

1 **Automated vision screening of children using a mobile graphic device**

2

3 Steven A. Kane, M.D., Ph.D., corresponding author
4 Vagelos College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University
5 The Edward S. Harkness Eye Institute
6 635 West 165th Street, Room 372
7 New York, NY 10032
8 United States of America

9

10 Mark Gaspich, BS
11 University of Central Florida
12 Orlando, FL

13

14 Julia Kane
15 Syracuse University
16 Syracuse, NY

17

18 Sarah Weitzman, MS
19 New York Eye and Ear Infirmary of Mt. Sinai
20 New York, NY

21

22 Albert Hofeldt, M.D.
23 New York Eye and Ear Infirmary of Mt. Sinai
24 New York, NY

25

26

27 **Total words with abstract:** 247

28 **Total words in paper body:** 2408

29 **Figures:** 3

30 **Supplements:** 0

31 **Running Title:** Automated vision screening of children using a mobile graphic device

32 **Competing interests:** None

33 **ABSTRACT**

34 **Background/Objective:** Can measures of interocular brightness disparity, acuity, and
35 colour vision identify children with amblyopia?

36 **Subjects/Methods:** 208 subjects from 3 to 14 years were recruited for a prospective,
37 observational protocol to measure interocular brightness disparity, acuities with and
38 without a pinhole, and colour vision using an iPad. Interocular brightness disparity was
39 assessed as the subject looked through a system of polarizing filters and chose the
40 brighter of two spaceships. The differential brightness of image pairs was varied
41 according to a staircase algorithm until equal brightness was perceived. Acuities were
42 tested with tumbling Es. Colour vision was tested with AO-HRR colour plates. 2 subjects
43 (1%) were later confirmed to have unilateral amblyopia.

44 **Results:** Binocular brightness balance on the iPad detected both amblyopes and
45 excluded all 202 non-amblyopes, in this study with sensitivity and specificity of 100%.
46 By using 20/30 as cutoff for normal acuity, 1 of the 2 amblyopes was detected and all
47 non-amblyopes were excluded by visual acuity testing with pinhole. The mean
48 difference between iPad and E-Chart visual acuities with pinhole was 0.02 logMAR with
49 limits of agreement from -0.08 to +0.11 logMAR. Colour vision testing with iPad and
50 printed plates gave identical results. Testing times were brief and exit pleasure poll
51 responses were positive.

52 **Conclusions:** Interocular brightness disparity, acuity, and colour vision can be
53 measured in children as young as 3 years playing a fun game on a mobile graphic
54 device. Interocular brightness disparity may be a sensitive and specific method to detect
55 unilateral amblyopia.

56 **KEY WORDS:** Amblyopia, Retinal Rivalry, Visual Screening

57 **INTRODUCTION**

58 Amblyopia, an often silent and elusive disease, remains the leading cause of
59 permanent vision loss in children¹ despite more than a century of interest in vision
60 screening.² Are the screening techniques at fault, are follow up and therapy at fault, or
61 are not enough children being screened for amblyopia? Ideal vision screening would
62 have low rates of false positive and false negative results, low expense, and ready
63 availability. A method having these qualities that could also be administered via
64 telemedicine could improve vision screening in schools and pediatric offices and reach
65 more children who are not being screened for amblyopia.

66 Relative brightness sense was found to agree closely with the degree of visual
67 acuity impairment in adult subjects with a range of ophthalmic diseases, including
68 amblyopia.³ This study investigates the utility of vision screening with a mobile graphic
69 device (iPad) to measure interocular brightness disparity, visual acuity, and colour
70 vision for detecting amblyopia in pediatric subjects in a school setting.

71 **SUBJECTS AND METHODS**

72 This study utilized a prospective, observational protocol that followed all the
73 tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the Columbia University
74 Institutional Review Board (protocol AAAC0020). 208 children, 121 girls and 87 boys
75 with ages from 3 to 14 years and mean of 7.8 years, were recruited as subjects and
76 tested at school. The protocol measures brightness disparity, acuity, and colour vision
77 with self-tested algorithms running on an iPad with results stored on the device. The
78 age distribution of these subjects was 15.4% (3-5 years of age), 46.6% (6-9 years of
79 age) and 37.9% (10-14 years of age). Their ocular histories were not known beyond the

80 use of spectacles until testing was completed.

