = 0.16$ ).




181

182 **Figure 2. Individual's binocularly perceived phase as a function of the interocular contrast ratio**  
183 **measured before the patching treatment.**

184 Each panel plots results of one patient. Error bars represent standard errors from 8 repetitions of the  
185 test. The curve in each panel represents fits with a contrast-gain-control model([Zhou et al., 2013b](#)). The  
186 purple triangle represents where the two eyes were balanced. The corresponding interocular contrast  
187 ratio (in short "BP") and the goodness-of-fit are provided in each panel.

188 Long term patching therapy (4hr/day for 2 months) significantly improved the visual acuity  
189 of the amblyopic eye in our patients, from an average of  $0.62 \pm 0.05$  to  $0.41 \pm 0.07$  (logMAR):  
190  $Z = -2.38$ ,  $P = 0.018$ , 2-tailed Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test. In Figure 3A, we plot the amblyopic  
191 eye acuity improvement after 2 months of treatment as a function of the normalized short-term  
192 ocular dominance index difference for the seven patients in our study. The normalized ocular  
193 dominance index difference was larger than 0 in five of the seven patients, which indicates a  
194 strengthening of the patched eye after the 2-hour short-term monocular deprivation. Two of  
195 the seven patients had a shift of ocular dominance in the reversal direction. This pattern of  
196 result was similar to that previously reported by Lunghi et al (2016), in which one of their 10  
197 patients had a shift of ocular dominance in the reversal way (see Figure 3B). A 2-tailed  
198 Pearson correlation analysis showed that the correlation between the amblyopic eye acuity  
199 improvement after 2 months of treatment and the normalized ocular dominance index  
200 difference after 2 hrs of amblyopic patching was not significant:  $r = 0.20$ ,  $P = 0.66$ .



201

202 **Figure 3. The relationship between the amblyopic eye acuity improvement after 2 months of**  
203 **treatment and the short-term monocular deprivation effect**

204 (A). Results from the present study. The horizontal axis represents the effect of short-term monocular  
205 deprivation on the ocular dominance (OD) shift. The value, if larger than 0, indicates the patched eye  
206 was getting stronger after the short-term monocular deprivation. The larger the value indicates the  
207 larger OD plasticity. The dashed line is a linear fit of the data. The error bars represent standard  
208 deviation based on the three post-test sessions measured within 10 minutes after patients finished the  
209 2-hour of monocular deprivation. A 2-tailed Pearson correlation analysis showed that the correlation  
210 between the amblyopic eye acuity improvement after 2 months of treatment and the normalized ocular  
211 dominance index difference was not significant:  $r = 0.20$ ,  $P = 0.66$ . (B). Reports from Lunghi et al's  
212 study(Lunghi et al., 2016). Their work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-  
213 NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. The results from Figure 4B and Table 1 in  
214 Lunghi et al (2016)'s paper are replotted here. Ten patients ( $6.2 \pm 1.0$  years (SD)) accepted Bangerter  
215 filter patching therapy (whole walking time in each day) after a 2-month of refractive adaptation. The  
216 ocular dominance index difference was quantified using a binocular rivalry task before the start of the  
217 patching therapy. The dashed line is a linear fit of the data. A 2-tailed Pearson correlation analysis  
218 showed that the correlation between the amblyopic eye acuity improvement after 2 months of treatment  
219 and the ocular dominance index difference was not significant:  $r = -0.22$ ,  $P = 0.54$ .

220

## 221 Discussion

222 We show that there was no significant correlation between the amblyopic eye acuity  
223 improvement after 2 months of occlusion treatment and the normalized ocular dominance (OD)  
224 index difference associated with the OD plasticity resulting from the amblyopic eye being  
225 subjected to 2 hrs of short-term deprivation.

