



**HAL**  
open science

# Correlation between Scanning Laser Polarimetry with and without Enhanced Corneal Compensation and High Definition Optical Coherence Tomography in Normal and Glaucomatous Eyes

Javier Benitez-Del-Castillo, Antonio Martinez, Teresa Regi

► **To cite this version:**

Javier Benitez-Del-Castillo, Antonio Martinez, Teresa Regi. Correlation between Scanning Laser Polarimetry with and without Enhanced Corneal Compensation and High Definition Optical Coherence Tomography in Normal and Glaucomatous Eyes. *International Journal of Clinical Practice*, 2011, 65 (7), pp.807. 10.1111/j.1742-1241.2011.02649.x . hal-00637820

**HAL Id: hal-00637820**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00637820>**

Submitted on 3 Nov 2011

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



**Correlation between Scanning Laser Polarimetry with and without Enhanced Corneal Compensation and High Definition Optical Coherence Tomography in Normal and Glaucomatous Eyes**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Clinical Practice</i>
Manuscript ID:	IJCP-07-10-0385.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Original Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	10-Jan-2011
Complete List of Authors:	Benitez-del-Castillo, Javier; Hospital General del S.A.S. de Jerez, Glaucoma Martinez, Antonio; Science research & Sports, Clinical research department Regi, Teresa; Hospital General del S.A.S. de Jerez, Glaucoma
Specialty area:	

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 Correlation between Scanning Laser Polarimetry with and without  
4  
5  
6 Enhanced Corneal Compensation and High Definition Optical  
7  
8  
9 Coherence Tomography in Normal and Glaucomatous Eyes  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 Javier Benítez-del-Castillo (MD, PhD)<sup>1</sup>, Antonio Martinez (MD)<sup>2</sup>, Teresa Regi  
17  
18 (MD)<sup>1</sup>  
19  
20

21 1.- Unidad de Glaucoma, Hospital General del S.A.S. de Jerez  
22

23 2.- Clinical research department, Science research & Sports.  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Correspondance: Javier Benítez-del-Castillo  
29

30 Address: Plaza Monti, 7 Bajo  
31

32 11403 Jerez (Cadiz)  
33  
34

35 Spain  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 Running title: SLP and OCT in glaucoma  
43

44 Keywords: Glaucoma, retinal nerve fiber layer, SLP-VCC, SLP- ECC, High  
45  
46 Definition OCT.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

**Purpose:** To assess the relationship between high-definition optical coherence tomography (HD-OCT) and scanning laser polarimetry (SLP) with variable (VCC) and enhance (ECC) corneal compensation in measuring peripapillary retinal nerve fiber layer (RNFL) thickness in healthy eyes and those with early-to-moderate glaucomatous VF loss.

**Methods:** Healthy volunteers and patients with glaucoma who met the eligibility criteria were enrolled in this prospective, cross-sectional, and observational study. Subjects underwent complete ophthalmologic examination, automated perimetry, SLP-ECC, SLP-VCC, and HD-OCT. SLP parameters were recalculated in 90 degrees segments (quadrants) in the calculation circle to be compared. Pearson correlation coefficients and Lin's concordance correlation coefficients were calculated. P-values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant. **Results:** Fifty-five normal volunteers (mean age 59.1 years) and 33 patients with glaucoma (mean age 63.8 years) were enrolled. In the glaucoma group, 18 patients (54.5 %) had MD  $\geq$  -6.0 decibels (early glaucoma) and 15 patients (45.4%) had MD between -6.01 and -12.0 decibels (moderate glaucoma). The best correlation between HD-OCT and SLP was found in the superior quadrant thickness,  $r=0.74$  (0.62 to 0.82) ( $p< 0.0001$ ) with SLP-VCC and in the average thickness,  $r= 0.80$  (0.71 to 0.86) ( $p< 0.0001$ ) and the superior quadrant thickness  $r= 0.80$  (0.71 to 0.87) ( $p< 0.0001$ ) with SLP-ECC. Concordance correlation coefficients obtained for every parameter in our study between HD-OCT and SLP-VCC and between HD-OCT and SLP-ECC were poor. **Conclusions:** Our results suggest that HD-OCT parameters of

1  
2  
3 RNFL thickness are significantly higher than SLP-VCC and SLP-ECC  
4  
5 parameters, and therefore those thickness values are not interchangeable. HD-  
6  
7 OCT and SLP methods are well correlated but concordance is poor. The  
8  
9 difference plots show a lack of agreement that changes as a proportion of the  
10  
11 mean.  
12  
13

### 14 15 What`s known?

16  
17  
18 Glaucoma is a progressive optic neuropathy that selectively affects retinal  
19  
20 ganglion cells. Among most reliable imaging methods that have been developed  
21  
22 to provide real-time, quantitative information of retinal nerve fiber layer  
23  
24 thickness are scanning laser polarimetry (SLP) and optical coherence  
25  
26 tomography (OCT).  
27  
28

29  
30 Optical coherence tomography (OCT), is a high-resolution, cross-sectional  
31  
32 imaging technique that allows in vivo measurements of the RNFL.  
33  
34

### 35 36 37 What`s new?

38  
39  
40 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to provide a comparison  
41  
42 using the same population of the relationship between these three imaging  
43  
44 modalities designed to analyze peripapillary RNFL thickness in glaucoma: the  
45  
46 scanning laser polarimetry with VCC and ECC mode, and the high definition  
47  
48 optical coherence tomography, which is a spectral-domain OCT.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Introduction

Glaucoma is a progressive optic neuropathy that selectively affects retinal ganglion cells (RCG). Optic nerve head (ONH) and retinal nerve fiber layer (RNFL) damage often precedes the development of visual field (VF) loss in glaucoma [1-3].

Among the most reliable imaging methods that have been developed to provide real-time, quantitative information of RNFL thickness, are scanning laser polarimetry (SLP) [4] and optical coherence tomography (OCT) [5, 6].

SLP is a non-invasive imaging technique that uses scanning laser technology coupled with an integrated polarization modulator/detector to provide a retardation map of the peripapillary RNFL based on its birefringent properties [4]. The polarization state of light is modulated by retardation in one axis (slow axis) by its passage through the nerve fibers of the retina. This retardation is in proportion to the thickness of the RNFL [7].

The polarimeter has an integrated variable corneal compensator (VCC) that determines and neutralizes the eye-specific corneal polarization axis and magnitude by using the concept of the macula as an intraocular polarimeter [8-12]. It has been reported that in a subset of eyes, SLP-VCC scans with atypical birefringence patterns (ABPs), where the brightest areas of the retardation maps are not consistent with the histologically thickest portions of the peripapillary RNFL along the superior and inferior arcuate bundles [13]. An enhanced compensator module (enhanced corneal compensation, ECC) has recently been launched and is currently used to reduce artifacts associated with ABP by removing the noise and enhancing the signal [13-15].

OCT is another non-invasive optical signal acquisition and processing method based on an interferometric technique, which allows for extreme high-quality and micrometer-resolution on three-dimensional images, as well as providing measurements of the RNFL. Traditional OCT is time domain OCT (TD-OCT). The mechanism of scanning largely limits the acquisition speed and makes real-time imaging impossible. In recent years a new model OCT based on Fourier domain interferometry has emerged. It's called spectral OCT (SD-OCT). SD-OCT can reach very high acquisition speed and increased depth resolution compared to previous technology [16]. This latest OCT technology currently used, named High Definition OCT (HD-OCT) by Zeiss (Carl-Zeiss Meditec, Inc., Dublin, CA), allows in-vivo quantification of RNFL thickness and the optic disc. The purpose of this study is to assess the concordance between the retinal nerve fiber layer thickness parameters using SLP with both VCC and ECC mode, and HD-OCT in normal subjects, and in patients with early to moderate open-angle glaucoma.

