

Kenneth J. Ciuffreda, O.D., Ph.D., Diana Ludlam, B.S., COVT,
Preethi Thiagarajan, B.S. Optm., M.S.

Oculomotor diagnostic protocol for the mTBI population

There is an ever-increasing awareness and visibility of the medical condition traumatic brain injury (TBI) in the United States. This is especially true in light of recent military conflicts¹ and professional football league probes of players' concussions.² However, despite such heightened sensitivity to this serious and pervasive problem, in particular with regard to the diagnosis of the many associated visual sequelae, there remains hesitation and a degree of uncertainty related to many aspects of its visual diagnosis and hence its subsequent treatment and remediation. For example, there is uncertainty and lack of clarity regarding what constitutes an optimal visual oculomotor diagnostic test protocol.

We receive queries on a weekly basis requesting assistance with the visually related aspects of TBI, in particular the "mild" form (mTBI). These requests for guidance come from Veteran's Affairs (VA) hospitals, medical practices, occupational therapists, and some optometric practices. Most of those requesting guidance and assistance perceive mTBI patients, with their constellation of related vision and non-vision dysfunctions, to represent something very "different," "special," and even a bit "perplexing," when compared to the typical patient having a basic oculomotor dysfunction (OMD; ICD-9-CM: 794.14) and/or accommodative insufficiency (AI; ICD-9-CM: 376.5) in the absence of any other medical condition. Those who inquire are often stymied and do not know where to start with these patients. Furthermore, some of these clinical conceptualizations have

been veiled in language and related concepts that have perplexed and confused the novice and even the seasoned optometric practitioner. For the most part, this is a misperception.

As previously mentioned, mTBI does create a constellation of basic vision, oculomotor, and related problems³ (see Table 1). However, given the fact that 3 of the 12 cranial nerves (CN) deal directly with fine oculomotor control (CN III, IV, and VI) and a fourth (CN VIII) deals with the vestibular system and its interactions with vision (e.g., vision vestibular neuromotor interactions related to both the versional and vergence systems), it is not surprising that oculomotor problems are prominent. For example, convergence insufficiency,⁴ accommodative insufficiency,⁴ and saccadic dysmetria (i.e., saccadic inaccuracy)^{5,6} are the most frequent oculomotor deficits found in the visually symptomatic mTBI clinic population, with 90% having a diagnosed oculomotor dysfunction.⁴ These are the same oculomotor deficiencies/diagnoses found in the typical, non-mTBI, OMD and/or deficient accommodation patient.^{7,8}

Given this information, we have a "model" of this patient. We think of the mTBI patient as having 3 levels of problems. First, we conceptualize the mTBI patient as having the same, or at least similar, oculomotor deficits as OMD, typically with an accommodative component that can be readily remediated with conventional optometric vision therapy.^{8,9} Second, they are perceived to be more complicated because of the "overlay" of other



Kenneth J. Ciuffreda, O.D., Ph.D.

problems related to the mTBI in general. These include poor attention, short-term memory lapses, behavioral problems, and general/ocular fatigue, to name a few.^{3,6} Medications may have undesirable side effects as well.¹⁰ Third, there are other vision-related conditions that may make these patients appear to be more challenging, but they too can be remediated using one's basic optometric armamentarium. These additional visual conditions may include photosensitivity,^{11,12} motion sensitivity,¹³ vestibular dysfunctions,¹⁴ visual field defects,¹⁵ and spatial mislocalization.¹⁶ However, these can be easily and effectively managed using tints,³ binasal occlusion,³ vestibular training,^{6,14} field-enhancing prisms,¹⁵ and yoked prisms,^{16,17} respectively. These concurrent issues

Table 1 Oculomotor and visual symptoms in a mild traumatic brain injury (adapted from Ciuffreda et al., 2009)

- Oculomotor-based reading difficulties (*the most common symptom*)
- Eye-tracking problems
- Difficulty with global scanning
- Eye-focusing problems
- Avoidance of near tasks
- Eye strain
- Diplopia
- Dizziness
- Vertigo
- Vision-derived nausea
- Increased sensitivity to visual motion
- Photosensitivity
- Visual inattention and distractibility
- Short-term visual memory loss
- Difficulty judging distances (relative and absolute)
- Inability to interact/cope visually in a complex social situation (e.g., minimal eye contact)
- Inability to tolerate complex visual environments (e.g., grocery store aisles, crowds, and highly patterned floors)

can indeed make patient management more difficult, but still quite doable.

