

1 **Full title:** Validation of a Visual Midline Gauge: A Cross-Sectional Study

2 **Authors:**

3 Amritha Stalin PhD, MPhil, BS Optometry*[#]

4 Ran Ding PhD, MPhil, B.E[#]

5 Susan J. Leat FCOptom, BSc, PhD, FAAO*[#]

6 Ohwod Binhilabi MSc, BScOptom*^a

7 Tammy Labreche OD, FAAO, BSc*[#]

8

9 **Author institutions:**

10 School of Optometry & Vision Science, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada*

11 Centre for Eye and Vision Research Limited, 17W Science, Hong Kong, China[#]

12 **Short title:** Validation of a visual midline gauge

13 **Corresponding author:** Amritha Stalin PhD, MPhil, BS Optometry

14 **Address:** School of Optometry & Vision Science, 200 University Avenue W,

15 Waterloo, ON, Canada, N2L 3G1

16 **E-mail:** astalin@uwaterloo.ca

17 **Word count:**

18 **Key words:** visual midline shift, stroke, cerebral vascular accident, cerebral vascular

19 incident, perceived visual midline

20

^aOhwod Binhilabi is currently researching at the King Abdullah International Medical Research Center, Riyadh, KSA.

21 **Background:** This study standardized the parameters of a novel visual midline gauge and
22 presents normative data, which can be used by optometrists in the assessment of visual
23 midline.

24 **Methods:** Ninety-three participants from three age groups (18 to 44, 45 to 64, and > 65
25 years) without history of significant neurological or ocular problems were recruited in
26 Waterloo, Canada and Hong Kong. In experiment 1, the perceived horizontal and vertical
27 visual midline was measured using the gauge for 2 speeds and 2 repositioning methods. In
28 experiment 2, the perceived midline was measured for three different distances (25, 50 and
29 100 cm) using a target speed and repositioning method chosen from the first experiment
30 results. Since there was no significant difference between the two sites in any of the
31 measures, data were combined for analysis.

32 **Results:** For experiment 1, linear mixed models showed no effect of age, speed or
33 repositioning method and no interaction ($p > 0.05$) for the perceived midline position ($p > 0.05$).
34 In experiment 2, there was no significant effect of age or distance and no interaction effects
35 on the perceived horizontal and vertical visual midline position using the chosen speed and
36 method (2.3 degrees per second, adjustment method). Normative data (mean and 95% ranges
37 of the perceived visual midline for control participants) was tabulated. The measurements
38 were found to be repeatable. A few participants were found to have significant midline shifts.

39 **Conclusion:** This study shows that the measurement of midline is tolerant of differences of
40 target speed, testing method, test distance, and age group of the participants and that the
41 measurements using the visual midline gauge are repeatable. It is possible for even
42 individuals without a history of neurological or ocular disorders to have significant shifts in
43 their perceived visual midline.

44

45 **NON-STANDARD ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

46 CVA - Cerebrovascular accidents

47 PolyU - Hong Kong Polytechnic University

48 UW - University of Waterloo

49 VA - visual acuity

50 VF - visual field loss

51 VMS - visual midline shift

52 VM – visual midline

53

54 INTRODUCTION

55 Cerebrovascular disease is the sixth most common global cause of chronic disability.^{1,2}
56 According to the Canadian Heart and Stroke Foundation, the number of cerebrovascular
57 accidents (CVAs or stroke) in Canada has increased³ and this is also the case in the UK⁴,
58 US^{5,6}, developing countries⁷ and worldwide.^{1,2} The incidence of stroke increased by 74%
59 between 1981 to 2004 in the UK for people older than 75 years old.⁴ Between 550,000 to
60 795,000 people experience a stroke each year in the United States^{5,6}, and around 400,000
61 Canadians are living with post-stroke disabilities.³ There is also an increase in the number of
62 people surviving a stroke and therefore living with the consequences.⁸ In the United States,
63 70% of stroke survivors receive rehabilitation services through either hospital-based
64 inpatient, nursing, or home rehabilitation care outpatient facilities.⁵ Approximately 10% of
65 individuals are admitted to a long term care facility after a stroke and only a few recover
66 completely.^{3,9-11} It is estimated that all stroke survivors have some degree of visual disorder,
67 60% having minor visual impairment and 40% surviving with moderate to severe
68 impairments.^{3,9,10}