81 To measure brightness disparity, binocular image separation is created by
82 wearing polarizing glasses combined with complementary linear polarizing filters
83 positioned over two vertically aligned spaceships on an iPad screen (Figure 1). Through
84 this polarizing filter arrangement, the right eye views only the bottom spaceship,
85 rivalrous with the black background viewed by the left eye, and the left eye views only
86 the top spaceship, rivalrous with the black background viewed by the right eye. Tops
87 and bottom spaceships are presented with brightness differences ranging from 0.3 to
88 1.8 log units in increments of 0.3. In response to recorded instruction, the subject
89 identifies and taps the brighter spaceship. The brightness difference of the spaceships
90 and response times are recorded on the device. In response to the subject's selection of
91 the brighter spaceship, brightness differences of subsequent spaceship pairs are then
92 sequenced within a stepwise, self-tested algorithm until the right-left brightness equality
93 endpoint is crossed and re-crossed. For a normal score the students must achieve a net
94 zero brightness imbalance in 2 of 3 games.

95 iPad visual acuity is based on matching tumbling Es calibrated from 20/400 to
96 20/20 for a testing distance of 40 cm. A tape measure attached to an iPad stand
97 confirms the testing distance. Reversible spectacles that occlude one eye are worn.
98 Testing begins by the examiner selecting a starting E size, typically 20/60. Two equally
99 sized Es are presented. The student taps YES on the touchscreen when the
100 orientations of the Es are identical and NO when the Es are mismatched. Three correct
101 responses advance the protocol to the next lower line. An incorrect response provides a
102 second chance during presentation of three E pairs of that letter size. Another incorrect

103 response at that E size terminates the self-test. Testing then restarts by the examiner
104 selecting a larger starting E size. The smallest E size with 3 correct responses is
105 recorded as the visual acuity for each eye. When visual acuity measures 20/30 or
106 worse, testing is repeated through a plastic panoramic pinhole (PH) disc containing
107 seven 6 mm opaque rings, each with a 1.0 mm central piercing and each ring margin
108 separated by 1 mm of clear plastic. If the subject fails to match the 20/400 E, the acuity
109 is recorded as less than 20/400. For comparison to distance acuity, the acuities of 63
110 subjects were also tested with tumbling Es (E-Chart) on a traditional eye chart at 20
111 feet.

112 Digital copies of the demonstration and test AO-HRR colour plates are presented
113 on an iPad. Reversible spectacles that occlude one eye are worn. The subject is asked
114 to touch a coloured shape or signify no coloured shape by touching a no colour circle
115 below. If the demonstration plates are correctly identified, the subject qualifies to
116 proceed. The test colour images are then similarly presented in a pseudo-random order
117 and then repeated for the other eye.

118 Subjects with abnormal results were referred for complete ophthalmological
119 examination if they were not already under care.

120 **RESULTS**

121 Of the 208 subjects were recruited for testing, 204 subjects were able to
122 complete the protocol to measure interocular brightness disparity, acuities, and colour
123 vision. Except for one amblyope, the visual acuities of the remaining 203 subjects were
124 20/30 or better in each eye either unassisted, with corrective spectacles, or with the aid
125 of the PH. Four subjects were excluded from the protocol due to either not

126 understanding the visual acuity tests (2 students) or omission of PH acuity testing (2
127 subjects). The only recruited subject who was unable to successfully play the brightness
128 disparity game was a young child who was also unable to perform the acuity and colour
129 vision tests.

130 For statistical analysis, acuities were converted to logMAR notation. For the 63
131 students (126 eyes) tested with both E-Chart and the iPad acuity without the PH, the
132 mean logMAR acuities for E-Chart was 0.11 (standard deviation SD = 0.16) and for iPad
133 acuity was 0.07 (SD = 0.12). With the PH, the mean logMAR acuity for E-Chart was
134 0.05 (SD = 0.05) and for iPad acuity was 0.04 (SD = 0.05). The improvement in mean
135 visual acuity with the addition of the PH was 55% (0.11 vs 0.05) for E-Chart and 42%
136 (0.07 vs 0.04) for iPad acuity while SD improved 67% (0.16 vs .05) for E-Chart and 58%
137 (0.12 vs 0.05) for iPad acuity. The limit of agreement between logMAR iPad acuity and
138 E-Chart was analyzed by the method of Bland and Altman,³ where 95% of differences
139 will lie between plus and minus 2 SD of the mean difference (d) between the tests.
140 Without the PH (Figure 2), for E-Chart minus iPad acuity, $d = 0.04$ logMAR (SD = 0.14,
141 $d-2SD = -0.25$ and $d+2SD = 0.32$). With the PH (Figure 3), for E-Chart minus iPad
142 acuity, $d = 0.02$ logMAR (SD = 0.05, $d-2s = -0.08$ and $d+2s = 0.11$).

