Case Western Reserve University

The Ocular Motor System

A Quantitative Evaluation

Theodore Frohlich

EBME 318: Biomedical Engineering Laboratory I

Dr. Jonathan Jacobs

27 October 2016

***Abstract—* Quantitative infrared oculographic evaluation of horizontal pursuit can be used to study the different neural mechanisms responsible for control of the eyes. The mere fact that “the eye may be quicker than vision” insinuates the necessity for a computer-aided capturing system. Ultimately, target pursuit became less and less accurate for each subject as target velocity increased –i.e. target velocity in smooth pursuit as well as target jumping amplitudes in saccadic pursuit.**

1. **Introduction**

The intro goes here

1. **Methods**

Using a collection of equipment including computer-based high-speed digital video eye tracker, rotating chair with head stabilization, laser aimed at a 2-D mirror galvanometer system, amplifiers, and the LabVIEW data acquisition system, we conducted a series of tests of the ocular motor subsystems described in the introduction. These test were performed with two subjects across four experiments:

***Experiment I. Smooth pursuit performance.***

***Experiment II. Visual gain and ocular motor control.***

***Experiment III. Saccadic performance.***

***Experiment IV. Vestibular-ocular reflex performance and control.***

1. **Results**

The results go here


1. **Discussion**

Following from the raw lab results provided in the previous section, this section will explore the significance of these results in the context of the experiment, through the guiding questions outlined for us:

***Question 1.***

The first four trials tested the eye’s ability to maintain a smooth pursuit. For this, we used velocity parameters of 5°, 10°, 20°, and 40°/sec for the trapezoidal waveform target trajectories. Since, according to our data, the subject’s left eye is consistently closer in alignment with the target, let us single out the left eye for these analyses.

By definition, the smooth pursuit gain, G, is the ratio of eye velocity to target velocity. To perform this calculation, it was necessary to zoom in on very small windows of time in the recorded data to capture unbiased samples of the subject’s eye velocity –i.e. without saccadic interruptions.




**Fig. 1.** Horizontal smooth pursuit gain (eye velocity/target velocity) versus the four constant target velocities: 5°, 10°, 20°, and 40°/sec. Eye velocities were extracted from brief time windows in Trials 1-4, over the course of which the subject’s ability to maintain accurate smooth pursuit of linear trajectories (constituent of an overall trapezoidal waveform trajectory) became significantly more difficult as target velocity was increased.

Coincidentally, the Fig. 1 in Sharpe & Sylvester’s study, published in 1978, shows normal data expected for young as well as elderly subjects. When compared to their results, averaging from the fifteen young subjects used in their study, our results—as shown in *our* Fig. 1 and from only one subject—are very close in alignment with the expected results. The only noteworthy discrepancy occurs between the gains obtained at 40°/sec, and it can be almost entirely attributed to the fact that eye trajectory slopes were measured in separate time frames of each trial. Naturally, this introduced high amounts of variability throughout the set of velocity samples. Ideally, given more time, I could have collected a handful of eye velocity samples, then averaged them to realize a more normalized representation of smooth pursuit gain.

***Question 2.***


Just like with linear trajectories, the pursuit gain of sinusoidal trajectories can be found by taking samples near the zero crossing, where velocity reaches a peak. With peak target amplitudes of ±15° and frequencies of 0.05, 0.1, 0.5, and 1.0 hertz, as well as peak target velocities consistent with Question 1, each trial yielded clean enough results to establish a reliable smooth pursuit gain from a single sample.



**Fig. 2.** Horizontal smooth pursuit gain (eye velocity/target velocity) versus the four constant target frequencies: 0.05 Hz, 0.1 Hz, 0.5 Hz, and 1.0 Hz. These gains were calculated using samples taken from narrow time frames in Trials 5-8, surrounding the zero crossing of the target trajectory, where the peak velocity was achieved. The decrease in ability to maintain smooth pursuit is even more apparent here than it is in Fig. 1.

When assessing the differences between results from sinusoidal pursuit versus linear pursuit, it is clear that the subject had greater difficulty anticipating and following sinusoidal target trajectories. For instance, where the smooth pursuit gains at a target velocity of 20°/sec for Trial 3 (in Fig. 1) are just around 1.0, the gains obtained by the third trial of sinusoidal pursuit (i.e. Trial 7) can be seen (in Fig. 2) to be noticeably lower, and then even lower by the last trial, conducted at 1.0 Hz.

Next, for the same set of trials, the phase lag (or lead) of eye velocity relative to target velocity and its change with target frequency are shown in




**Fig. 3.** Horizontal phase lag (of eye position with respect to target position) versus the four constant target frequencies: 0.05 Hz, 0.1 Hz, 0.5 Hz, and 1.0 Hz. These delays were measured using samples taken from narrow time frames in Trials 5-8, using the zero crossing as a reference point on both the target trajectory and the eye trajectory. (Note: once again, this measurement concerns only the subject’s left eye.)