69 Within the optometric profession, there is an increased interest in rehabilitation to enhance
70 the independence, function, safety, and health of an individual and to optimise aging
71 following a neurological event. After a CVA, individuals may have a wide range of visual
72 sequelae, including impaired visual acuity, binocular vision disorders, visual field deficits,
73 and visual perceptual difficulties.^{12,13} Up to 70% of stroke patients report visual field
74 defects.¹⁰ Reduced visual acuity post-stroke (less than 0.50 logMAR [6/18] corrected) was
75 documented in 13% of individuals for both near and distance vision.¹² Ocular motility
76 deficits are present in 68.4% of individuals with stroke.¹² Perceptual changes include visual
77 neglect (unilateral spatial inattention), and visual midline shift, in addition to others.

78 Visual neglect is a neurological disorder which occurs after a brain lesion and can result in
79 loss of visual attention of one side of visual space.¹⁴⁻¹⁷ Neglect can impact different personal
80 spaces (personal space, intrapersonal-space, and external space) and is the most common
81 perceptual change post-stroke.¹²

82 Abnormal egocentric localization or visual midline shift (VMS) is a condition in which an
83 individual experiences a shift in their visual midline, defined as the point which the
84 individual perceives as being straight ahead or “in front of their nose”.^{9,10,18} The midline can
85 be shifted laterally or vertically so that a target will be perceived as straight ahead when, for
86 example, it is presented in front of the left eye rather than the true inter-ocular centre.^{18,19} The
87 prevalence of the visual midline shift following CVA has not been determined. Visual
88 midline shift may result in postural changes and subsequent issues with balance and safety,
89 the resultant condition being called visual midline shift syndrome.^{3,9,10,13,18}

90 The pathophysiology of visual midline shift is uncertain and there is discrepancy in the
91 terminology used. It has been proposed that a CVA may affect a specific area of the feed-
92 forward dorsal visual pathway within the right inferior or posterior parietal lobe of the brain
93 resulting in visual neglect.²⁰ Neglect of one hemisphere may result in a change of visual
94 midline, often referred to as an altered subjective-straight ahead.^{18,20} Padula et al.¹⁸ proposed
95 that as a result of hemianopia following a CVA, VMS develops as a result of lack of
96 information to the retinotectal pathway. This visual pathway travels from the retina through
97 the superior colliculus to the pulvinar nucleus in the midbrain instead of through the lateral
98 geniculate nucleus and onto the primary visual cortex.¹⁸ Information that travels through this
99 pathway combines with information from different systems such as the vestibular,
100 proprioceptive, and kinesthetic which are responsible for the awareness of self-space by an
101 individual.¹⁸ Therefore, lack of information provided to that pathway causes the brain to

102 attempt to re-create a balance which results in a postural lean away from the affected visual
103 space disturbing posture and balance.¹⁸

104 There has been little research regarding VMS, leaving many questions to be answered in
105 terms of the epidemiology, pathophysiology, and evidence-based treatment modalities. This
106 contrasts with the on-going and considerable research into visual neglect which may
107 accompany VMS. Prisms have been suggested as a rehabilitation intervention for patients
108 with VMS to correct posture and balance, improve quality of life following a stroke and
109 possibly decrease the incidence of falls.^{13,21,22} However, there are no clear guidelines
110 regarding duration of wear or amount of prism.^{22,23} There is also insufficient evidence
111 regarding accurate assessment of VMS, which is necessary for any study protocol or clinical
112 management.

113 At present there is no validated clinical method of measuring the visual midline. Clinically,
114 the visual midline is currently measured manually. The patient is asked to visually track a
115 “wand” (a hand-held target) moved laterally or vertically in front of the individual to find the
116 subjective visual midline point. Padula et al.¹⁸ used a 30 cm long wand, the tip of which is
117 the target, presented against a blank wall at approximately 45 cm from the patient. The
118 recommended speed of the target was 4 cm per second. Various other methods have been
119 described. For example, Houston²⁰ called the visual midline the visual eye-head egocentric
120 midline and created an apparatus to standardize measurements. Kapoor et al.¹³ used a laser
121 pointer, viewed through a mirror while Kuhn et al.²³ described a method to measure the
122 midline (called the subjective straight ahead) with a small red spot presented in a perimeter.²³

123 The purpose of this study is to standardize the parameters of a visual midline gauge using
124 participants with unimpaired vision and no history of stroke or other neurological disorders.¹⁸

125 The information gained in this study will be used to develop an accurate assessment tool for

126 use with post-stroke patients and to gather normative data against which the visual midline of
127 post-CVA patients can be compared.