Thus, based on our recent studies on vergence^{18,19} and accommodation,^{20,21} as well as our earlier research on vision and reading,^{5,22} we propose the following parameters to be diagnostically important in each area to be tested

in the mTBI population (*see Table 2*). These clinic oculomotor and accommodative parameters were found to be present with a very high frequency of occurrence in this population. Thus, they will result in the highest yield (i.e., few false positives) and be of greatest clinical predictive value. In

addition, when available, the objectively based and automated Visagraph eye movement recording system²³ should be used to assess reading ability and visual efficiency, as reading difficulty is the most common symptom in the mTBI population (*see Table 1*).^{4,24-26}

With the above proposed diagnostic protocol, and related OMD and AI categorizations, the next critical step can be taken, namely therapeutic intervention (e.g., optometric vision therapy).^{8,9} The targeted diagnostic test battery should also serve to guide intervention with respect to those oculomotor and accommodative aspects exhibiting the most deficiency. This therapy has been well documented in the literature using both objective recording techniques to assess oculomotor and accommodative system responsivity following therapeutic intervention⁹ and more formal clinical trials.²⁷

In conclusion, we have presented a clear and simple perspective with respect to vision management for the mTBI population. This includes a targeted and comprehensive oculomotor and accommodative diagnostic clinical test protocol. For the most part, the patient should not be approached as “special,” but rather simply a more challenging and extreme case of OMD and AI for the contemporary, full-scope optometrist.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Irwin B. Suchoff, O.D., for his many helpful comments and critical review of our manuscript.

References

1. Warden D. Mild TBI during the Iraq and Afghanistan wars. *J Head Trauma Rehabil* 2006;21:398-402.
2. Casson IR, Pellman EJ, Viano DC. Concussion in the National Football League: an overview for neurologists. *Phys Med Rehabil Clin N Am* 2009;20:195-214.
3. Ciuffreda KJ, Ludlam DP, Kapoor N. Clinical oculomotor training in traumatic brain injury. *Optom Vis Dev* 2009;40:16-23.

Table 2 Targeted clinical oculomotor parameters

Vergence

- NPC break (especially with repetition)
- NPC recovery (especially with repetition)
- PRV break
- PRV recovery
- Vergence facility (prism flipper baseline)
- Vergence facility (prism flipper fatigue)
- Horizontal near dissociated phoria
- AC/A ratio
- Fixation disparity at near
- Associated phoria at near
- Stereoacuity (per its relation to vergence error)

Accommodation

- Accommodative amplitude
- Accommodative facility (lens flipper fatigue)
- PRA/NRA

Version

- Fixational stability
- Saccadic accuracy
- Pursuit accuracy
- DEM

NPC = near point of convergence; PRV = positive relative vergence; AC/A = accommodative convergence to accommodation ratio; PRA = positive relative accommodation; NRA = negative relative accommodation; DEM = Developmental Eye Movement test.