## Methods

### Subjects and measurement protocol

Healthy volunteers and patients with glaucoma who met the eligibility criteria according to the same study observer (JB-C) were consecutively enrolled in this prospective, cross-sectional, and observational study run at Glaucoma Unit from Hospital General del S.A.S. de Jerez. All participants signed an informed

1  
2  
3 written consent form approved by the ethics committee of Hospital General del  
4  
5 S.A.S. de Jerez, which was in agreement with the provisions of the Declaration  
6  
7 of Helsinki for biomedical research.  
8

9  
10 All subjects underwent a complete ophthalmic examination, including slit lamp  
11  
12 biomicroscopy, dilated stereoscopic examination, gonioscopy, Goldmann  
13  
14 applanation tonometry, ultrasound pachymetry, and photography of the optic  
15  
16 disc. Two reliable visual field (VF) examinations were obtained with standard  
17  
18 automated perimetry (SAP; Humphrey Field Analyzer; Carl-Zeiss Meditec, Inc.,  
19  
20 Dublin, CA), by using the SITA (Swedish Interactive Threshold Algorithm)  
21  
22 standard strategy program 24-2.  
23  
24

25  
26 All participants were required to meet the following inclusion criteria: refractive  
27  
28 error between -7.00 and +3.00 D (spherical equivalent), best corrected visual  
29  
30 acuity equal or better than 20/40, age range between 40 and 79 years, reliable  
31  
32 SAP (< 33% rate of fixation losses, false positives, and false negatives), and no  
33  
34 prior history of intraocular surgery except for uncomplicated cataract extraction.  
35  
36 Exclusion criteria were any ocular disease other than glaucoma or cataract,  
37  
38 neurological disorders or medications that can cause visual field defects, visual  
39  
40 acuity < 20/40, peripapillary atrophy extending to 1.7 mm from the disc's centre,  
41  
42 retinal disease, or unreliable SAP.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 The control group consisted of healthy individuals who were recruited  
49  
50 consecutively among volunteers such as office employees, friends or family  
51  
52 members of patients with glaucoma. Normal subjects had no history of ocular  
53  
54 disease except cataract, their intraocular pressure (IOP) was less than or equal  
55  
56 to 21 mm Hg by Goldmann applanation tonometry, and had a normal optic disc  
57  
58 appearance based on both clinical stereoscopic examination and review of  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 stereo disc photography. All normal eyes had two SAP examinations with  
4  
5 normal findings, defined as glaucoma hemifield test results within normal limits,  
6  
7 and mean and pattern standard deviation (SD) of  $P > 5\%$ . A normal optic disc  
8  
9 was defined as having a cup/disc area ratio less than or equal to 0.4, a  
10  
11 neuroretinal rim with no glaucomatous changes such as localized rim loss or  
12  
13 slimming of the rim or peripapillary hemorrhages seen ophthalmoscopically.  
14  
15 Glaucomatous optic neuropathy was defined as either cup-to-disc asymmetry  
16  
17 between fellow eyes of greater than 0.2, rim thinning, notching, excavation,  
18  
19 and/or RNFL defect. Patients with glaucoma had glaucomatous optic nerve  
20  
21 damage and corresponding abnormal SAP defined as an abnormal glaucoma  
22  
23 hemifield test results and pattern SD outside 95% of normal limits. Patients with  
24  
25 SAP abnormalities had at least one confirmatory visual field examination.  
26  
27 Early and moderate glaucoma were defined according to the criteria described  
28  
29 by Hodapp et al. [17]. Early glaucoma requires the mean deviation (MD) to be  
30  
31 less than  $-6$  dB, with  $< 18$  points depressed below  $p < 0.05$ ,  $< 10$  points  
32  
33 depressed below  $p < 0.001$ , and no point in the central  $5^\circ$  with a sensitivity of  $<$   
34  
35  $15$  dB. Moderate glaucoma requires a mean deviation between  $-6.01$  and  $-12$   
36  
37 dB, on the pattern deviation plot, fewer than 50% (37) of the points are  
38  
39 depressed below the 5% level and fewer than 20 points are depressed below  
40  
41 the 1% level; no points in the central  $5^\circ$  has a sensitivity of 0 dB, and only one  
42  
43 hemifield may have a point with sensitivity of  $< 15$  dB within  $5^\circ$  of fixation.  
44  
45 SLP imaging (GDx SLP, software version 5.5.0; Carl Zeiss Meditec, Inc. Dublin,  
46  
47 CA) was performed through undilated pupils. Three consecutive scans were  
48  
49 obtained with VCC and ECC on the same day by the same examiner. An  
50  
51 average of the three measurements was used for the analysis. A primary scan  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 was obtained before each measurement, to compensate for the corneal  
4  
5 birefringence. Images that were obtained during eye movement were excluded,  
6  
7 as well as unfocused, poorly centred images or images with a quality scan  
8  
9 score of less than 8. A fixed concentric measurement band centred on the optic  
10  
11 disc with a 3.2-mm outer and a 2.4-mm inner diameter was used to generate  
12  
13 the peripapillary retardation measurements. SLP parameters used as outcome  
14  
15 measures for this investigation included: TSNIT (temporal, superior, nasal,  
16  
17 inferior, temporal) average, superior average, inferior average, nasal average,  
18  
19 temporal average, and the typical scan score (TSS). The 64 segments in the  
20  
21 calculation circle of RNFL thickness values were extracted by means of an  
22  
23 electronic data export and recalculated in 90 degrees segments (quadrants) in  
24  
25 order to be compared.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 HD-OCT imaging (Cirrus OCT, software ver. 3.0; Carl Zeiss Meditec, Inc.  
32  
33 Dublin, CA) was performed through undilated pupils using the Optic Disk cube  
34  
35 scan 2000x200 pixels protocol on the same day by the same examiner. The  
36  
37 average of two measurements was used for the analysis. Images that were  
38  
39 obtained during eye movement or were unfocused, were poorly centred, or with  
40  
41 signal strength of less than 7 were excluded. OCT parameters in the TSNIT  
42  
43 calculation circle (3.46 mm diameter) used as outcome measures for this  
44  
45 investigation included average TSNIT RNFL thickness and superior, inferior,  
46  
47 temporal and nasal quadrants RNFL thicknesses.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

## 55 Statistical analysis

56  
57 Sample size calculation was based on the assumption that a correlation  
58  
59 coefficient of 0.4 is statistically significant. Approximately 45 patients were  
60

1  
2  
3 required given an  $\alpha$  of 0.05 and a  $1 - \beta$  of 0.8 was chosen to decrease the risk  
4  
5 of a false negative result. A minimum recruitment of 50 patients in each group  
6  
7 was planned to allow for patient exclusions.  
8  
9

10  
11 Only one eye per subject was enrolled. If both eyes met eligibility criteria, one  
12  
13 eye was selected randomly.  
14

15  
16 Data were tested for normal distribution using a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. If  
17  
18 data were normally distributed, a two-tailed unpaired Student's t test or Chi-  
19  
20 square test were used to compared clinical and demographic characteristics  
21  
22 between glaucoma and healthy subjects.  
23  
24

25  
26 We compared the retinal nerve fiber layer thickness parameters of the HD-OCT  
27  
28 with those of the SLP-VCC and SLP-ECC and analyzed the difference. We also  
29  
30 compared the difference between SLP-VCC and SLP-ECC.  
31

32  
33 To analyze the correlation between HD-OCT and SLP, with VCC and ECC  
34  
35 mode, Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated for every parameter.  
36