226 On the face of it, our results seem to be in consistent with the claim made by Lunghi et al  
227 (2016) ([Lunghi et al., 2016](#)) that the ocular dominance change measured 2 hours after  
228 occlusion therapy predicts “the recovery rate” of the amblyopic eye in anisometric children.  
229 However, Lunghi et al ([Lunghi et al., 2016](#)) in their original paper plotted the change in ocular  
230 dominance (OD) against the *absolute* acuity at end of treatment. This is because they defined  
231 the effects of occlusion treatment (the “recovery rate”) in terms of the absolute visual acuity of  
232 the amblyopic eye measured after 2 months of treatment. We believe that this prediction is  
233 not interesting because clinically, in patients with amblyopia, their final visual acuity is best  
234 predicted by their initial visual acuity before. This is also true in Lunghi et al’s study. According  
235 to Table 1 in Lunghi et al’s paper, there is a strong correlation between the amblyopic eye’s  
236 visual acuity before and after 2-month of treatment:  $r = 0.731$ ,  $P = 0.016$ . The p-value is even  
237 smaller than that reported in Lunghi et al’s paper using the homeostatic plasticity ( $\rho = -0.65$ ,  
238  $P = 0.04$ ). This suggests that if one’s objective was to predict amblyopic eye’s visual acuity  
239 after 2-month of occlusion therapy, one can simply rely on patients’ initial visual acuity rather  
240 than a complicated psychophysics measure. What one really wants to do is to predict what  
241 change will occur in acuity as a result of treatment. That is what we set out to do.

242 Thus, our purpose was to investigate the relationship between the effects of the occlusion  
243 therapy, in terms of the visual acuity *improvement* (*i.e., the acuity benefit*) of the amblyopic  
244 eye measured after 2 months of treatment, and the short-term monocular deprivation induced  
245 visual plasticity. Therefore, we plotted *the change* in ocular dominance from short-term  
246 deprivation against *the change* in acuity from classical patching, as this is the only valid way  
247 of assessing whether changes in short term plasticity can predict improvements in long term

248 patching. According to Amblyopia PPP([Wallace et al., 2018](#)), success of patching therapy only  
249 make sense if it is measured in terms of an incremental change, that is an “improvement”.  
250 After re-plotting Lunghi et al (2016)’s data in this more convention way (corresponding to our  
251 data Figure 3A) where OD changes are plotted against patching-induced acuity changes, their  
252 results agree with ours and show that there is no significant correlation (Lunghi et al:  $r = -0.22$ ,  
253  $P = 0.54$ ; the present study:  $r = 0.20$ ,  $P = 0.66$ ) between OD changes at the beginning of  
254 patching therapy and acuity changes after 2 months of classical patching therapy.

255 There were a number of important differences between our study and the previous one  
256 by Lunghi et al (2016) ([Lunghi et al., 2016](#)). However, since the data from the two studies are  
257 consistent with there being no significant correlation between short-term ocular dominance  
258 plasticity changes and longer-term patching therapy improvements, none of these differences  
259 can be particularly crucial. Thus, our conclusions are robust in the face of the differences  
260 which are now listed:

261 First, Lunghi et al (2016) ([Lunghi et al., 2016](#)) used binocular rivalry to measure ocular  
262 dominance whereas we used a binocular combination task. Both tasks are laboratory-based  
263 tests and are potentially hard for children. In Lunghi et al (2016) ([Lunghi et al., 2016](#)), they  
264 added features to make the test child-friendly. In our study, we instigated practice sessions  
265 and only chose patients who were able to do the test accurately such that their R-square  
266 values for the “binocularly perceived phase vs. interocular contrast ratio” curve were larger  
267 than 0.85. Nevertheless, both tests have been widely used in studying the homeostatic  
268 plasticity in normal adults (rivalry:([Lunghi et al., 2011](#); [Lunghi et al., 2013](#); [Lunghi et al., 2015b](#);  
269 [Lunghi and Sale, 2015](#); [Bai et al., 2017](#); [Kim et al., 2017](#); [Ramamurthy and Blaser, 2018](#); [Finn](#)  
270 [et al., 2019](#); [Sheynin et al., 2019a](#); [Sheynin et al., 2019b](#)); combination:([Zhou et al., 2013a](#);  
271 [Zhou et al., 2014](#); [Bai et al., 2017](#); [Wang et al., 2017](#); [Yao et al., 2017](#); [Zhou et al., 2017a](#);  
272 [Zhou et al., 2017b](#); [Min et al., 2018](#); [Min et al., 2019](#); [Sheynin et al., 2019a](#))) and in patients  
273 with amblyopia (rivalry:([Lunghi et al., 2019](#)); combination:([Zhou et al., 2013c](#); [Zhou et al.,](#)  
274 [2019](#))).