At low frequencies, the tracking was primarily *pursuit*, and it became more and more *saccadic* towards the higher frequencies. Judging by these characteristics, it appears that the frequency response of the system would initially be more sporadic if it was measured using less-predictable target motion. That said, I believe the overall response would become more homogenous as more measurements were to be made. In effect, randomizing the target’s motion would most likely produce results that do not depend as much on the independent variable here.

***Question 3.***


For the two attempts at pursuit in the dark, after the experiment, the subject *did* think that he made smooth movements. Fig. 4 illustrates this:



**Fig. 4.** Second attempt at imaginary tracking (Trial 10), in which the subject tracked his finger in the dark. Although the tracking being done here is rough in comparison to those resulting from Trials 1-8, it is clear that there is plenty of smooth pursuit present.

As pursuit in this trial is largely smooth, we can easily measure their respective velocities. For instance, the smooth pursuit velocity at the first zero crossing to the right (just past 2 seconds) is approximately 29.0 °/sec, and other (peak) pursuit velocities could be measured similarly.


Now, which the subject track better: his finger or the imagined target? When comparing the results from Trial 10 (shown in Fig. 4) to those obtained in Trial 9, it is amazing to see just how significant proprioception is for spatial awareness –the subject’s ability to *feel* and track the position of the target. Fig. 5 shows the results from Trial 9 and is illustrative in depicting how much more challenging it was for the subject to smoothly pursue an imagined target:



**Fig. 5.** First attempt at imaginary tracking (Trial 9), in which the subject tracked an imagined target in the dark. Clearly riddled with saccades, this trial is especially illustrative in showing the importance of proprioception in establishing and maintaining smooth pursuit.

***Question 4.***

For the experiment using the feedback of eye position to move the target, the level of *external negative* feedback gain that was necessary to sustain saccadic oscillations was most closely achieved in Trial 18, in which the negative feedback gain was 1.0.




**Fig. 6.** Saccadic oscillations achieved in Trial 18 using an external negative feedback gain of 1.0. Although only sustained for a couple seconds, this is trial exhibits the longest-sustained saccadic oscillations across all five trials using negative feedback. For instance, Trial 17 exhibited only half the number of oscillations, and Trial 16 exhibited half of that. On the other hand, Trials 19 and 20 exhibited no sustained saccadic oscillations.

With regard to what is theoretically expected here, this observation is very close. Since there is intrinsically an internal feedback gain of -1, the external negative feedback gain, A, that would be necessary for achieving a total feedback gain of zero, would theoretically have to be 1, such that

Although the results in Fig. 6 do not show perfectly sustained saccadic oscillations, these are perhaps the closest experimental results one could obtain from a single trial with a single subject. Of course, what might account for discrepancies could be the subject’s use of corrective anticipation when tracking the target.

***Question 5.***

For the saccadic tests, let us begin by taking a closer look into the ocular motor system (OMS) response when subjected to two rapid jumps in target position, shown and annotated in Fig. 7.



**Fig. 7.** OMS response to two back-to-back target jumps in the saccadic tests. The target data is annotated with the delay of the second target jump (T), and annotations for the right eye—ignoring the left—include the following: amplitude of the first saccade (a1), amplitude of the second saccade (a2), latency of the second saccade (t2), and intersaccadic interval (ISI).

Now, to evaluate these parameters, the saccade pairs can be sorted into each of the eleven different target delays tested in this trial: . With this done, the means for all of the above four parameters (, , , and ) were able to be computed. These results are provided in Table 1 of the appendix.

Additionally, these parameters can be graphically shown against the eleven different target delays: the next two figures portray the mean values of and versus and then and versus , respectively.

FIGURE

**Fig. 8.** Caption

Paragraph

FIGURE

**Fig. 9.** Caption

Paragraph

***Question 6.***

A

***Question 7.***

A

1. **Conclusion**

The conclusion goes here

**Appendix**

**Table 1**

**Acknowledgement**

I would like to take a moment to thank Dr. Jacobs for the opportunity to participate in such a fascinating experiment! Being allowed to use the array of state-of-the-art equipment in the Daroff-Dell’Osso Ocular Motility Laboratory (OMLAB) was especially fun and memorable.

**References**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [1] | L. A. Abel, D. Schmidt, L. F. Dell'Osso and R. B. Daroff, "Saccadic system plasticity in humans," *Annals of NeuroIogy,* vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 313-318, October 1978. |
| [2] | J. A. Sharpe and T. O. Sylvester, "Effect of aging on horizontal smooth pursuit," *Investigative Ophthalmology and Visual Science,* vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 465-480, May 1978. |