37  
38 To evaluate agreement between HD-OCT and SLP, with VCC and ECC mode,  
39  
40 we calculated Lin's concordance correlation coefficient (CCC) for every  
41  
42 parameters [18, 19] then Bland & Altman difference plots were designed and  
43  
44 analyzed [20].  
45

46  
47 Statistical analysis was performed using MedCalc11.1.0 (MedCalc software,  
48  
49 Mariakerke, Belgium and Stata 9.0 (StataCorp LP, College Station, TX, USA).  
50

51  
52 A probability value of  $p < 0.05$  was considered indicative of statistical  
53  
54 significance.  
55

## 56 57 58 Results 59 60

1  
2  
3 One hundred and seventeen eyes from 64 normal volunteers and 53 patients  
4 with glaucoma were enrolled.  
5

6  
7  
8 9 subjects were not included in the control group: 4 for quality SLP-VCC scan <  
9 8; 3 for OCT signal strength < 7, and two for unreliable visual field.  
10

11  
12  
13 Twenty glaucoma patients were not included: 9 for quality SLP-VCC scan < 8; 6  
14 for OCT signal strength < 7, and five for unreliable visual field.  
15

16  
17  
18 After exclusions, overall study population (88 eyes of 88 patients) included 55  
19 eyes of 55 patients in the control group and 33 eyes of 33 patients in the  
20 glaucoma group. The analyses had a statistical power of the 68.7% to detect a  
21 correlation coefficient statistically significant between the two groups, at a  
22 significance level of 0.05. Table I demonstrates the clinical characteristics of the  
23 study population.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 In the glaucoma group, 18 patients (54.5%) had MD  $\geq$  -6.0 decibels (early  
33 glaucoma) and 15 patients (45.4%) had MD between -6.01 and -12.0 decibels  
34 (moderate glaucoma).  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 Table 2 shows important and statistically significant differences (all with  
40  $p < 0.002$ ) that were found between the HD-OCT and the SLP-VCC and ECC  
41 parameters, in total average and in each quadrant RNFL thickness. These  
42 differences were found in the overall population of the study and also in the  
43 normal and the glaucoma group.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 Additionally, statistically significant differences were found between SLP-VCC  
52 and ECC in the overall population of the study and in both the normal and the  
53 glaucoma group, in: average thickness ( $p = 0.0034$  in overall population,  
54  $p = 0.0200$  in control group and  $p = 0.0275$  in glaucoma group), temporal quadrant  
55 thickness ( $p < 0.0001$  in overall population, in control and in glaucoma group),  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and nasal quadrant thickness ( $p=0.0003$  in overall population,  $p=0.0022$  in  
4 control group and  $p=0.0224$  in glaucoma group). There were no statistically  
5 significant differences between SLP-VCC and ECC in superior quadrant  
6 thickness ( $p=0.9385$  in overall population,  $p=0.5960$  in control group and  
7  $p=0.8289$  in glaucoma group) nor in inferior quadrant thickness ( $p=0.1716$  in  
8 overall population,  $p=0.1483$  in control group and  $p=0.2521$  in glaucoma group)  
9 (Table 2).

10  
11 Our study showed significant correlations ( $r$ ) between HD-OCT and SLP-VCC  
12 or ECC, for most RNFL parameters (Table 3) except for the temporal RNFL  
13 quadrant between HD-OCT and SLP-VCC, in the overall study population  
14 ( $r=0.08$ , 95% CI= -0.13 to 0.29,  $p= 0.4479$ ), in the control group ( $r=0.20$ , 95%  
15 CI= -0.06 to 0.44,  $p= 0.1367$ ) and in the glaucoma group ( $r=0.35$ , 95% CI= -0.01  
16 to 0.63,  $p= 0.0579$ ), and except for the nasal RNFL quadrant between HD-OCT  
17 and SLP-ECC in the glaucoma group ( $r=0.26$ , 95% CI= -0.10 to 0.57,  $p=$   
18 0.1536). Correlation coefficients between HD-OCT and SLP-VCC in the overall  
19 study population ranged from  $r= 0.08$  (95% CI= -0.13 to 0.29,  $p= 0.4479$ ) for  
20 temporal quadrant RNFL thickness, to  $r=0.74$  (95% CI= 0.62 to 0.82,  $p< 0.0001$ )  
21 for superior quadrant RNFL thickness. Correlation coefficients between HD-  
22 OCT and SLP-VCC in the control group ranged from  $r= 0.20$  (95% CI= -0.06 to  
23 0.44,  $p= 0.1367$ ) for temporal quadrant RNFL thickness, to  $r=0.62$  (95% CI=  
24 0.42 to 0.76,  $p< 0.0001$ ) for superior quadrant RNFL thickness. Correlation  
25 coefficients between HD-OCT and SLP-VCC in the glaucoma group ranged  
26 from  $r= 0.35$  (95% CI= -0.01 to 0.63,  $p= 0.0579$ ) for temporal quadrant RNFL  
27 thickness, to  $r=0.70$  (95% CI= 0.45 to 0.85,  $p< 0.0001$ ) for superior quadrant  
28 RNFL thickness. Correlation coefficients between HD-OCT and SLP-ECC in the  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 overall study population ranged from  $r = 0.40$  (95% CI= 0.21 to 0.58,  $p = 0.0001$ )  
4  
5 for nasal quadrant RNFL thickness, to  $r = 0.80$  (95% CI= 0.71 to 0.87,  $p < 0.0001$ )  
6  
7 for superior quadrant RNFL thickness. Correlation coefficients between HD-  
8  
9 OCT and SLP-ECC in the control group ranged from  $r = 0.30$  (95% CI= 0.03 to  
10  
11 0.53,  $p = 0.0301$ ) for nasal quadrant RNFL thickness, to  $r = 0.67$  (95% CI= 0.49 to  
12  
13 0.80,  $p < 0.0001$ ) for superior quadrant RNFL thickness. Correlation coefficients  
14  
15 between HD-OCT and SLP-ECC in the glaucoma group ranged from  $r = 0.26$   
16  
17 (95% CI= -0.10 to 0.57,  $p = 0.1536$ ) for nasal quadrant RNFL thickness, to  
18  
19  $r = 0.77$  (95% CI= 0.56 to 0.88,  $p < 0.0001$ ) for average RNFL thickness.  
20  
21  
22 Comparison of correlation coefficients between HD-OCT and SLP-VCC versus  
23  
24 HD-OCT and SLP-ECC shows only statistically significant differences in  
25  
26 average RNFL thickness (Diff Z statistics= -3.22,  $p = 0.0013$ ) and in temporal  
27  
28 quadrant RNFL thickness (Diff Z statistics= -2.31,  $p = 0.0205$ ) within the overall  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35 population of the study.