143 Of the 204 subjects tested for brightness disparity, 2 had interocular brightness
144 imbalance and 202 did not have brightness imbalance. When their ophthalmic status
145 was unmasked, the first of these two subjects was known to have amblyopia and was
146 under treatment. This child being treated for amblyopia OS had acuities measuring
147 20/20 OD and 20/25 OS at the time of testing. Left brightness disparity thrice measured
148 0.3 log unit. Colour vision was normal in each eye. The second of these two subjects

149 was not under ophthalmic care and was referred for complete ophthalmic examination.
150 This child was confirmed to have previously undetected left amblyopia with acuities of
151 20/20 OD and 20/40 OS and no visual acuity improvement with PH. Left brightness
152 disparity twice measured 0.6 log unit and once measured 0.3 log unit. Colour vision
153 testing suggested a blue-yellow defect OS and normal colour vision OD. A third subject
154 who had been successfully treated for amblyopia OS had acuities measuring 20/20 in
155 each eye. Brightness disparity testing found alternating ocular preference with
156 endpoints of 0.3 OS, 0.3 OD, and 0.0 log units. Colour vision was normal in each eye.

157 Of the 204 subjects tested for colour vision, 198 students tested normal, and 6
158 subjects displayed a colour vision defect using the AO-HRR colour plates in an iPad.
159 Five with a defect were bilaterally identical, classified as hereditary, with 1 female
160 (0.83% of the females) and 4 males (4.5% of the males). The remaining subject had a
161 monocular colour vision defect in the amblyopic eye (the child with amblyopia described
162 above).

163 For brightness disparity, testing time was measured in 62 subjects. Times ranged
164 from 12 to 63 seconds with the mean time of 32.7 seconds and standard deviation of
165 9.8 seconds. For iPad acuity, testing time was measured in 36 subjects. Times ranged
166 from 41 to 188 seconds with mean of 89 seconds with standard deviation of 35.6
167 seconds. Some subjects began testing at the 20/60 level and others at the 20/400 level;
168 this difference was not factored into the recording time. For colour vision testing, testing
169 time was measured in 38 subjects. Times ranged from 17 to 95 seconds with mean of
170 52.8 seconds and standard deviation of 25.4 seconds.

171 Exit pleasure polls on a scale from 1 (boring) to 10 (fun) were taken in 60
172 children. The average pleasure scores were 9.7 for brightness disparity testing, 9.0 for
173 iPad acuity, and 9.6 for colour vision testing. The younger subjects reported higher
174 pleasure scores than the subjects between 8 and 13 years of age.

175 **DISCUSSION**

176 The prevalence of amblyopia in this cohort is approximately 1%, within the
177 reported prevalence of amblyopia worldwide between 1% and 4%⁴. Prevalence in our
178 cohort toward the lower end of this range may reflect our recruitment process. We
179 hypothesize that many students at this school already receive private ophthalmic care.
180 Parents of some children with known amblyopia and other ocular conditions may have
181 chosen to not respond to our invitation to participate in this study, possibly decreasing
182 our measured prevalence of amblyopia.

183 The standard method for detecting amblyopia remains complete ophthalmic
184 examination and measurement of best corrected acuity.⁵ In primary care and school
185 settings, commercially available instrument-based screening devices are common.⁶⁻¹⁰
186 These devices are mostly designed to detect risk factors for amblyopia such as
187 refractive error, strabismus, anisocoria, and media opacities rather than relative
188 decreased acuity or amblyopia. These risk factors occur in 21%¹¹ whereas amblyopia
189 affects only 2 to 3%¹ of the population in the United States, a disparity that may explain
190 the inverse relationship between sensitivity and specificity of these devices according to
191 the referral criteria chosen by the manufacturer or operator.¹² Two more recently
192 introduced devices, the Pediatric Vision Scanner¹³ and Diopsys¹⁴ objectively measure
193 retinal birefringence and visually evoked potentials (VEP), respectively, to detect

194 asymmetry between eyes and identify unilateral amblyopia. These devices are
195 expensive, are not widely available in schools and pediatric offices, and are not readily
196 applicable to telemedicine.

197 Why interocular brightness sense is useful to detect amblyopia is unknown. Many
198 authors have found brightness sense useful for studying optic nerve disease. None to
199 our knowledge state that normal brightness balance excludes disease. Inducing
200 interocular brightness imbalance was found to severely impair hitting by major league
201 baseball players¹⁵, suggesting that brightness sense influences motion stereopsis and
202 may be evolutionarily old and conserved. A study of colour rivalry suppression in
203 patients with ocular disease and amblyopia suggested that brightness disparity might
204 also accompany unilateral amblyopia¹⁶. Our study supports this hypothesis that
205 measurement of interocular brightness sense while playing a game on a readily
206 available mobile graphic device, an iPad, may be a sensitive and specific method to
207 detect unilateral amblyopia. Specialized, expensive equipment is not needed for this
208 testing, making this methodology potentially attractive for online vision screening and for
209 telemedicine.

