2007 Research Days Abstract Form – Department of Ophthalmology – UNIFESP/FPM

SCIENTIFIC SECTION PREFERENCE (REQUIRED): Review the Scientific section Descriptions. Select and enter the two -lette Code for the one (1) Section best sullied to review your abstract

3. PRESENTATION PREFERENCE (REQUIRED) Check one (1) (a) Paper (b) Poster

The signature of the First (Presenting)
 Author, (REQUIRED) acting as the
 authorized agent for all authors, hereby
 contificer.

Signature of First

Scientific Section Descriptions

Scientific Section Descriptions
(OR) ORBIT
(PL) OCULAR PLASTIC SURGERY
(RE) RETINA AND VITRECUS
(RE) RETINA AND VITRECUS
(RE) RETINA AND VITRECUS
(TU) TUMORS AND PATHOLOGY
(TI) TUMORS AND PATHOLOGY
(TI) TUMORS AND PATHOLOGY
(TI) TSTANBISMS
(UV) UVERTIS
(US) ACRIMAN SYSTEM
(SS) ACRIMAN SYSTEM
(SS) ACRIMAN SYSTEM
(CO) CORNEA AND EXTERNAL DISEASE
(CI) GOULDAR
(CO) CORNEA AND EXTERNAL DISEASE
(CI) GOULDAR
(CI) GOULDAR
(RS) REFRACTIVE SURGERY
(CS) COLLAR ULTRASOUND
(US) COLLAR ULTRASOUND
(US) COLLAR BUCKROSINEERING
(EP) EPIDEMIOLOGY
(EF) ELECTROPHYSIOLOGY

Deadline: 29/10/2007

FORMAT:
Abstract should contain:
Title, Name of Authors, Name of other authors (maximum 6),
Purpose, Methods, Results,
Conclusions.
Example: ARVO (1.10 x 1.70)
Abstract Book

ostract Form - Department of Ophthalmology - UNIFESF/EFM					
	FIRST (PRESENTING) AUTHOR (REQUIRED) Must be author listed first in body of abstract				
	()R1 ()R2 (X)PG0 ()PG1	() R3 () Estagiário	() Tecnólogo	() PIBIC	
	Last Name	First Name	Midd	lle	
	Kanadani	Fábio	N		
	INSTITUIÇÃO Universidade Federal de São Paulo- UNIFESP Santa Casa de Belo Horizonte				
	5. ABSTRACT (REQUIRED)				

Functional Assessment in Glaucoma Suspect and Glaucomatous Eyes: A Comparison of

mfVEP, FDT and SWAP

Purpose: To compare subjective and objective tests of visual function at different stages of glaucoma. Methods: Seventy-two subjects enrolled in a prospective study were evaluated with frequency doubling technology perimetry (FDT), short-wavelength automated perimetry (SWAP), and the multifocal visual evok ed potential (mfVEP) technique. The subjects were placed in the following groups based upon the results of standard achromatic perimetry (SAP): 22 eyes were classified as glaucoma suspect (GS) (normal glaucoma hemifield test (GHT) and mean deviation (MD)), 21 eyes as early glaucoma (MD < -6 dB), and 13 as moderate glaucoma (MD > -6 dB). Eyes with early or moderate glaucoma had glaucomatous optic neuropathy and abnormal GHTs and MDs on SAP. FDT was performed with the $Humphrey\ Matrix\ (24\quad -2\ program),\ SAP\ with \qquad the\ Humphrey\ Field\ Analyzer\ II\ (24\qquad -2\ program)$ program), and mfVEPs with the VERIS system using a 60 sector pattern $\,\,$ -reversal dartboard array. SWAP and FDT fields were classified as abnormal when the GHT was outside normal limits and there were 3 or more contiguous points in an hemifield of the pattern deviation plot with p<0.05. The mfVEP was considered abnormal when the interocular or monocular probability plot had 3 or more contiguous points in a hemifield with p<0.05 and at least one of these points had p<0.01. Results: In the GS group, SWAP, FDT and mfVEP tests revealed visual field abnormalities in 18%, 36% and 59% of eyes, respectively. In early glaucoma, abnormalities were noted in 70% (SWAP), 81% (FDT) and 67% (mfVEP). In moderate glaucoma, abnormalities were noted in 100% (SWAP), 100% (FDT) and 92% (mfVEP). The specificity was greater in SWAP (89%) than in FDT (75%) and mfVEP (80%). subjective and objective tests, we sugges t that a combination of one subjective (FDT or SWAP) and one objective (mfVEP) test be used for follow -up and early detection of

Conclusions: In view of the differences in detection of functional deficits between the glaucoma.