36  
37 Table 4 shows Concordance Correlation Coefficient (CCC,  $r_c$ ) for retinal nerve  
38  
39 fiber layer thickness parameters between HD-OCT and SLP in the overall  
40  
41 population, control and glaucoma group. Concordance correlation coefficients  
42  
43 between HD-OCT and SLP-VCC in the overall study population ranged from  
44  
45  $r_c = 0.03$  (95% CI= -0.04 to 0.11) for temporal quadrant RNFL thickness, to  $r_c =$   
46  
47 0.22 (95% CI= 0.15 to 0.28) for inferior quadrant RNFL thickness. Concordance  
48  
49 correlation coefficients between HD-OCT and SLP-VCC in the control group  
50  
51 ranged from  $r_c = 0.03$  (95% CI= -0.01 to 0.07) for temporal quadrant RNFL  
52  
53 thickness, to  $r_c = 0.08$  (95% CI= 0.04 to 0.12) for superior quadrant RNFL  
54  
55 thickness. Concordance correlation coefficients between HD-OCT and SLP-  
56  
57 VCC in the glaucoma group ranged from  $r_c = 0.23$  (95% CI= 0.06 to 0.38) for  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 average RNFL thickness, to  $r_c = 0.32$  (95% CI= 0.14 to 0.48) for inferior  
4  
5 quadrant RNFL thicknes. Concordance correlation coefficients between HD-  
6  
7 OCT and SLP-ECC in the overall study population ranged from  $r_c = 0.03$  (95%  
8  
9 CI= 0.01 to 0.05) for temporal quadrant RNFL thickness, to  $r_c = 0.22$  (95% CI=  
10  
11 0.15 to 0.29) for inferior quadrant RNFL thickness. Concordance correlation  
12  
13 coefficients between HD-OCT and SLP-ECC in the control group ranged from  
14  
15  $r_c = 0.02$  (95% CI= 0.00 to 0.04) for temporal quadrant RNFL thickness, to  $r_c =$   
16  
17 0.08 (95% CI= 0.04 to 0.12) for superior quadrant RNFL thickness.  
18  
19  
20  
21 Concordance correlation coefficients between HD-OCT and SLP-ECC in the  
22  
23 glaucoma group ranged from  $r_c = 0.04$  (95% CI= -0.01 to 0.09) for nasal  
24  
25 quadrant RNFL thickness, to  $r_c = 0.36$  (95% CI= 0.18 to 0.53) for inferior  
26  
27 quadrant RNFL thickness.  
28  
29  
30

31 Agreement between HD-OCT versus SLP-VCC and HD-OCT versus SLP-ECC,  
32  
33 were also evaluated with Bland and Altman plots. We obtained similar results  
34  
35 for every parameter in the study. Figure 1 shows the difference plots for  
36  
37 average thickness HD-OCT and SLP-VCC (regression equation:  
38  
39  $y = 25,0974 + -0,8502 x$ ; coefficient of determination  $R^2 : 0.4557$ ;  $p < 0.0001$ )  
40  
41 and for average thickness HD-OCT and SLP-ECC (regression equation:  
42  
43  $y = 21,2377 + -0,8769 x$ ; coefficient of determination  $R^2 : 0.7226$ ;  $p < 0.0001$ ),  
44  
45 respectively. As it is shown in the graphics, agreement level between methods  
46  
47 is low because of a proportional error that increases as the mean values of  
48  
49 average thickness increase.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

## 57 Discussion

58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to provide a comparison  
4 within the same population of these three imaging modalities designed to  
5 analyze peripapillary RNFL thickness in glaucoma: the scanning laser  
6 polarimetry (SLP) with both VCC and ECC mode, and the high definition optical  
7 coherence tomography (HD-OCT), which is a spectral-domain OCT.  
8

9  
10 We have found important and statistically significant differences (all with  
11  $p < 0.002$ ) in every thickness parameters between HD-OCT and SLP-VCC and  
12 between HD-OCT and SLP-ECC, in the overall study population and in the  
13 control and glaucoma group. HD-OCT parameters show higher values than SLP  
14 parameters. This, even though the standard set in the calculation circle for  
15 conventional SLP measurements is smaller than the OCT circle, and the RNFL  
16 thickness becomes thinner along the distance from the optic disc [21], and that  
17 SLP parameters in our study were converted into quadrants in order to be  
18 compared. Similar differences between OCT and SLP were found by others,  
19 Leung et al [22], Kanamori et al [23] and Chung & Sohn [24] but comparing  
20 time-domain OCT and SLP-VCC, by Sehi et al [25] comparing also time-domain  
21 OCT with SLP-VCC and ECC, and finally by Horn et al [26] comparing spectral-  
22 domain OCT but only with SLP-VCC. Most simple explanation for this finding  
23 could be that although both instruments express RNFL thickness in  
24 micrometers, they are using different scales as some author pointed out [27].  
25  
26 But, it should also be noted that targets of measurements by SLP and OCT are  
27 different [23]. OCT analyzes a retinal section from the inner retinal membrane to  
28 the posterior NFL boundary, which is automatically calculated. Hence, RNFL  
29 thickness measured by OCT presumably includes not only ganglion cell axons,  
30 but also Müller cell processes and astrocytes. In contrast, SLP measures the  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 RNFL thickness based on analysis of retardations developed by only retinal  
4  
5  
6 nerve fibers.

7  
8 The measured retardation maps in SLP are converted into RNFL thickness  
9  
10 maps by using a constant birefringence value (conversion factor 0.67 nm/mm),  
11  
12 and under the assumptions that (i) the RNFL is the only birefringent structure in  
13  
14 the area, and (ii) the light is backscattered by a polarization-preserving layer.  
15  
16 But previous works already have indicated that the RNFL birefringence is not  
17  
18 constant across the whole nerve head region [28-29] and more importantly, the  
19  
20 RNFL birefringence observed in the healthy eye differed from that of the  
21  
22 glaucomatous eye [30]. The conversion factor of the RNFL retardation, as  
23  
24 measured by SLP, to RNFL thickness by a constant factor throughout the retina  
25  
26 could be too simple and even provides inaccurate thickness readings. The  
27  
28 conversion would have to be done by locally varying birefringence values that  
29  
30 are, however, not accessible by SLP. Therefore, it is suggested by some  
31  
32 authors that SLP results should be displayed as retardation values (instead of  
33  
34 thickness) since this is the quantity actually measured [30]. These are in fact  
35  
36 the new measuring units incorporated for GDxPRO, new model of SLP by Zeiss  
37  
38 (Carl-Zeiss Meditec, Inc., Dublin, CA): Polarimetric-microns (P-microns) of  
39  
40 RNFL "Integrity" to be distinguished from "thickness" microns of the OCT.  
41  
42 Differences between SLP-VCC and SLP-ECC were statistically significant in the  
43  
44 overall population of the study and in both the normal and the glaucoma group,  
45  
46 in several parameters: average thickness ( $p=0.0034$  in overall population,  
47  
48  $p=0.0200$  in control group and  $p=0.0275$  in glaucoma group), temporal quadrant  
49  
50 thickness ( $p<0.0001$  in overall population, in control and in glaucoma group),  
51  
52 and nasal quadrant thickness ( $p=0.0003$  in overall population,  $p=0.0022$  in  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 control group and  $p=0.0224$  in glaucoma group). These differences were not  
4  
5 found in the superior and inferior quadrants, in concordance with Reus et al.  
6  
7 [31]. ECC method improves the signal-to-noise ratio of RNFL retardation  
8  
9 measurements with SLP by shifting the measurements to a more sensitive  
10  
11 detection range of the instrument. The shift is made possible by introducing a  
12  
13 preset measurement bias that is mathematically removed from the  
14  
15 measurements afterward. ECC method improves SLP images by showing the  
16  
17 expected RNFL appearance better than in those obtained with VCC. In addition,  
18  
19 the typical scan score, which quantifies inversely the amount of atypia, is higher  
20  
21 with ECC than with VCC [31- 32], as we have confirmed in our study (Table 1).  
22  
23 Diagnostic accuracy in glaucoma is also better with ECC than with VCC [25,  
24  
25 33]. We mentioned before how previous works have indicated that RNFL  
26  
27 birefringence is not constant across the whole nervehead region being highest  
28  
29 in the superior and inferior quadrants and lowest in the temporal and nasal  
30  
31 quadrants [29]. We also mentioned that RNFL birefringence measurements  
32  
33 were most reliable in those thicker areas of RNFL [28]. We should expect from  
34  
35 ECC mode an eventual improvement in SLP images representing the expected  
36  
37 RNFL morphology, especially in the temporal and nasal quadrants, so that  
38  
39 differences between SLP-VCC and ECC mode in temporal and nasal quadrants  
40  
41 and in average RNFL thickness are explained.