128 **METHODS**

129 The Visual Midline (VM) gauge consists of a metal bar against a solid black background.
130 The bar and the background are both the same colour black. A white sphere of 13 mm size is
131 situated just behind the bar and can be moved at different speeds (1.15 or 2.3 degrees per
132 second). The target moves mechanically and can be manoeuvred using a control box and
133 push button. The bar has a millimetre scale for the examiner to measure the position of the
134 target, which is not visible to the participant (Figure 1).

135 This cross-sectional study received clearance through a University of Waterloo Research
136 Ethics Board and a Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) Institutional Review Board
137 and adhered to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. Participants were recruited from
138 among the graduate students, staff, faculty, and their families as well as the School of
139 Optometry Clinics at the University of Waterloo (UW) School of Optometry and Vision
140 Sciences (UW) and the PolyU from January 2022 to September 2022. Snowball recruiting
141 was also used.

142 A preliminary phone screening interview was conducted to ensure that potential participants
143 met the ocular and health history inclusion and exclusion criteria. Inclusion criteria were;
144 either gender, corrected visual acuity of 0.1 logMAR (6/7.5) or better in each eye.
145 Participants were excluded if they met any of the following criteria: more than one-line intra-
146 ocular difference in visual acuity (VA), strabismus, significant previous ocular or health
147 history, neurological disorders such as Parkinson's, multiple sclerosis, cerebellar dysfunction,
148 vestibular dysfunction, cerebral palsy, dizziness/vertigo, a diagnosis of dementia or cognitive
149 impairment, previous history of stroke or any medication that would affect balance. In

150 addition, the phone interview included questions on handedness (right, left or ambidextrous)
151 and history of falls.

152 Fifty-four and 39 participants were recruited from UW and PolyU respectively, in three age
153 groups; 18 to 44, 45 to 64, and above 65 years (See Table 1).

154 Participants attended for two visits. During the first visit, participant's VA was measured at
155 4m using a different Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Studies chart for each eye. A per-
156 letter scoring system was used for calculating the VA, which was recorded in logMAR
157 units.²⁴ Ocular alignment was assessed with the unilateral cover test for distance and near
158 using an accommodative target, and visual field loss (VF) was assessed using a hand-held arc
159 perimeter with a 13 mm diameter white target and recorded manually on Goldmann VF
160 recording sheets. After confirming the eligibility using these tests, the VM assessments were
161 conducted.

162 Visual midlines were assessed using the clinical method and the VM gauge. During the
163 clinical method,¹⁸ participants were asked to visually track a hand-held 13 mm diameter
164 sphere target on a 30 cm long wand that was moved laterally or vertically in front of their
165 face at a distance of 50 cm. The speed of the target was approximately 3-4 cm per second.
166 Participants were asked to indicate when the target was perceived to be in their midline. For
167 horizontal measurements they were asked to indicate when the target was in line with the tip
168 of their nose and for vertical measurements, they were asked to respond when it was level
169 with their eyes. The examiner subjectively estimated the VM from their intra-ocular midline
170 in centimeters based on the participants response. Two trials were undertaken from each
171 direction.

172 At the first visit (Experiment 1), horizontal and vertical VM was measured using the VM
173 gauge at a 50 cm distance, with 2 speeds (1.15 or 2.3 degrees per second) and two methods of
174 repositioning the target for accuracy (adjustment and repeated). Horizontal and vertical VM
175 was also measured with the clinical method (see description above). At the second visit
176 (Experiment 2), vertical and horizontal VM was measured for 25, 50 and 100 cm using the
177 speed and method of repositioning chosen based on the data analysis of all the first visit data.
178 VM with the clinical method was repeated.