275 Second, Lunghi et al (2016) ([Lunghi et al., 2016](#)) measured the ocular dominance  
276 associated with short-term occlusion of the fellow fixing eye whereas we measured the ocular  
277 dominance changes associated with the short-term deprivation of the amblyopic eye. To our  
278 limited knowledge, it is so far not clear whether the effect of short-term patching differ in  
279 magnitude for patching different eyes. We have no reason to believe that the underlying  
280 mechanisms in patching different eyes are different. We are at present assuming this. In  
281 support of this assumption, both studies found similar directions of ocular dominance shift (in  
282 favor of the patched eye) in most of the patients (9/10 in Lunghi et al's study and 5/7 in the  
283 present study) after the short-term monocular deprivation. Limited by the small sample in the  
284 present study, the normalized ocular dominance indices for the 7 patients were not statistically  
285 larger than 0 ( $t(6) = 1.33, P = 0.23$ ). However, we still failed to find any significantly correlation  
286 between the amblyopic eye acuity improvement after 2 months of occlusion treatment and the  
287 normalized ocular dominance (OD) index difference associated with the OD plasticity based  
288 on those having an ocular dominance shift in favor of the patched eye ( $n = 5; r = -0.14, P =$   
289  $0.82$ ).

290 Third, their patients had mild-moderate amblyopia ( $\leq 0.4$  logMAR) and were treated by  
291 occluding the fellow eye with a Bangerter filter (strength 0.4) whereas our patients had more  
292 severe amblyopia  $> 0.45$  logMAR and were treated by occluding the fellow eye with an opaque  
293 patch.

294 Fourth, the main conclusions in both the Lunghi et al's study ([Lunghi et al., 2016](#)) and  
295 the current study relied on correlations in small samples (i.e., 7 in ours and 10 in Lunghi et al  
296 (2016) ([Lunghi et al., 2016](#))). It's always hard to justify what's the proper sample size for a  
297 valid conclusion based on a correlation analysis, e.g., why 10 is enough, while 7 is not  
298 acceptable? This itself is tightly linked to the question that one asks. In particular, for the  
299 question that we asked, whether the homeostatic plasticity predicts the recovery rate (or the  
300 effects of occlusion therapy; or the visual acuity improvement), both Lunghi et al's and our  
301 study failed to reach a significant correlation. Thus, both of these two studies suggest that the

302 homeostatic plasticity might not be able to predict the acuity improvements from occlusion  
303 therapy. Considering that this conclusion relies on 2 studies (Lunghi et al's and ours) with 17  
304 patients (10 in Lunghi et al's and 7 in ours) from 2 independent groups using different  
305 techniques, we believe that this strengthens the conclusion. In other words, if one has to get  
306 a large sample to reach significance in this kind of correlation analysis, it's hard to believe that  
307 we can use the homeostatic plasticity as a prediction index in clinical practice.

308 Short-term ocular dominance plasticity does not provide an index of cortical plasticity in  
309 the general sense, such that it could be used to predict acuity improvement outcomes from  
310 classical patching. This conclusion is robust to the type of measurement method used, the  
311 degree of amblyopia treated and the eye that is occluded (i.e., fixing vs amblyopic) in the short-  
312 term OD measurement. In some ways this general conclusion is unsurprising because short  
313 term OD plasticity is a very specific homeostatic form of plasticity([Min et al., 2018](#)), which may  
314 be quite different from the type of plasticity that underlies monocular patching therapy. While  
315 it may not predict monocular outcomes in patching therapy, it is yet to be determined if this is  
316 also true for purely binocular outcomes, using purely binocular therapy ([Hess and Thompson,](#)  
317 [2015](#)), or changes of neural transmitter concentration (e.g. GABA([Lunghi et al., 2015b](#))), etc.  
318 All that can be said is that there appears to be no simple straightforward prediction from the  
319 extent of ocular dominance change from short-term occlusion and the acuity benefit of long-  
320 term occlusion therapy.