42  
43 Important and statistically significant differences found in thickness parameters  
44  
45 between OCT and SLP reveal that those values are not interchangeable. It's  
46  
47 worth mentioning that those differences of SLP and OCT, providing RNFL  
48  
49 thickness measures, does not invalidate their usefulness as glaucoma-detection  
50  
51 tools. For glaucoma-detection purposes, results in individual patients are  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 compared with a normative data base that was acquired under similar  
4  
5 assumptions, therefore conclusions concerning the diagnosis and/or the stage  
6  
7 of glaucoma are still valid.  
8  
9

10 Results of this study suggest that the high-definition OCT retinal nerve fibre  
11  
12 layer thickness parameters were significantly correlated with those of the SLP-  
13  
14 VCC and SLP-ECC, except in the temporal RNFL quadrant between HD-OCT  
15  
16 and SLP-VCC and except in the nasal RNFL quadrant between HD-OCT and  
17  
18 SLP-ECC in the glaucoma group.  
19  
20  
21

22 The real point is that the significant correlations found between OCT and SLP  
23  
24 are not really unexpected findings because with all 3 technologies we try to  
25  
26 measure the same biological feature. Similar correlations between OCT and  
27  
28 SLP were found by others, Leung et al [22] and Chung & Sohn [24] but  
29  
30 comparing time-domain OCT and SLP-VCC, and by Sehi et al [25] comparing  
31  
32 also time-domain OCT with SLP-VCC and ECC.  
33  
34  
35

36 In agreement with Leung et al [22] and Sehi et al [25], we found lower  
37  
38 correlation in temporal RNFL quadrant with SLP-VCC and in nasal RNFL  
39  
40 quadrant with SLP-ECC. It would be possible that the regional variability in the  
41  
42 RNFL measurements and the variation of the optic nerve head birefringence  
43  
44 around the optic nerve head are responsible for the observation. Being the  
45  
46 thinnest portions in the RNFL profile, the nasal and temporal sectors have been  
47  
48 reported to have higher variability in the OCT [34] and in SLP RNFL  
49  
50 measurements [28-29]. Curiously, the average values in the temporal RNFL  
51  
52 quadrant in images obtained with VCC, were significantly higher in  
53  
54 glaucomatous eyes (40.36 microns) than in healthy eyes (29.70 microns) ( $p=$   
55  
56 0.0016). In images obtained with ECC, this difference was not statistically  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 significant (glaucomatous eyes and healthy eyes: 21.54 microns and 20.74  
4 microns, respectively) ( $p= 0.4802$ ). Similar results were obtained by Reus et al  
5  
6  
7 [31]. They found that the amount of retardation in the temporal region, in healthy  
8 and ocular hypertensive eyes, measured with VCC, significantly correlated with  
9 the amount of residual anterior segment birefringence, and in the nasal region,  
10 this correlation was of borderline significance. With ECC, no relationship was  
11 apparent between measured peripapillary retardation and residual anterior  
12 segment birefringence. These data suggested to the authors [31] that some of  
13 the differences between VCC and ECC were due most likely due to  
14 measurement artifacts affecting nasal and especially temporal sectors in the  
15 RNFL peripapillary area. This would explain the low and not statistically  
16 significant correlation coefficient between SLP-VCC and OCT in the temporal  
17 RNFL quadrant that we found in our study. Improving residual anterior  
18 compensation with ECC mode reduces retardation magnitude and also induces  
19 changes in polarization axis. We speculate that rotation in retardation axis could  
20 be related with our finding of a low and not significant correlation between OCT  
21 and SLP-ECC in the nasal RNFL quadrant of the glaucoma group. Anyway, we  
22 should say that in our study, compared with SLP-VCC, SLP-ECC has stronger  
23 correlations with HD-OCT, especially when measuring the whole calculation  
24 circle in RNFL average thickness ( $p= 0.0013$ ), and in superior and inferior RNFL  
25 quadrants. Others have shown this but with td-OCT [25].

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Correlation and agreement are not always the same thing. Therefore, a high  
correlation does not automatically imply that there is good agreement between  
the two methods. Correlation essentially assesses the linear relationship  
between the two sets of measurements. It is directly related with the precision of

1  
2  
3 the data measuring the tightness of the data about its reduced major axis.  
4  
5 Precision is inversely related to random analytical errors. Agreement  
6  
7 (concordance) assesses about reliability and consistency between the two sets  
8  
9 of measurements. Agreement is inversely related to systematic analytical  
10  
11 errors, constant or proportional errors. So the Pearson correlation coefficient ( $r$ )  
12  
13 is not a good agreement measure. In fact, the 'r' implies that data from two  
14  
15 variables ( $x, y$ ) with perfect correlation ( $r=1$ ) lie on a straight line which,  
16  
17 however, may not pass through the origin or may not have a slope equal to  
18  
19 unity, which would provide information about a low agreement between the  
20  
21 data.  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 Lin's [18-19] concordance correlation coefficient (CCC or " $r_c$ ") computes  
28  
29 agreement on a continuous measure obtained by two methods. The CCC  
30  
31 combines measures of both precision and accuracy to determine how far the  
32  
33 observed data deviate from the line of perfect concordance (that is, the line at  
34  
35 45 degrees on a square scatter plot). Lin's coefficient increases in value as a  
36  
37 function of the nearness of the data's reduced major axis to the line of perfect  
38  
39 concordance (the accuracy of the data) and of the tightness of the data about its  
40  
41 reduced major axis (the precision of the data). CCC values obtained for every  
42  
43 parameter in our study between HD-OCT and SLP-VCC and between HD-OCT  
44  
45 and SLP-ECC were poor.  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 Agreement between methods, HD- OCT versus SLP (VCC or ECC mode) were  
52  
53 also evaluated with Bland & Altman plots. The Lin and Bland & Altman  
54  
55 approaches are complementary, indicating agreement (or lack of) on two  
56  
57 different scales. Analyzing Bland & Altman plots we obtained similar trend  
58  
59 results for every parameter in our study [20, 35].  
60

1  
2  
3 Difference plots as we see in Fig 1 show that agreement level between methods  
4  
5 is low because of a proportional error that increases as the mean values of  
6  
7 average thickness increase. We already mentioned the reasons that could  
8  
9 explain different values between methods and in this context, we theorize that  
10  
11 this proportional error could also be explained taking into account that SLP will  
12  
13 measure only axons (and neural microstructures) while OCT will measure  
14  
15 axons and glia, support tissue, that could be lost in a parallel manner with the  
16  
17 ganglion cells axons in the disease process of glaucoma [21].  
18  
19

20  
21  
22 Our study has several limitations that should be taken into account. This study  
23  
24 was conducted in a Caucasian population with early to moderate stage POAG.  
25  
26 Appropriate caution is therefore recommended when extending the results to  
27  
28 other populations.  
29  
30

31  
32 Another limitation might be the high rate of patient exclusions, mainly due to the  
33  
34 inadequate quality imaging and unreliability of visual field exams. Finally, the  
35  
36 small number of cases with glaucoma that did not allow for the possibility of  
37  
38 doing subanalysis in our study population.  
39  
40

41  
42 In conclusion, our results suggest that HD-OCT parameters of RNFL thickness  
43  
44 are significantly higher than SLP-VCC and SLP-ECC parameters, therefore  
45  
46 those thickness values are not interchangeable. HD-OCT and SLP methods are  
47  
48 well correlated but concordance is poor. The difference plots show a lack of  
49  
50 agreement that changes as a proportion of the mean.  
51  
52

## 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 References

1.- Quigley HA, Dunkelberger GR, Green WR (1988). Chronic human glaucoma causing selectively greater loss of larger optic nerve fibers. *Ophthalmology*; 95: 357-63.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

2.- Quigley HA, Dunkelberger GR, Green WR (1989). Retinal ganglion cell atrophy correlated with automated perimetry in human eyes with glaucoma. *Am J Ophthalmol*; 107: 453-64.