179 During the measurement with the VM gauge, the participant was seated at the specified
180 distance in front of the midline gauge. A headrest table was used to stabilize head position,
181 adjusted for the target distance such that their inter-ocular midpoint was in line with the '0'
182 midpoint on the device horizontally and level with the centre of the spherical target vertically.
183 The room lights were fully on.

184 Before each measurement, the target was placed in a position remote from the anticipated
185 midline of the participant on alternating sides (left or right) and moved towards the expected
186 midline position. The '0' position on the VM gauge was not visible to the participant. The
187 participant was instructed to visually track the target with their eyes. The participant
188 responded with a push button when they perceived the target to be aligned with their visual
189 midline, which stopped the target movement. For horizontal measurements they were asked
190 to press the push button when the target was in line with the tip of their nose. For vertical
191 measurements, they were asked to respond when it was level with their eyes. Five trials were
192 undertaken from each direction. Participants were allowed to reposition the target position
193 after each trial if they did not believe it was in line with their midline. Two different methods
194 were used in visit 1 for this correction. In the adjustment method, participants were allowed
195 to ask the examiner to restart the trial and the participant was able to adjust the position of the
196 target from where it stopped initially using the push button. In the repeated method, the target

197 was moved back to the initial position (similar to when the trial started), and the trial was
198 repeated until the participant confirmed that the final target position was in alignment with
199 their perceived midline. This repeated method required 3 to 4 remeasurements for some of
200 the participants.

201 Experiment 1. The parameters for the VM gauge measurement in visit 1 (vertical/horizontal,
202 two speeds, and two methods of adjustment) were varied in a counter-balanced order between
203 participants to control for fatigue and practice effects. Two trials were performed in each
204 direction to demonstrate the task, and the results of these trials were not recorded. Following
205 this, the measurements were repeated five times from each direction resulting in a total of 80
206 trials for each participant during the first visit. Breaks were provided in between the
207 conditions to reduce fatigue and to maintain attention.

208 Experiment 2. During visit 2, VM testing was conducted with the target speed (2.3 degrees
209 per second) and the adjustment method of repositioning determined from the results of the
210 first experiment. In experiment 2, the horizontal and vertical midlines were measured at 50
211 and 100 cm distances, corresponding to intrapersonal-space and external space), but only
212 horizontal measurements were possible at 25 cm (personal space) due to mechanical
213 constraints. Once again, the parameters were varied in a counter-balanced order and five
214 measurements were taken from left, right, up and down starting points.

215 **Analysis**

216 Jamovi (version 2.3.18.0) software and Microsoft office Excel (version 16.55) were used to
217 analyze the data. Descriptive statistics were examined to ensure that data met statistical test
218 assumptions and Shapiro-Wilk test was used to assess normality. A Mann-Whitney U-test
219 was conducted to compare the VM data from UW and PolyU since the examiners were

220 different at each location. There was no significant difference ($p>0.05$) in any of the
221 measures, therefore, data from both centres were combined for all further analysis.

222 Since the data were not normally distributed, Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were used to assess
223 the effect of test direction (right vs. left and up vs. down) at all distances for both visits.

224 Linear mixed models for repeated measures were used to analyze the impact of target speed,
225 method of repositioning, and age group of participants on the VM at first visit for the
226 horizontal and vertical directions. Linear mixed models were also used to analyze the effect
227 of testing distance and age group of participants on the VM at second visit for the horizontal
228 and vertical visual midline.

229 A Wilcoxon W test was used for each participant to check the study assumption that these
230 normal observers did not have a significant midline shift, i.e., whether their perceived midline
231 was significantly different from zero. Since many t-tests were undertaken (for each distance,
232 vertical and horizontal) a Bonferroni correction was used and the usual p value of <0.05 was
233 changed to $<0.05/n = <0.00056$ for significance. One sample t-tests were also performed for
234 each distance for both horizontal and vertical measures for each age group to determine if the
235 average position of the midline was centred on zero.

236 Clinically, it is usual to perform two measurements from each side.¹⁸ So normal data for use
237 in clinical settings were calculated as the mean of the first two measurements from each
238 direction and $1.96 \times SD$ (95% range). All other analysis was based on the full data set of 5
239 readings from each direction) parameters.

240 Repeatability between visit 1 and 2 was assessed using Bland Altman plots, bias, limits of
241 agreement for repeatability, and correlation coefficients.