## 321 **DATA AVAILABILITY**

322 The datasets generated for this study are available on request to the corresponding author.

323

## 324 **ETHICS STATEMENT**

325 This study was carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the ethics committee  
326 of the Wenzhou Medical University, with written informed consent from all subjects after

327 explanation of the nature and possible consequences of the study. All subjects gave written  
328 informed consent in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. The protocol was approved  
329 by the ethics committee of the Institutional Review Boards of Wenzhou Medical University.

330

### 331 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

332 CT, JZ, and RH conceived the experiments. CT, ZH, and YC performed the experiments. CT,  
333 ZH, YC, and JZ analyzed the data and interpreted the data. CT, JZ, and RH wrote the  
334 manuscript. All authors contributed to manuscript revision, read and approved the submitted  
335 version.

336

### 337 **FUNDINGS**

338 This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China grant NSFC  
339 81500754, the Qianjiang Talent Project (QJD1702021), the Wenzhou Medical University grant  
340 QTJ16005 and the Project of State Key Laboratory of Ophthalmology, Optometry and Visual  
341 Science, Wenzhou Medical University (K171206) to JZ, the Canadian Institutes of Health  
342 Research Grants CCI-125686, NSERC grant 228103, and an ERA-NET Neuron grant  
343 (JTC2015) to RFH. The sponsor or funding organization had no role in the design or conduct  
344 of this research.

345

### 346 **References**

347 Bai, J., Dong, X., He, S., and Bao, M. (2017). Monocular deprivation of Fourier phase  
348 information boosts the deprived eye's dominance during interocular competition but not  
349 interocular phase combination. *Neuroscience* 352, 122-130. doi:  
350 10.1016/j.neuroscience.2017.03.053.