3.- Sommer A, Katz J, Quigley HA, Miller NR, Robin AL, Richter RC, Witt KA. (1991). Clinically detectable nerve fibers atrophy precedes the onset of glaucomatous field loss. *Arch Ophthalmol*; 109: 77-83.

4.- Sanchez-Galeana C, Bowd C, Blumenthal EZ, Gokhale PA, Zangwill LM, Weinreb RN (2001). Using optical imaging summary data to detect glaucoma. *Ophthalmology*; 108:1812–1818.

5.- Sihota R, Sony P, Gupta V, Dada T, Singh R. (2006). Diagnostic capability of optical coherence tomography in evaluating the degree of glaucomatous retinal nerve fiber damage. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*; 47:2006-10.

6.- Huang D, Swanson EA, Lin CP, Schuman JS, Stinson WG, Chang W, Hee MR, Flotte T, Gregory K, Puliafito CA, Fujimoto JC (1991). Optical coherence tomography. *Science*; 254:1178–81.

7.- Weinreb RN, Dreher AW, Coleman A, Quigley H, Shaw B, Reiter K (1990). Histopathologic validation of Fourier-ellipsometry measurements of retinal nerve fiber layer thickness. *Arch Ophthalmol*;108: 557–560.

8.- Zhou Q, Weinreb RN (2002). Individualized compensation of anterior segment birefringence during scanning laser polarimetry. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*;43:2221–2228

9.- Weinreb RN, Bowd C, Greenfield DS, Zangwill LM (2002). Measurement of the magnitude and axis of corneal polarization with scanning laser polarimetry. *Arch Ophthalmol*.;120:901–906.

10.- Knighton RW, Huang X-R, Greenfield DS (2002). Analytical model of scanning laser polarimetry for retinal nerve fiber layer assessment. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*;43:383–392.

11.- Garway-Heath DF, Greaney MJ, Caprioli J (2002). Correction for the erroneous compensation of anterior segment birefringence with the scanning laser polarimeter for glaucoma diagnosis. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*;43:1465–1474.

12.- Weinreb RN, Bowd C, Zangwill LM (2003). Glaucoma detection using scanning laser polarimetry with variable corneal polarization compensation. *Arch Ophthalmol*;121:218–224.

13.- Bagga H, Greenfield DS, Feuer W (2005). Quantitative assessment of atypical birefringence images using scanning laser polarimetry with variable corneal compensation. *Am J Ophthalmol*.;139: 437–446.



- 1  
2  
3 14.- Toth M, Hollo G (2005). Enhanced corneal compensation for scanning  
4 laser polarimetry on eyes with atypical polarisation pattern. *Br J Ophthalmol* ;  
5 89:1139–1142.  
6  
7  
8 15.- Da Pozzo S, Marchesan R, Canziani T, Vattovani O, Ravalico G (2006).  
9 Atypical pattern of retardation on GDx-VCC and its effect on retinal nerve fiber  
10 layer evaluation in glaucomatous eyes. *Eye*;20:769–775.  
11  
12 16.- Vizzeri G, Balasubramanian M, Bowd C, Weinreb RN, Medeiros FA,  
13 Zangwill LM (2009). Spectral domain-optical coherence tomography to detect  
14 localized retinal nerve fiber layer defects in glaucomatous eyes. *Optics Express*;  
15 5: 4004-4018.  
16  
17  
18 17.- Hodapp, E., Parrish, R., and Anderson, D. *Clinical Decisions in Glaucoma*.  
19 St. Louis: Mosby-Year Book, Inc., 1993.  
20  
21  
22 18.- Lin, L.I. (1989). A concordance correlation coefficient to evaluate  
23 reproducibility. *Biometrics*, 45, 255-268.  
24  
25  
26 19.- Lin, L.I. (2000). A note on the concordance correlation coefficient.  
27 *Biometrics*, 56, 324-325.  
28  
29  
30 20.- Bland JM, Altman DG. (1986). Statistical methods for assessing agreement  
31 between two methods of clinical measurement. *Lancet*; 1:307–10  
32  
33 21.- Quigley HA and Addicks EM. (1982). Quantitative studies of retinal nerve  
34 fiber layer defects. *Arch Ophthalmol*; 100: 807-814.  
35  
36  
37 22.- Leung CK, Chan W, Chong KKL, Yung W, Tang K, Woo J, Chan WM, Tse  
38 KK. (2005). Comparative Study of Retinal Nerve Fiber Layer Measurement by  
39 StratusOCT and GDx VCC, I: Correlation Analysis in Glaucoma. *Invest*  
40 *Ophthalmol Vis Sci*; 46:3214-20.  
41  
42  
43 23.- Kanamori A, Nagai-Kusuhara A, Escaño MFT, et al. (2006). Comparison of  
44 confocal scanning laser ophthalmoscopy, scanning laser polarimetry and optical  
45 coherence tomography to discriminate ocular hypertension and glaucoma at an  
46 early stage. *Graefe's Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol*; 244: 58-68.  
47  
48  
49 24.- Chung YS, Sohn YH (2006). The relationship between optical coherence  
50 tomography and scanning laser polarimetry measurements in glaucoma. *Kor J*  
51 *Ophthalmol*; 20: 225-229.  
52  
53  
54 25.- Sehi M, Ume S, Greenfield DS, and Advanced Imaging in Glaucoma Study  
55 Group. (2007). Scanning Laser polarimetry with enhanced corneal  
56 compensation and optical coherence tomography in normal and glaucomatous  
57 eyes. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.*; 48: 2099-2104.  
58  
59  
60 26.- Horn FK, Mardin CY, Laemmer R et al. (2009). Correlation between Local  
Glaucomatous Visual Field Defects and Loss of Nerve Fiber Layer Thickness



1  
2  
3 Measured with Polarimetry and Spectral Domain OCT. Invest Ophthalmol Vis  
4 Sci.;50:1971–1977.  
5

6  
7 27.- Leung CK, Cheung CY, Lin D, et al. (2008). Longitudinal Variability of  
8 Optic Disc and Retinal Nerve Fiber Layer Measurements. Invest Ophthalmol Vis  
9 Sci.;49: 4886–4892.  
10

11 28.- Cense B, Chen TC, Park BH, et al. (2004). Thickness and birefringency of  
12 healthy retinal nerve fiber layer tissue measured with polarization-sensitive  
13 optical coherence tomography. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci ; 45 : 2606-2612.  
14

15  
16 29.- Huang X-R, Bagga H, Greenfield DS and Knighton RW. (2004) Variation of  
17 peripapillary retinal nerve fiber layer birefringence in normal subjects. In vest  
18 Ophthalmol Vis Sci; 45: 3073-3080.  
19

20  
21 30.- Götzinger E, Pircher M, Baumann B et al. (2008). Retinal nerve fiber layer  
22 birefringence evaluated with polarization sensitive spectral domain OCT and  
23 scanning laser polarimetry: a comparison. J Biophoton; 1: 129-139.  
24