210 Acuity testing with iPad using tumbling Es was equivalent to distance testing in
211 our cohort and compares favorably with other methods of acuity measurement. Without
212 a pinhole, amblyopes are not segregated from those with only refractive error. In
213 screening children having unknown refractive errors for amblyopia, we found that
214 adding a panoramic PH improves acuities for iPad acuity and E-Chart to a level capable
215 of excluding amblyopia with either eye chart. Applying Bland and Altman statistics,³ E-
216 Chart verses iPad acuity with PH ($d= 0.02$, $d+2SD = 0.11$, $d-2SD = -0.08$) showed

217 closer agreement than when other charts¹⁷ were compared to E-Chart by this method:
218 E-Chart vs HOTV ($d= 0.17$, $d+2s = 0.37$, $d-2s = -0.03$) and E-Chart verses Lea symbols
219 ($d= 0.15$, $d+2s = 0.36$, $d-2s = -0.07$). Our limits of agreement (0.11 and -0.08) suggest
220 that E-Chart and iPad acuity with panoramic PH can be used interchangeably.
221 Combining measures of interocular brightness disparity and acuity with PH permits
222 identification of unilateral amblyopia by two methods using one device.

223 The incidence of bilateral amblyopia has been estimated to be 0.5% and the
224 interocular acuity difference can be very small, less than 1 lines of letters in 50% of the
225 patients.¹⁸ In our study, brightness disparity testing detected the amblyope with one line
226 of difference in visual acuity, however more studies are needed to determine the
227 sensitivity for detecting a minimum interocular vision difference by this method. Until
228 that sensitivity is known, both brightness disparity and acuity testing should be used for
229 detecting amblyopia.

230 Video games and smartphones and tablets are ubiquitous across many societies
231 and popular with children. This study found measures of interocular brightness disparity
232 and visual acuity using tumbling Es useful to detect amblyopia in children as young as 3
233 years. The determination of interocular brightness disparity required only an average of
234 $\frac{1}{2}$ minute testing time per eye, was easy in that only 1 young subject of the 208 subjects
235 was unable to play the "game," and was fun, with a mean exit pleasure score of 9.7/10.
236 The rationale that earlier screening for amblyopia leads to better outcomes is being
237 questioned,¹⁹ as is the value of current vision screening in children.²⁰ Outcomes were
238 similar when treatment was immediately initiated or delayed,²¹ so screening when

239 children are 3 years and able to play a video game remains a reasonable approach to
240 lessening the societal burden of visual loss due to amblyopia.

241 Determination of brightness disparity with a graphic mobile device as
242 demonstrated in this study is fun and easy for children and is highly sensitive and
243 specific for detecting unilateral amblyopia. Acuity testing with spectacles or pinhole on
244 the same device can support the results of brightness disparity measurement and help
245 detect bilateral amblyopia. Online vision screening and telemedicine that directly
246 measure amblyopia rather than assess risk factors may eventually displace amblyopia
247 as number one cause of permanent vision loss in children. The screening of children in
248 different schools and pediatric practices comparing this methodology with existing
249 commercial devices is planned.

250

251 REFERENCES

- 252 1. The statistics on eye disease in America (2020).
253 <https://www.nvisioncenters.com/education/eye-disease-statistics/#cdc>
- 254 2. Appelboom TL. A history of vision screening. *J Sch Health* 55(4), 138-141 (1985)
- 255 3. Hofeldt TS, Hofeldt AJ. Measuring colour rivalry suppression in amblyopia. *Br J*
256 *Ophthalmol.* 83(11), 1283-1286 (1999)
- 257 4. Bland JM, Altman DG. (1986). Statistical methods for assessing agreement between
258 two methods of clinical measurement. *Lancet*, i, 307-310 (1986)
- 259 5. Committee on Practice and Ambulatory Medicine and Section on Ophthalmology,
260 American Academy of Pediatrics. *Pediatrics* 111(4), 902-907(2003)