- 351 Binda, P., Kurzawski, J.W., Lunghi, C., Biagi, L., Tosetti, M., and Morrone, M.C. (2018).  
352 Response to short-term deprivation of the human adult visual cortex measured with 7T  
353 BOLD. *Elife* 7. doi: 10.7554/eLife.40014.
- 354 Brainard, D.H. (1997). The Psychophysics Toolbox. *Spat Vis* 10(4), 433-436.
- 355 Chadnova, E., Reynaud, A., Clavagnier, S., and Hess, R.F. (2017). Short-term monocular  
356 occlusion produces changes in ocular dominance by a reciprocal modulation of  
357 interocular inhibition. *Sci Rep* 7, 41747. doi: 10.1038/srep41747.
- 358 Ding, J., and Sperling, G. (2006). A gain-control theory of binocular combination. *Proc Natl*  
359 *Acad Sci U S A* 103(4), 1141-1146. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0509629103.
- 360 Finn, A.E., Baldwin, A.S., Reynaud, A., and Hess, R.F. (2019). Visual plasticity and exercise  
361 revisited: No evidence for a "cycling lane". *J Vis* 19(6):21, 1-10. doi: 10.1167/19.6.21.
- 362 Fronius, M., Cirina, L., Ackermann, H., Kohnen, T., and Diehl, C.M. (2014). Efficiency of  
363 electronically monitored amblyopia treatment between 5 and 16 years of age: new  
364 insight into declining susceptibility of the visual system. *Vision Res* 103, 11-19. doi:  
365 10.1016/j.visres.2014.07.018.
- 366 Hess, R.F., and Thompson, B. (2015). Amblyopia and the binocular approach to its therapy.  
367 *Vision Res* 114, 4-16. doi: 10.1016/j.visres.2015.02.009.
- 368 Kim, H.W., Kim, C.Y., and Blake, R. (2017). Monocular Perceptual Deprivation from  
369 Interocular Suppression Temporarily Imbalances Ocular Dominance. *Curr Biol* 27(6),  
370 884-889. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2017.01.063.
- 371 Lunghi, C., Berchicci, M., Morrone, M.C., and Di Russo, F. (2015a). Short-term monocular  
372 deprivation alters early components of visual evoked potentials. *J Physiol* 593(19),  
373 4361-4372. doi: 10.1113/jp270950.
- 374 Lunghi, C., Burr, D.C., and Morrone, C. (2011). Brief periods of monocular deprivation disrupt  
375 ocular balance in human adult visual cortex. *Curr Biol* 21(14), R538-539. doi:  
376 10.1016/j.cub.2011.06.004.
- 377 Lunghi, C., Burr, D.C., and Morrone, M.C. (2013). Long-term effects of monocular deprivation  
378 revealed with binocular rivalry gratings modulated in luminance and in color. *J Vis*  
379 13(6):1, 1-15. doi: 10.1167/13.6.1.
- 380 Lunghi, C., Emir, U.E., Morrone, M.C., and Bridge, H. (2015b). Short-term monocular  
381 deprivation alters GABA in the adult human visual cortex. *Curr Biol* 25(11), 1496-  
382 1501. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2015.04.021.
- 383 Lunghi, C., Morrone, M.C., Secci, J., and Caputo, R. (2016). Binocular Rivalry Measured 2  
384 Hours After Occlusion Therapy Predicts the Recovery Rate of the Amblyopic Eye in  
385 Anisometric Children. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 57(4), 1537-1546. doi:  
386 10.1167/iovs.15-18419.
- 387 Lunghi, C., and Sale, A. (2015). A cycling lane for brain rewiring. *Curr Biol* 25(23), R1122-  
388 1123. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2015.10.026.
- 389 Lunghi, C., Sframeli, A.T., Lepri, A., Lepri, M., Lisi, D., Sale, A., et al. (2019). A new  
390 counterintuitive training for adult amblyopia. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol* 6(2), 274-284.  
391 doi: 10.1002/acn3.698.
- 392 Min, S.H., Baldwin, A.S., and Hess, R.F. (2019). Ocular dominance plasticity: A binocular  
393 combination task finds no cumulative effect with repeated patching. *Vision Res* 161,  
394 36-42. doi: 10.1016/j.visres.2019.05.007.
- 395 Min, S.H., Baldwin, A.S., Reynaud, A., and Hess, R.F. (2018). The shift in ocular dominance  
396 from short-term monocular deprivation exhibits no dependence on duration of  
397 deprivation. *Sci Rep* 8(1), 17083. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-35084-1.
- 398 Mou, T. (1966). Logarithmic visual acuity chart and five-score recording. *Chinese Journal of*  
399 *Ophthalmology* 13(1), 96-106.