25  
26 31.- Reus NJ, Zhou Q, Lemij HG. (2006). Enhance imaging algorithm for  
27 scanning laser polarimetry with variable corneal compensation. Invest  
28 Ophthalmol Vis Sci; 47:3870–3877.  
29

30  
31 32.- Sehi M, Guaqueta DC and Greenfield DS. (2006). An enhancement module  
32 to improve the atypical birefringence pattern using scanning laser polarimetry  
33 with variable corneal compensation. Br J Ophthalmol; 90: 749-753.  
34

35  
36 33.- Mai TA, Reus NJ, Lemij HG. (2007) Diagnostic accuracy of scanning laser  
37 polarimetry with enhanced versus variable corneal compensation.  
38 Ophthalmology; 114: 1988-1993.  
39

40  
41 34.- Carpineto P, Ciancaglini M, Zuppardi E, et al. (2003). Reliability of nerve  
42 fiber layer measurements using optical coherence tomography in normal and  
43 glaucomatous eyes. Ophthalmology; 110: 190-195.  
44

45  
46 35.- Johnson R. (2008). Assessment of bias with emphasis on method  
47 comparison. Clin Biochem Rev; 29 suppl (i): s37-s42.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 1. Clinical characteristics of the study population.

	Overall study population (n=88)		
	Control group (n= 55)	Glaucoma group (n= 33)	P value
<b>Age (mean <math>\pm</math> SD, years)</b>	59.1 $\pm$ 7.5	63.8 $\pm$ 13.3	0.0364
<b>Gender:</b>			
Male	22	23	
Female	33	10	0.0132
<b>TSS with SLP-VCC (mean <math>\pm</math> SD)</b>	87.50 $\pm$ 15.97	78.93 $\pm$ 28.2	0.0719
<b>TSS with SLP-ECC (mean <math>\pm</math> SD)</b>	98.83 $\pm$ 2.36	96.78 $\pm$ 7.9	0.0773
<b>SAP MD (mean) (95% CI) (dB)</b>	-1.02 (-1.45 to -0.58)	-6.69 (-8.07 to -5.31)	< 0.0001
<b>SAP PSD (mean) (95% CI) (dB)</b>	2.03 (1.72 to 2.34)	6.22 (4.80 to 7.65)	< 0.001

Abbreviations: HD-OCT= High Definition Optical Coherence Tomography; TSS= Typical Scan Score; SLP-VCC= Scanning Laser Polarimetry with VCC mode; SLP-ECC= Scanning Laser Polarimetry with ECC mode; SAP= Standard Achromatic Perimetry; MD= Mean Deviation (decibels); PSD= Pattern Standard Deviation (decibels)

Table 2. Retinal nerve fiber layer thickness parameters using high-definition optical coherence tomography and scanning laser polarimetry with variable and enhance corneal compensation in the study overall population, control and glaucoma group.

<b>Overall population</b>	<b>HD-OCT (95% CI)</b>	<b>SLP-VCC (95% CI)</b>	<b>P value*</b>	<b>SLP-ECC (95% CI)</b>	<b>P value**</b>	<b>P value***</b>
Avg Thick +	82.4 (78.8 to 86.1)	50.4 (48.5 to 52.2)	<0.0001	46.7 (45.1 to 48.3)	<0.0001	0.0034
SupQ Thick	99.4 (94.1 to 104.7)	59.9 (57.1 to 62.6)	<0.0001	60.0 (57.3 to 62.7)	<0.0001	0.9385
InfQ Thick	101.3 (94.8 to 107.8)	62.5 (59.6 to 65.3)	<0.0001	65.2 (62.5 to 67.9)	<0.0001	0.1716
TemQ Thick	61.2 (58.1 to 64.3)	33.5 (30.2 to 36.8)	<0.0001	21.4 (19.1 to 22.1)	<0.0001	<0.0001
NasQ Thick	67.7 (64.9 to 70.4)	42.6 (40.3 to 44.8)	<0.0001	37.5 (35.9to 39.0)	<0.0001	0.0003
<b>Control group</b>	<b>HD-OCT (95% CI)</b>	<b>SLP-VCC (95% CI)</b>	<b>P value*</b>	<b>SLP-ECC (95% CI)</b>	<b>P value**</b>	<b>P value***</b>
Avg Thick +	91.1 (87.6 to 94.5)	52.5 (51.0 to 54.0)	<0.0001	50.1 (48.7 to 51.5)	<0.0001	0.0200
SupQ Thick	111.7 (106.6 to 116.7)	64.5 (61.8 to 67.2)	<0.0001	65.5 (62.9 to 68.0)	<0.0001	0.5960
InfQ Thick	116.3 (109.9 to 122.7)	68.3 (65.7 to 70.9)	<0.0001	70.9 (68.5 to 73.3)	<0.0001	0.1483
TemQ Thick	65.1 (61.4 to 68.8)	29.7 (27.2 to 32.1)	<0.0001	20.7 (19.4 to 22.0)	<0.0001	<0.0001
NasQ Thick	71.0 (67.8 to 74.3)	44.5 (42.4 to 46.7)	<0.0001	40.3 (38.7 to 41.9)	<0.0001	0.0022
<b>Glaucoma group</b>	<b>HD-OCT (95% CI)</b>	<b>SLP-VCC (95% CI)</b>	<b>P value*</b>	<b>SLP-ECC (95% CI)</b>	<b>P value**</b>	<b>P value***</b>
Avg Thick +	67.3 (62.9 to 71.8)	46.5 (42.2 to 50.8)	<0.0001	41.1 (38.5 to 43.6)	<0.0001	0.0275
SupQ Thick	78.0 (71.5 to 84.5)	51.6 (46.9 to 56.4)	<0.0001	51.0 (46.6 to 55.3)	<0.0001	0.8289
InfQ Thick	75.1 (67.2 to 83.1)	52.1 (47.5 to 56.6)	<0.0001	55.7 (51.2 to 60.3)	0.0001	0.2521
TemQ Thick	54.3 (49.4 to 59.1)	40.3 (32.5 to 48.1)	0.0029	21.5 (19.5 to 23.4)	<0.0001	<0.0001
NasQ Thick	61.8 (57.5 to 66.1)	39.1 (34.1 to 44.1)	<0.0001	32.8 (30.3 to 35.2)	<0.0001	0.0224

Abbreviations: 95% CI= 95% confidence interval; HD-OCT= high definition optical coherence tomography; SLP-VCC= scanning laser polarimetry with VCC mode; SLP-ECC= scanning laser polarimetry with ECC mode; Avg Thick= average thickness; SupQ Thick= superior quadrant average thickness; InfQ Thick= inferior quadrant average thickness; TempQ Thick= inferior quadrant average thickness; NasQ Thick= nasal quadrant average thickness.

+ TSNIT average thickness in SLP

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

- \* Differences between HD-OCT and SLP-VCC
- \*\* Differences between HD-OCT and SLP-ECC
- \*\*\* Differences between SLP-VCC and SLP-ECC

For Peer Review Only

Table 3. Pearson correlation coefficients (95% confidence interval)\* for retinal nerve fiber layer thickness parameters of High-definition optical coherence tomography (HD-OCT) and Scanning laser polarimetry (SLP) in the overall population, control and glaucoma group.