4. Ciuffreda KJ, Kapoor N, Rutner D, et al. Occurrence of oculomotor dysfunctions in acquired brain injury: a retrospective analysis. *Optometry* 2007;78:155-61.
5. Kapoor N, Ciuffreda KJ, Han Y. Oculomotor rehabilitation in acquired brain injury: a case series. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2004;85:1667-78.
6. Suchoff IB, Ciuffreda KJ, Kapoor N. *Visual and vestibular consequences of acquired brain injuries*. Santa Ana, CA: Optometric Extension Program Foundation, 2001.
7. Cooper JS, Burns CR, Cotter SA, et al. *Optometric clinical practice guideline. Care of the patient with accommodative and vergence dysfunction*. St. Louis, MO: American Optometric Association, 1998.
8. Scheiman M, Wick B. *Clinical Management of Binocular Vision*, 3rd ed. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott, 2008.
9. Ciuffreda KJ. The scientific basis for and efficacy of optometric vision therapy in nonstrabismic accommodative and vergence disorders. *Optometry* 2002;73:735-62.
10. Han MH, Craig SB, Rutner D, et al. Medications prescribed to brain injury patients: a retrospective analysis. *Optometry* 2008;79:252-8.
11. Chang TT, Ciuffreda KJ, Kapoor N. Critical flicker frequency and related symptoms in mild traumatic brain injury. *Brain Inj* 2007; 21:1055-62.
12. Schrupp LE, Ciuffreda KJ, Kapoor N. Foveal versus eccentric retinal critical flicker frequency in mild traumatic brain injury. *Optometry* 2009;80:642-50.
13. Patel R, Ciuffreda KJ, Tannen B, et al. Elevated coherent motion thresholds in mild traumatic brain injury. *Optometry*, in press.
14. Winkler PA, Ciuffreda KJ. Ocular fixation, vestibular dysfunction, and visual motion hypersensitivity. *Optometry* 2009;80:502-12.
15. Suchoff IB, Kapoor N, Ciuffreda KJ, et al. The frequency of occurrence, types, and characteristics of visual field defects in acquired brain injury: a retrospective analysis. *Optometry* 2008;79:259-65.
16. Ciuffreda KJ, Ludlam DP. Egocentric localization: normal and abnormal aspects, Suter P and Harvey L (eds), *Vision rehabilitation: multidisciplinary care of the patient following brain injury*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, in press.
17. Suchoff IB, Ciuffreda KJ. A primer for the optometric management of unilateral spatial inattention. *Optometry* 2004;75:305-18.
18. Szymanowicz D, Thiagarajan P, Ciuffreda KJ, et al. *Vergence dynamics in mild traumatic brain injury*. Fort Lauderdale, FL: Association for Research in Vision and Ophthalmology (ARVO), 2009:Abstract 2891, Vol 50.
19. Szymanowicz D, Thiagarajan P, Ciuffreda KJ, et al. Vergence in mild traumatic brain injury. *J Rehabil Res Dev*, submitted.
20. Green W, Ciuffreda KJ, Thiagarajan P, et al. Accommodation in mild traumatic brain injury. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2010;47:183-99.
21. Green W, Ciuffreda KJ, Thiagarajan P, et al. Static and dynamic aspects of accommodation in mild traumatic brain injury: a review. *Optometry* 2010;81:129-36.
22. Ciuffreda KJ, Han Y, Kapoor N, et al. Oculomotor rehabilitation for reading in acquired brain injury. *Neurorehabilitation* 2006;21: 9-21.
23. Ciuffreda MA, Ciuffreda KJ, Santos D. Visagraph: baseline analysis and procedural guidelines. *J Behav Optom* 2003;14:60-4.
24. Stelmack JA, Frith T, Koevering DV, et al. Visual function in patients followed at a Veterans Affairs polytrauma network site: An electronic medical record review. *Optometry* 2009;80:419-24.
25. Lew HL, Poole JH, Vanderploeg RD, et al. Program development and defining characteristics of returning military in a VA Polytrauma Network Site. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2007;44:1027-34.
26. Cockerham GC, Goodrich GL, Weichel ED, et al. Eye and visual function in traumatic brain injury. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2009;46: 811-8.
27. Scheiman M, Mitchell GL, Cotter S, et al. A randomized clinical trial of vision therapy/orthoptics versus pencil pushups for the treatment of convergence insufficiency in young adults. *Optom Vis Sci* 2005;82:583-95.

Corresponding author:

Kenneth J. Ciuffreda, O.D., Ph.D.,
State University of New York/
State College of Optometry
New York, New York