medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251210; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license . Maximum likelihood perimetric progression analysis

<u>TITLE</u>

Maximum likelihood perimetric progression analysis: Using raw (trial-by-trial) response data to estimate progression more robustly

RUNNING TITLE

Maximum likelihood perimetric progression analysis

LIST OF AUTHORS

Pete R. Jones¹ ¹Division of Optometry and Visual Sciences, School of Health Science, City, University of London, London, England, EC1V OHB.

CORRESPONDENCE

^{*}Pete R Jones, Division of Optometry and Visual Sciences, School of Health Sciences, City, University of London, Northampton Square EC1V 0HB, London, UK; <u>peter.jones@city.ac.uk</u>

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

1 item of supplemental code: MLprogressionAnalysis_SuplCode.m

MEETING PRESENTATION(S)

(none)

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

(none)

<u>CONFLICTS OF INTEREST</u> No conflicting relationship exists for any author.

DISCLOSURES

P.R. Jones, None

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251210; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license . Maximum likelihood perimetric progression analysis

ABSTRACT

1 **Purpose**: To describe and demonstrate a more efficient (Maximum Likelihood) method for

2 quantifying visual field progression.

3 **Design**: Monte Carlo simulation.

4 *Methods*: Trial-by-trial response data were simulated using a stochastic psychometric model (a

⁵ "simulated observer"). Simulated Differential Light Sensitivity (DLS) decreased between tests to

6 mimic long-term visual field progression. Progression slopes were fitted, either by fitting a

7 regression slope to independent DLS estimates from each test (conventional method), or by fitting

⁸ all the raw data combined in a single model (proposed maximum likelihood method).

9 **Results**: The proposed ML method seldom performed worse than a conventional, regression-based

¹⁰ approach, and often performed better. For an idealized observer with a lapse (false negative) rate of

0 and a guess (false positive) rate of 0, both methods were equally precise. However, as lapse rate

increased, the ML method exhibited less random measurement error. For small numbers of trials

13 this increase in precision translated to a negative progression slope being detected with 95%

14 confidence at least one year/assessment sooner. The only time the ML method was observed to

perform worse was when very few trials (N = 4) were combined with very high lapse rates ($\lambda = 0.3$):

an unlikely but not inconceivable scenario.

Conclusions: Combining raw, trial-by-trial response data in a single ML model can provide a more
 robust estimate of visual field progression than conventional methods (e.g., linear regression), at no
 additional cost to the patient or clinician (i.e., no additional trials).

20 **KEY WORDS:** Visual Fields; Perimetry; Progression; Glaucoma; Psychophysics; Maximum Likelihood

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251210; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license . Maximum likelihood perimetric progression analysis Page 3 of 6

Maximum likelihood perimetric progression analysis: Using raw (trial-by-trial) response data to estimate progression more robustly

- The ability to accurately monitor perimetric rate of change ('progression') is key for the effective management of glaucoma. Typically, rate of progression (e.g., change in Differential Light Sensitivity, 24 DLS, at a specific retinal location, or in some overall summary metric, such as Mean Deviation, MD) is estimated by fitting a curve through a series of point-estimates (scalar 'best guess' values), with 26 each value representing a single assessment/hospital-visit. This approach is suboptimal, however, 27 since there is additional information contained in the raw, trial-by-trial, test data; information that is 28 effectively discarded when a point-estimate is generated at the end of each assessment. 29 In principle, this additional information could also be factored in when estimating rate of 30 progression. Thus, rather than using the raw data from each test to compute independent point-31 estimates, $\mathbb{D}DLS_0$, DLS_1 , ..., $DLS_n\mathbb{Z}$, and then fitting a line through this time-series (a 'two step' 32 solution, illustrated in Fig 1A), all of the raw data from every test could instead be used together to 33 fit a single, maximum likelihood (ML) model, consisting of a single psychometric function whose 34 threshold is determined by two parameters: an initial value, DLS_0 , and a rate of progression value, 35 DLS_{Λ} (a 'one step' solution, illustrated in Fig 1B). MATLAB code instantiating both of these methods is
- 37 given as *Supplemental Code*, and this same code was used to generate the simulations reported

38 below.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251210; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license . Maximum likelihood perimetric progression analysis Page 4 of 6





39

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251210; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license . Maximum likelihood perimetric progression analysis Page 5 of 6

To assess whether this 'one step' (ML) solution has the potential to meaningfully reduce measurement error, we ran Monte Carlo simulations using a simulated observer, whose probability of responding correctly to a stimulus of magnitude dB was determined, in the typical fashion, by a psychometric function of the form:

$$P(Seen) = \gamma + (1 - \gamma - \lambda) \cdot (1 - \Phi[x_{dB}; (DLS_0 + DLS_\Delta), \beta])$$
 (Eq. 1)

⁵⁶ where Φ is a Gaussian cumulative density function (CDF); *DLS*₀ is the initial threshold sensitivity at ⁵⁷ first assessment, fixed at 30 dB; DLS_{Δ} is the rate of progression, fixed at -1 dB/year (i.e., DLS = 25 dB ⁵⁸ after 5 years; Note that the sum of *DLS*₀ and *DLS*_{Δ} together constituted the mean/location ⁵⁹ parameter of the CDF); γ is the guess rate (0 to 1), fixed at 0; β is the psychometric slope parameter ⁶⁰ (the standard deviation of the CDF), fixed at 2 dB (Note, not be confused with the rate of ⁶¹ progression slope parameter: *DLS*_{Δ}); and λ is the lapse rate (0 to 1), which was systematically ⁶² manipulated across simulations as follows: \square 0, 0.05, ..., 0.3 \square .