<b>Overall study population (n=88)</b>						
<b>HD-OCT Parameter</b>	<b>SLP-VCC parameter (95% CI)</b>	<b>P value*</b>	<b>SLP-ECC parameter (95% CI)</b>	<b>P value*</b>	<b>Difference** Z statistics</b>	<b>P value**</b>
Avg. Thick.	0.54 (0.37 to 0.68)	<0.0001	0.80 (0.71 to 0.86)	<0.0001	-3.22	0.0013
SupQ.	0.74 (0.62 to 0.82)	<0.0001	0.80 (0.71 to 0.87)	<0.0001	-0.96	0.3342
InfQ.	0.72 (0.60 to 0.81)	<0.0001	0.72 (0.60 to 0.81)	<0.0001	-0.03	0.9758
TempQ.	0.08 (-0.13 to 0.29)	0.4479	0.41 (0.22 to 0.58)	0.0001	-2.31	0.0205
NasQ.	0.50 (0.32 to 0.65)	<0.0001	0.40 (0.21 to 0.57)	0.0001	0.81	0.4127
<b>Control group (n=55)</b>						
<b>HD-OCT Parameter</b>	<b>SLP-VCC parameter (95% CI)</b>	<b>P value*</b>	<b>SLP-ECC parameter (95% CI)</b>	<b>P value*</b>	<b>Difference** Z statistics</b>	<b>P value**</b>
Avg. Thick.	0.48 (0.25 to 0.66)	0.0002	0.62 (0.42 to 0.76)	<0.0001	-1.03	0.3030
SupQ.	0.62 (0.42 to 0.76)	<0.0001	0.67 (0.49 to 0.80)	<0.0001	-0.43	0.6620
InfQ.	0.50 (0.27 to 0.68)	0.0001	0.51 (0.27 to 0.68)	0.0001	-0.06	0.9454
TempQ.	0.20 (-0.06 to 0.44)	0.1367	0.46 (0.22 to 0.65)	0.0005	-1.50	0.1331
NasQ.	0.37 (0.12 to 0.58)	0.0050	0.30 (0.03 to 0.53)	0.0301	0.40	0.6874
<b>Glaucoma group (n=33)</b>						
<b>HD-OCT Parameter</b>	<b>SLP-VCC parameter (95% CI)</b>	<b>P value*</b>	<b>SLP-ECC parameter (95% CI)</b>	<b>P value*</b>	<b>Difference** Z statistics</b>	<b>P value**</b>
Avg. Thick.	0.54 (0.22 to 0.76)	0.0021	0.77 (0.56 to 0.88)	<0.0001	-1.61	0.1070
SupQ.	0.70 (0.45 to 0.85)	<0.0001	0.75 (0.54 to 0.87)	<0.0001	-0.40	0.6824
InfQ.	0.64 (0.37 to 0.82)	0.0001	0.68 (0.42 to 0.83)	<0.0001	-0.27	0.7835
TempQ.	0.35 (-0.01 to 0.63)	0.0579	0.53 (0.21 to 0.75)	0.0024	-0.87	0.3842
NasQ.	0.61 (0.31 to 0.79)	0.0004	0.26 (-0.10 to 0.57)	0.1536	1.71	0.0863

1  
2  
3  
4 Abbreviations: 95% CI= 95% confidence interval; HD-OCT= high definition optical coherence tomography; SLP-VCC= scanning  
5 laser polarimetry with VCC mode; SLP-ECC= scanning laser polarimetry with ECC mode; Avg Thick= average thickness; SupQ=  
6 superior quadrant average thickness; InfQ= inferior quadrant average thickness; TempQ= inferior quadrant average thickness;  
7 NasQ= nasal quadrant average thickness.  
8  
9

10 \* Correlation coefficients (95% confidence interval) were established between:

11 Avg Thick and TSNIT average thickness

12 HD-OCT SupQ and SLP SupQ

13 HD-OCT InfQ and SLP InfQ

14 HD-OCT TempQ and SLP TempQ

15 HD-OCT NasQ and SLP NasQ  
16  
17

18 \*\* Difference and comparison between Pearson correlation coefficients HD-OCT--SLP-VCC and HD-OCT--SLP-ECC.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

Table 4. Concordance Correlation Coefficient (95% confidence interval)\* for retinal nerve fiber layer thickness parameters between High-definition optical coherence tomography (HD-OCT) and Scanning laser polarimetry (SLP) in the overall population, control and glaucoma group.

<b>Overall study population (n=88)</b>		
<b>HD-OCT parameter</b>	<b>SLP-VCC parameter (95% CI)</b>	<b>SLP-ECC parameter (95% CI)</b>
Avg. Thick.	0.11 (0.06 to 0.16)	0.12 (0.08 to 0.15)
SupQ.	0.19 (0.13 to 0.25)	0.21 (0.14 to 0.27)
InfQ.	0.22 (0.15 to 0.28)	0.22 (0.15 to 0.29)
TempQ.	0.03 (-0.04 to 0.11)	0.03 (0.01 to 0.05)
NasQ.	0.15 (0.08 to 0.21)	0.06 (0.02 to 0.10)
<b>Control group (n=55)</b>		
<b>HD-OCT parameter</b>	<b>SLP-VCC parameter (95% CI)</b>	<b>SLP-ECC parameter (95% CI)</b>
Avg. Thick.	0.03 (0.01 to 0.06)	0.04 (0.02 to 0.06)
SupQ.	0.08 (0.04 to 0.12)	0.08 (0.04 to 0.12)
InfQ.	0.07 (0.03 to 0.12)	0.07 (0.03 to 0.11)
TempQ.	0.03 (-0.01 to 0.07)	0.02 (0.00 to 0.04)
NasQ.	0.07 (0.01 to 0.13)	0.03 (0.00 to 0.06)
<b>Glaucoma group (n=33)</b>		
<b>HD-OCT parameter</b>	<b>SLP-VCC parameter (95% CI)</b>	<b>SLP-ECC parameter (95% CI)</b>
Avg. Thick.	0.23 (0.06 to 0.38)	0.14 (0.06 to 0.22)
SupQ.	0.28 (0.12 to 0.42)	0.27 (0.13 to 0.39)
InfQ.	0.32 (0.14 to 0.48)	0.36 (0.18 to 0.53)
TempQ.	0.25 (-0.00 to 0.48)	0.05 (0.01 to 0.10)
NasQ.	0.24 (0.08 to 0.38)	0.04 (-0.01 to 0.09)

Abbreviations: 95% CI= 95% confidence interval; HD-OCT= high definition optical coherence tomography; SLP-VCC= scanning laser polarimetry with VCC mode; SLP-ECC= scanning laser polarimetry with ECC mode; Avg Thick= average thickness; SupQ=

1  
2  
3  
4 superior quadrant average thickness; InfQ= inferior quadrant average thickness; TempQ= inferior quadrant average thickness;  
5 NasQ= nasal quadrant average thickness.  
6  
7

8 \* Concordance Correlation Coefficients (95% confidence interval) were established between:

9 Avg Thick and TSNIT average thickness

10 HD-OCT SupQ and SLP SupQ

11 HD-OCT InfQ and SLP InfQ


12 HD-OCT TempQ and SLP TempQ

13 HD-OCT NasQ and SLP NasQ  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47




Figure 1. a) Difference plot for Average Thickness HD-OCT and Average Thickness SLP-VCC in the overall population in the study with regression line of differences versus averages. B) Difference plot for Average Thickness HD-OCT and Average Thickness SLP-ECC in the overall population in the study with regression line of differences versus averages.

a)



b)



Abbreviations: HD-OCT= high definition optical coherence tomography; SLP-VCC= scanning laser polarimetry with VCC mode; AV\_THICK\_OCT= average thickness in HD-OCT; TSNIT\_AV\_VCC= average thickness in SLP-VCC. SLP-ECC= scanning laser polarimetry with ECC mode; AV\_THICK\_OCT= average thickness in HD-OCT; TSNIT\_AV\_ECC= average thickness in SLP-ECC.