242 **RESULTS**

243 **Experiment 1**

244 **Effect of direction**

245 The results of Wilcoxon signed-rank tests showed significant differences between the visual
246 midlines measured with different starting directions (i.e., when the target moved from right
247 vs. left, and up vs. down). Specifically, the visual midlines were found to be shifted towards
248 the direction from where the target started (Figure 2). Hence, the 10 measurements for each
249 person (5 from each direction) were paired and analyzed as one measurement for all further
250 analysis. For example, the first measurement from the right was paired with the first
251 measurement from the left as one data point. This is similar to how the tests would be
252 conducted clinically¹⁸.

253 **Effect of method and target speed**

254 The linear mixed model included fixed effects for age group, target speed,
255 repositioning method as well as the interactions and a random intercept per participant. There
256 was no significant effect of repositioning method, target speed, or age group on the position
257 of visual midline for either horizontal or vertical directions ($p > 0.05$). There were no
258 significant interaction effects. To conduct the VM test more efficiently, the faster
259 repositioning method (i.e., adjustment) and speed (i.e., 2.3 degrees/second) were chosen for
260 the second visit.

261 **Experiment 2**

262 The linear mixed model for the second visit included fixed effect for age group and
263 distance as well as the interactions and a random intercept per subject. There was no
264 significant effect of distance or age group for either horizontal or vertical direction ($p < 0.05$).
265 There were no significant interaction effects.

266 **Visual midline shifts in individuals**

267 Wilcoxon *W* tests were conducted to assess for a significant VMS in each participant.
268 Each participant's average midline position was compared with zero, for the method of
269 adjustment, speed of 2.3 degrees/s, and distance of 50cm. This showed that some individuals
270 had significant horizontal and vertical visual midline shifts which remained significant after
271 Bonferroni correction (modified *p* value was $<0.05/91 = <0.00055$). In age group 1, there
272 were 2 and 3 participants who had horizontal and vertical VMSs, respectively. In age group
273 2, there were 4 and 7 participants who had horizontal and vertical VMSs, respectively. and in
274 age group 3, there were 12 and 9 participants who had horizontal and vertical VMSs,
275 respectively.

276 **Repeatability**

277 The first two measurements from each starting direction were used to assess the
278 repeatability. The results of the Bland Altman plots, and the Spearman correlation analysis
279 are shown in Figures 3 & 4. The Bland Altman plots, limits of agreement for repeatability,
280 and correlation coefficients all showed good repeatability.

281 The results were similar when test-retest repeatability analysis was conducted with all 10
282 measurements (5 paired measurements).

283 **Normative data**

284 Because there was no effect of age or testing distance of 50 and 100 cm, normative data were
285 calculated for all ages and 50 and 100 cm together. The data for 25cm were kept separate
286 since measurements at 25 cm were only possible for the horizontal direction. Means and the
287 95% range of normal ($1.96 \times SD$) are shown in Table 2.

288 **DISCUSSION**

289 The purpose of the study was to develop and test a new device to measure the perceived
290 visual midline position. This study investigated the effect of parameters such as target speed,
291 repositioning method, testing distance, and age of participants in individuals without a history
292 of significant neurological or ocular disorders. The study is important, as, although other
293 authors have described various methods for measuring the midline, there are currently no
294 published studies on the effect of the various parameters on the VM or normative data.

295 There are a wide variety of suggested ways to measure the perceived midline. Padula et al.¹⁸
296 described using one target size (30 cm length) and one speed (4 cm per second) at one
297 distance (45 cm), but no explanation was provided on the basis of choosing these parameters.
298 The portable method mentioned by Kapoor et al.¹³ used a laser pointer target moving slowly
299 in front of the participant while the participant looked through goggles and saw a reflected
300 mirror image in front of their eyes. A hand-held clicker was used to indicate when the image
301 of the laser pointer was aligned with their midline. Some of the participants were instructed
302 to look straight and not to follow the target and other participants received a demonstration of
303 the true subjective straight-ahead position prior to the test.¹³ The method by Kuhn et al.²³ for
304 measuring the visual midline shift involved a red spot presented in the perimeter in different
305 quadrants right, left, up and down and the participant was asked to verbally adjust the
306 position of the red spot until it aligned with their subjective straight-ahead position.
307 Houston²⁰ measured the visual eye-head egocentric midline by asking the participant to
308 respond when a 1 cm, manually moved white target (3 degrees/second) was perceived at the
309 center.²⁰