Each simulated observer was used to generate 23, 4, ..., or 122 'years' of DLS estimates (1

assessment per year), with each assessment consisting of a single DLS estimate (a '1 point grid')

made using either 28, 16, 32, or 642 trials. This resulted in 280 unique conditions (7 Lapse Rates X

10 N Years/Assessments X 4 N Trials Per Assessment). Each of these 280 conditions was

independently simulated 10,000 times, yielding 2.8M simulated 'patients' in total (each of whom

performed 3—12 DLS assessments). Within each assessment, stimulus selection was determined

⁶⁹ by a conventional QUEST+ routine¹ (in this instance equivalent to ZEST²), using a bimodal prior taken

⁷⁰ from Vingrys & Pianta (1999)³. The final threshold estimate (i.e., *DLS*, in *dB*) was computed as the

mean of the probability mass function. See *Supplemental Code* for full technical details.

For each simulated patient, rate of progression was then computed, post hoc, in two ways: First,

⁷³ using a conventional two-step linear regression procedure (*Fig 1A*). Second, by refitting all of the

raw, trial-by-trial data from every assessment using the proposed ML procedure (*Fig 1B*). This ML

procedure differed from the conventional QUEST+/ZEST procedure used within each individual

assessment only inasmuch as the stimulus domain had two dimensions (Stimulus Intensity in dB,

and *N Years*) rather than one (*Stimulus Intensity*) and the model free-parameters domain had two

dimensions (*DLS*₀ and *DLS*_{Δ}) rather than one (*DLS*).

For each set of 10,000 rate of progression estimates, the standard deviation, $\sigma_{DLS\Delta}$, was computed as an index of random measurement error. Ideally, $\sigma_{DLS\Delta}$ would be 0 (same estimated rate of progression on every simulation), with higher values indicating lower precision. medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251210; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license . Maximum likelihood perimetric progression analysis Page 6 of 6

The results are shown in Figure 1C, D. In brief, the proposed ML method seldom performed worse 82 than a conventional, regression-based approach, and often performed better. For an idealized 83 observer with a lapse (false negative) rate of 0 and a guess (false positive) rate of 0, both methods 84 were equally precise (Fig 1C, leftmost data point in each panel). However, as lapse rate increased, 85 the ML method exhibited less random measurement error. For small numbers of trials this increase 86 in precision translated to a negative progression slope being detected with 95% confidence at least 87 one year/assessment sooner (Fig 1D). Unsurprisingly, this difference between the two methods was 88 attenuated when large, clinically unrealistic, numbers of trials were used to estimate thresholds, 89 since in such circumstances measurement error for both methods converged towards zero (Fig 90 **1C,D**, *bottommost panels*). Though some advantage for the ML method was still observed for very 91 high lapse rates. The only time the ML method was observed to perform more poorly than the 92 conventional method was when very few trials (N = 4) were combined with very high lapse rates (λ 93 = 0.3): an unlikely but not inconceivable scenario. 94 Other than the data shown in Figure 1, no other conditions (i.e., observer parameters or 95 psychometric algorithm settings) were simulated: The goal was not to systematically assess the 96 exact level of benefit under all possible scenarios, but to assess whether any meaningful benefit is 97 possible under a single, broadly realistic scenario. Interested readers can, however, modify the 98

99 **Supplemental Code** to simulate other scenarios.

These simulations, though not comprehensive, illustrate that combining raw, trial-by-trial response data in a single ML model can provide a more robust estimate of visual field progression than a conventional 'two-step' (e.g., linear regression) approach, at no additional cost to the patient or clinician (i.e., without requiring any additional stimulus presentations, or varying current test durations or methods in any way).

105 **REFERENCES**

- 1061.Watson, A. B. QUEST+: A general multidimensional Bayesian adaptive psychometric107methodWatson. J. Vis. 2017;17:10
- Turpin, A., McKendrick, A. M., Johnson, C. A. & Vingrys, A. J. Properties of perimetric
 threshold estimates from full threshold, ZEST, and SITA-like strategies, as determined by
 computer simulation. *Invest. Ophthalmol. Vis. Sci.* 2003;44:4787–4795
- 1113.Vingrys, A. J. & Pianta, M. J. A new look at threshold estimation algorithms for automated112static perimetry. Optom. Vis. Sci. 1999;76:588–595