- 400 Pelli, D.G. (1997). The VideoToolbox software for visual psychophysics: transforming  
401 numbers into movies. *Spat Vis* 10(4), 437-442.
- 402 Ramamurthy, M., and Blaser, E. (2018). Assessing the kaleidoscope of monocular deprivation  
403 effects. *J Vis* 18(13):14, 1-16. doi: 10.1167/18.13.14.
- 404 Sheynin, Y., Chamoun, M., Baldwin, A.S., Rosa-Neto, P., Hess, R.F., and Vaucher, E. (2019a).  
405 Cholinergic Potentiation Alters Perceptual Eye Dominance Plasticity Induced by a Few  
406 Hours of Monocular Patching in Adults. *Front Neurosci* 13, 22. doi:  
407 10.3389/fnins.2019.00022.
- 408 Sheynin, Y., Proulx, S., and Hess, R.F. (2019b). Temporary monocular occlusion facilitates  
409 binocular fusion during rivalry. *J Vis* 19(5):23, 1-17. doi: 10.1167/19.5.23.
- 410 Stewart, C.E., Fielder, A.R., Stephens, D.A., and Moseley, M.J. (2005). Treatment of unilateral  
411 amblyopia: factors influencing visual outcome. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 46(9), 3152-  
412 3160. doi: 10.1167/iovs.05-0357.
- 413 Stewart, C.E., Stephens, D.A., Fielder, A.R., and Moseley, M.J. (2007a). Modeling dose-  
414 response in amblyopia: toward a child-specific treatment plan. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis*  
415 *Sci* 48(6), 2589-2594. doi: 10.1167/iovs.05-1243.
- 416 Stewart, C.E., Stephens, D.A., Fielder, A.R., and Moseley, M.J. (2007b). Objectively  
417 monitored patching regimens for treatment of amblyopia: randomised trial. *Bmj*  
418 335(7622), 707. doi: 10.1136/bmj.39301.460150.55.
- 419 Wallace, D.K., Repka, M.X., Lee, K.A., Melia, M., Christiansen, S.P., Morse, C.L., et al.  
420 (2018). Amblyopia Preferred Practice Pattern(R). *Ophthalmology* 125(1), P105-p142.  
421 doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2017.10.008.
- 422 Wang, Y., Yao, Z., He, Z., Zhou, J., and Hess, R.F. (2017). The Cortical Mechanisms  
423 Underlying Ocular Dominance Plasticity in Adults are Not Orientationally Selective.  
424 *Neuroscience* 367, 121-126. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroscience.2017.10.030.
- 425 Yao, Z., He, Z., Wang, Y., Lu, F., Qu, J., Zhou, J., et al. (2017). Absolute Not Relative  
426 Interocular Luminance Modulates Sensory Eye Dominance Plasticity in Adults.  
427 *Neuroscience* 367, 127-133. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroscience.2017.10.029.
- 428 Zhou, J., Baker, D.H., Simard, M., Saint-Amour, D., and Hess, R.F. (2015). Short-term  
429 monocular patching boosts the patched eye's response in visual cortex. *Restor Neurol*  
430 *Neurosci* 33(3), 381-387. doi: 10.3233/rnn-140472.
- 431 Zhou, J., Clavagnier, S., and Hess, R.F. (2013a). Short-term monocular deprivation strengthens  
432 the patched eye's contribution to binocular combination. *J Vis* 13(5):12, 1-10. doi:  
433 10.1167/13.5.12.
- 434 Zhou, J., He, Z., Wu, Y., Chen, Y., Chen, X., Liang, Y., et al. (2019). Inverse Occlusion: A  
435 Binocularly Motivated Treatment for Amblyopia. *Neural Plast* 2019, 5157628. doi:  
436 10.1155/2019/5157628.
- 437 Zhou, J., and Hess, R.F. (2016). Neutral-Density Filters Are Not a Patch on Occlusion. *Invest*  
438 *Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 57(10), 4450-4451. doi: 10.1167/iovs.16-20316.
- 439 Zhou, J., Huang, P.C., and Hess, R.F. (2013b). Interocular suppression in amblyopia for global  
440 orientation processing. *J Vis* 13(5):19, 1-14. doi: 10.1167/13.5.19.
- 441 Zhou, J., Reynaud, A., and Hess, R.F. (2014). Real-time modulation of perceptual eye  
442 dominance in humans. *Proc Biol Sci* 281(1795). doi: 10.1098/rspb.2014.1717.
- 443 Zhou, J., Reynaud, A., and Hess, R.F. (2017a). Aerobic Exercise Effects on Ocular Dominance  
444 Plasticity with a Phase Combination Task in Human Adults. *Neural Plast* 2017,  
445 4780876. doi: 10.1155/2017/4780876.
- 446 Zhou, J., Reynaud, A., Kim, Y.J., Mullen, K.T., and Hess, R.F. (2017b). Chromatic and  
447 achromatic monocular deprivation produce separable changes of eye dominance in  
448 adults. *Proc Biol Sci* 284(1867). doi: 10.1098/rspb.2017.1669.

449 Zhou, J., Thompson, B., and Hess, R.F. (2013c). A new form of rapid binocular plasticity in  
450 adult with amblyopia. *Sci Rep* 3, 2638. doi: 10.1038/srep02638.

451