310 In the first session, we found no significant effect of target speed and repositioning method.
311 So, the fastest speed and testing method (adjustment) were chosen based on clinical
312 considerations as it would make the testing more efficient in a clinical setting. This speed was

313 slower than the one used by Padula et al.¹⁸, which was 5 degrees per second, but much faster
314 than that by Kapoor et al.¹³, which was 0.5 degrees per second.

315 The effect of starting direction was analysed from the first visit results, and there was a
316 significant effect of starting direction. Therefore, it is important in any clinical or
317 experimental setting that the final determination is based on the average of an equal number
318 of measurements from each direction, as is indeed clinical practice¹⁸.

319 In Experiment 2, the midline position was measured at three different distances to see
320 whether the perceived midline changes in personal space, intrapersonal-space, and external
321 space. This is important as one underlying pathophysiological theory is that an altered
322 midline occurs as a result of neglect²⁵, which may occur differently in these spaces. Only the
323 horizontal direction assessment was possible at the personal space level due to physical
324 constraints. Experiment 2 showed no significant differences in the position of the perceived
325 midline, based on age and distance. Therefore, the normal data is presented together for all
326 age groups, separately for 25 cm, and combined for 50 and 100 cm. Overall, VM
327 measurements were not significantly different from zero.

328 In this study, we expected that people with normal vision and no history of neurological
329 impairments would have no significant midline shift. However, there were a few participants
330 who had significant VMS when the individual measurements were compared with zero. To
331 the authors' knowledge, this finding has not been reported before, but is important as not all
332 midline shifts may be due to stroke and may be present prior to stroke.

333 Prisms are one suggested method to control and treat midline shifts by two approaches. Some
334 have recommended the prescription of prisms in glasses for full-time wear¹⁸ and others have
335 recommended prism adaptation while undergoing therapy as a management.¹⁹ In either case it
336 would be expected that there should be some relationship between the degree of midline shift

337 and the amount of prism used and so an accurate measure of the presence and degree of
338 midline shift is desired, as can be provided by this gauge.

339 This is the first research study that has attempted to standardize the assessment of visual
340 midline. The study has shown that the measurement of the perceived midline is relatively
341 insensitive to the target speed and testing distances within the range that was tested. This is
342 also the first study to provide normative data, against which post-stroke patients can be
343 compared.

344 Futures studies are indicated to use the VM gauge to determine the range and potential causes
345 of midline shifts in individuals without stroke, but who might have other ocular disorders. It
346 is also important to determine the prevalence and natural history of midline shift in the post-
347 stroke population. Secondary analysis of this data will be conducted to determine the
348 associations of VMS with other vision and non-vision variables.

349 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

350 We would like to thank Dr. Henry Chan for supporting the project at Hong Kong Polytechnic
351 University.

352 **SOURCES OF FUNDING**

353 This work was supported by the InnoHK initiative and the Hong Kong Special
354 Administrative Region Government; Network for Aging Research at the University of
355 Waterloo Emerging Scholar Mentorship Grant; and the Canadian Optometric Education Trust
356 Fund.