- 261 6. Organizational principles to guide and define the child health care system and/or
262 improve the health of all children. *Pediatrics* 111(4), 902-907 (2003)
- 263 7. Attebo K, Mitchell P, Cumming R, Smith W, Jolly N, Sparkes R. Prevalence and
264 causes of amblyopia in an adult population. *Ophthalmol.* 105(1),154-159 (1998)
- 265 8. Kirk VG, Claussen MM, Armitage MD, Arnold RW. Preverbal photoscreening for
266 amblyogenic risk factors and outcomes in amblyopia treatment: early objective
267 screening and visual acuities. *Arch Ophthalmol.* 126(4), 489-492 (2008)
- 268 9. Salcido AA, Bradley J, Donahue SP. Predictive value of photoscreening and
269 traditional screening of preschool children. *J AAPOS* 9(2),114-120 (2005)
- 270 10. Halegoua J, Schwartz RH. Vision photoscreening of infants and young children in a
271 primary care pediatric office: can it identify asymptomatic treatable amblyopic risk
272 factors? *Clin Pediatr (Phila)* 54(1), 33-39 (2015)
- 273 11. Longmuir SQ, Pfeifer W, Leon A, Olson RJ, Short L, Scott WE. Nine-year results of
274 a volunteer lay network photoscreening program of 147,809 children using a
275 photoscreener in Iowa. *Ophthalmol.* 117(10), 1869-1875 (2010)
- 276 12. Arnold RW. Amblyopia risk factor prevalence. *J Ped Ophthal and Strabismus* 50(4),
277 213-217 (2013)
- 278 13. Children's Eye Foundation. A Practical Guide for Primary Care Physicians:
279 Instrument-based vision screening in children. *Pediatrics* (2017).
280 <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2016-3444>

- 281 14. Hunter Dg, Nassif Ds, Piskun Nv, Winsor R, Gramatikov Bi, Guyton DI. Pediatric
282 vision screener 1: instrument design and operation. *J Biomed Opt.* (6):1363-8 (2009)
- 283 15. Donahue SP, Ommran SS, Howards C. Visually Evoked Potential Detection of
284 Amblyopia in the Clinic. ARVO Annual Meeting Abstract, Investigative Ophthalmology &
285 Visual Science 53, 3887 (2012)
- 286 16. Hofeldt AJ, Hoefle FB, Bonafede B. Baseball hitting, binocular vision, and the
287 Pulfrich effect. *Arch Ophthalmology* 114, 1490-1494 (1996)18.
- 288 17. Wallace D, Chandler DL, Beck RW, Arnold RW, Bacal DA, Birch EA, et al.
289 Treatment of Bilateral refractive amblyopia in children 3 to <10 years old. *Am J*
290 *Ophthalmol.* 144(4), 487–496 (2007)
- 291 18. Moganeswari D, Thomas J, Srinivasan K, Jacob GP. Test re-test reliability and
292 validity of different visual acuity and stereoacuity charts used in preschool children. *J*
293 *Clin Diagn Res.* 9(11), (2015).<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/issues/261550/>
- 294 19. Holmes JM. When to screen for amblyopia.
295 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaapos.2020.02.001>
- 296 20. Elflein HM, Pokora R, Müller DF, Jahn K, Ponto KA, Pitz S, et al. No benefit of a
297 pediatric screening in discovering reduced visual acuity in children: Experiences from a
298 cross-sectional study in Germany. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 17(10), 3419-3429
299 (2020)
- 300 21. Clarke MP, Wright CM, Hrisos S, Anderson JD, Henderson J, S R Richardson SR.
301 Randomised controlled trial of treatment of unilateral visual impairment detected at
302 preschool vision screening. *BMJ* 327:1251-6 (2003)

303 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

304 Figure 1. Screenshot of two spaceships presented on an iPad.

305 Figure 2. Bland-Altman plot of agreement between E-Chart and iPad visual acuities
306 without pinhole for 63 subjects, 126 eyes.

307 Figure 3. Bland-Altman plot of agreement between E-Chart and iPad visual acuities with
308 pinhole for 63 subjects, 126 eyes, frequency (n).

309 **FIGURES** in attached Powerpoint

310 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST/FUNDING:**

311 Dr Kane, Mark Gaspich, Julia Kane and Sarah Weitzman declare no conflict of interest.

312 Dr. Hofeldt holds a patent relating to the content of a manuscript.

313 This study was unfunded.

314

315 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

316 All authors made the following contributions:

317 1. Conceived and/or designed the work that led to the submission, acquired data,
318 and/or played an important role in interpreting the results.

319 2. played an important role in interpreting the results.

320 3. Drafted or revised the manuscript.

321 4. Approved the final version.

322 5. Agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions
323 related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately
324 investigated and resolved.




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3