FIRST (PRES	ENTING) AUTHO	JR (REQ	UIRED)	
Must be autho	r listed first in bo	dy of abs	tract	
( )R1	(x)R2	( ) R3		
( ) PG	( ) Estagiário	( ) Tecr	nólogo	
lihama	Daniela	I	Mayumi	Last
Name	First		Middle	Edot
GLAUCOMA	Se	ervice (se	etor)	

## Comparison of Visual Field Defects Between Short Wavelength Automated Perimetry and Frequency Doubling Technology Perimetry in Glaucomatous Patients

D.M. Iihama, M.M. Aoki, I.M. Tavares, L.A.S. Melo, Jr., A. Paranhos, Jr.

**Purpose:** To compare the extension and depth of visual field defects detected by Short Wavelength Automated Perimetry (SWAP) and Frequency Doubling Technology (FDT-Matrix) Perimetry in open-angle glaucoma. **Methods:** Fifteen eyes of 15 patients were enrolled. Patients were included if they had open-angle glaucoma and a glaucomatous defect in the Standard Automated Perimetry. The patients underwent SWAP and FDT-Matrix perimetries in a random sequence, and the exams were performed twice in each perimeter. The results of the second exams of both perimeters were considered for analysis. The extension and depth of visual field defect were analyzed from the Total Deviation Graph, considering the percentage of points showing defects with probabilities lower than 5% and 0.5%, respectively. **Results:** All fifteen patients completed the study. The mean percentage of points with probabilities lower than 5% in the SWAP and FDT perimetries were 61.6% and 51.5% (P=0.39), respectively. The mean percentage of points with probabilities lower than 0.5% in the SWAP and FDT perimetries were 21.1% and 30.2% (*P*=0.16), respectively. Conclusions: SWAP and FDT perimetries are not different

respectively. **Conclusions:** SWAP and FDT perimetries are not different regarding to depth and extension of visual field defects in glaucomatous patients.