357 **DISCLOSURES**

358 None

359 REFERENCES

- 360 1. Ezejimofor MC, Chen YF, Kandala NB, et al. Stroke survivors in low-and middle-
361 income countries: a meta-analysis of prevalence and secular trends. *J Neurol Sci.*
362 2016;364:68-76.
- 363 2. Akbarkhodjaeva ZA, Tursunov J. Prevalence of stroke in the world. *Journal of Stroke*
364 *and Cerebrovascular Diseases.* 2017;26(4):913-914.
- 365 3. Heart and Stroke Foundation of Canada. Different Strokes Recovery triumphs and
366 challenges at any age. 2017 Stroke Report. . Accessed November 8, 2022.
367 [https://www.heartandstroke.ca/-/media/pdf-files/canada/stroke-](https://www.heartandstroke.ca/-/media/pdf-files/canada/stroke-report/strokereport2017en.aspx?la=en&hash=67F86E4C3338D5A7FE7862EA5D0DD57CA8539847)
368 [report/strokereport2017en.aspx?la=en&hash=67F86E4C3338D5A7FE7862EA5D0DD](https://www.heartandstroke.ca/-/media/pdf-files/canada/stroke-report/strokereport2017en.aspx?la=en&hash=67F86E4C3338D5A7FE7862EA5D0DD57CA8539847)
369 [57CA8539847](https://www.heartandstroke.ca/-/media/pdf-files/canada/stroke-report/strokereport2017en.aspx?la=en&hash=67F86E4C3338D5A7FE7862EA5D0DD57CA8539847)
- 370 4. Rothwell PM, Coull AJ, Giles MF, et al. Change in stroke incidence, mortality, case-
371 fatality, severity, and risk factors in Oxfordshire, UK from 1981 to 2004 (Oxford
372 Vascular Study). *The Lancet.* 2004;363(9425):1925-1933.
- 373 5. Gresham GE, Stason WB, Duncan PW. *Post-Stroke Rehabilitation.* Vol 95. Diane
374 Publishing; 2004.
- 375 6. Fang MC, Perrailon MC, Ghosh K, Cutler DM, Rosen AB. Trends in stroke rates,
376 risk, and outcomes in the United States, 1988 to 2008. *Am J Med.* 2014;127(7):608-
377 615.
- 378 7. Benamer HTS, Grosset D. Stroke in Arab countries: a systematic literature review. *J*
379 *Neurol Sci.* 2009;284(1-2):18-23.
- 380 8. Johnson CO, Nguyen M, Roth GA, et al. Global, regional, and national burden of
381 stroke, 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study
382 2016. *Lancet Neurol.* 2019;18(5):439-458.
- 383 9. Goldstein LB, Adams R, Becker K, et al. Primary prevention of ischemic stroke: a
384 statement for healthcare professionals from the Stroke Council of the American Heart
385 Association. *Circulation.* 2001;103(1):163-182.
- 386 10. Miller EL, Murray L, Richards L, et al. Comprehensive overview of nursing and
387 interdisciplinary rehabilitation care of the stroke patient: a scientific statement from the
388 American Heart Association. *Stroke.* 2010;41(10):2402-2448.
- 389 11. Foulkes MA, Wolf PA, Price TR, Mohr JP, Hier DB. The Stroke Data Bank: design,
390 methods, and baseline characteristics. *Stroke.* 1988;19(5):547-554.
- 391 12. Rowe F, Brand D, Jackson CA, et al. Visual impairment following stroke: do stroke
392 patients require vision assessment? *Age Ageing.* 2009;38(2):188-193.
- 393 13. Kapoor N, Ciuffreda KJ, Harris G, et al. A new portable clinical device for measuring
394 egocentric localization. *J Behav Optom.* 2001;12(5):115-119.
- 395 14. Suchoff IB, Ciuffreda KJ. A primer for the optometric management of unilateral
396 spatial inattention. *Optometry-Journal of the American Optometric Association.*
397 2004;75(5):305-318.
- 398 15. Chokron S, Imbert M. Variations of the egocentric reference among normal subjects
399 and a patient with unilateral neglect. *Neuropsychologia.* 1995;33(6):703-711.
- 400 16. Keane S, Turner C, Sherrington C, Beard JR. Use of fresnel prism glasses to treat
401 stroke patients with hemispatial neglect. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2006;87(12):1668-
402 1672.
- 403 17. Heilman KM, Bowers D, Watson RT. Performance on hemispatial pointing task by
404 patients with neglect syndrome. *Neurology.* 1983;33(5):661.

- 405 18. Padula W V, Nelson CA, Padula W V, Benabib R, Yilmaz T, Krevisky S. Modifying
406 postural adaptation following a CVA through prismatic shift of visuo-spatial
407 egocenter. *Brain Inj.* 2009;23(6):566-576.
- 408 19. Rossetti Y, Rode G, Pisella L, et al. Prism adaptation to a rightward optical deviation
409 rehabilitates left hemispatial neglect. *Nature.* 1998;395(6698):166-169.
- 410 20. Houston KE. Measuring visual midline shift syndrome & disorders of spatial
411 localization: a literature review & report of a new clinical protocol. *Journal of*
412 *Behavioral Optometry.* 2010;21(4).
- 413 21. Facchin A, Beschin N, Daini R. Not prism prescription, but prism adaptation
414 rehabilitates spatial neglect; a reply to Bansal, Han and Ciuffreda. *Brain Inj.*
415 2015;29(4):533-534.
- 416 22. Bansal S, Han E, Ciuffreda KJ. Use of yoked prisms in patients with acquired brain
417 injury: A retrospective analysis. *Brain Inj.* 2014;28(11):1441-1446.
- 418 23. Kuhn C, Heywood CA, Kerkhoff G. Oblique spatial shifts of subjective visual straight
419 ahead orientation in quadrant visual field defects. *Neuropsychologia.*
420 2010;48(11):3205-3210.
- 421 24. Ferris FL, Kassoff A, Bresnick GH, Bailey I. New visual acuity charts for clinical
422 research. *Am J Ophthalmol.* 1982;94(1):91-96.
- 423 25. neuroscience DPR neurology and, 2006 undefined. Postural disorders and spatial
424 neglect in stroke patients: a strong association. *content.iospress.com.* Accessed March
425 14, 2023. [https://content.iospress.com/articles/restorative-neurology-and-](https://content.iospress.com/articles/restorative-neurology-and-neuroscience/rnn00363)
426 [neuroscience/rnn00363](https://content.iospress.com/articles/restorative-neurology-and-neuroscience/rnn00363)
427

428

429 **TABLES**

430 **Table 1:** Demographic data of all participants.

Age group	UW	PolyU
18 to 44 years	13 women & 7 men 29.4±6.7 years (18 to 44)	9 women & 5 men 25.3±6.5 years (19 to 42)
45 to 64 years	8 women & 9 men 54.9±6.8 years (45 to 64)	5 women & 7 men 59.7±5.3 years (47 to 64)
65 years and above	9 women & 8 men 72.0±5.3 years (65 to 84)	9 women & 4 men 69.5±3.5 years (65 to 77)

431

432 **Table 2:** Normative data for all age groups for the horizontal and vertical midline positions in
433 millimeters. Positive results indicate right/downward shifts.

	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	Minimum (mm)	Maximum (mm)	Range (1.96 X SD)	
Horizontal (25 cm)	2.53	6.2	-15.7	21.4	-9.622	14.682
Horizontal (50&100 cm)	1.4	7.94	-31.3	23.9	-14.1624	16.9624
Vertical (50&100 cm)	1.15	10.5	-21.6	50.6	-19.43	21.73


434

435

436 **FIGURES WITH FIGURE LEGENDS:**

437 **Figure 1:** Post stroke visual midline gauge, A & B: Table with chin rest, and buzzer. C:


438 Experimenter's view from the back showing the numbered scale and target.



439

440


441 **Figure 2.** The effect of direction. A. The mean and standard deviation of the visual midline
442 for the first visit, horizontal direction (right vs. left) for 2 different speeds and 2 repositioning
443 methods. For each participant, the average of the 10 measures from the right and left were
444 calculated. Positive results indicate rightward shifts. B. The mean and standard deviation of
445 the visual midline shift for the first visit, vertical direction (up vs. down) for 2 different
446 speeds and 2 repositioning methods. For each participant, the average of the 10 measures
447 from up and down are plotted. Positive results indicate downward shifts. “adj” = adjustment
448 method, “rep” = repeated method. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$



449

450


451 **Figure 3. A:** Bland Altman plots for test-retest repeatability of the difference between the
452 first and second visit for the adjustment method, horizontal direction, 50 cm. The solid line
453 indicates the average of the differences between the two visits. The dotted lines represent the
454 upper and lower limits of agreement. **B:** Scattergrams of test and retest for the adjustment
455 method, horizontal direction, 50cm.



456

457

458 **Figure 4. A:** The result of the Bland Altman plots for test-retest repeatability of the
459 difference between the first and second visit for the adjustment method, vertical direction,
460 50cm. The solid line indicates the average of the differences between the two visits. The
461 dotted lines represent the upper and lower limits of agreement. **B:** Scattergrams of test and
462 retest for the adjustment method, vertical direction, 50cm.



463