Results’ note

Yuta Suzuki

05 December, 2021






## Article information

Pupil response asymmetries of the periphery visual field in the glare illusion

Novera Istiqomah, Yuta Suzuki, Yuya Kinzuka, Minami Tetsuto, Shigeki Nakauchi

\*Corresponding author: Yuta Suzuki

## Figure 2



## Figure 3

## Results

We presented the glare illusion and halo stimuli at one out of five VF locations (i.e., upper, lower, left, right, and center). As reported previously, enhanced pupil constriction in the Center condition was observed shown in Fig.2A ((16) = -2.502, = 0.024, Cohen’s = 0.334, = 2.67)

To assess temporal component of papillary response, the early component corresponded to peak pupil constriction after stimulus onset and the late comportment which was defined by are under the curve (AUC) were calculated (see Method). In early component (Fig 3B), pupil constriction to the glare illusion was larger than control pattern as the previous analysis The two-way repeated measures ANOVA revealed a significant main effect on the pattern and VF locations ((1, 16) = 6.818, p = 0.019, = 0.299; = 4.535, (2.486, 39.775) = 4.694, p = 0.01, = 0.227, = 1.785). However, the post-hoc multiple comparisons for the VF locations showed that any pair of VF loaction did not reach the significance level (p > 0.05). There was no significant interaction between the pattern and VF locations ((2.832, 45.309) = 0.604, p = 0.606, = 0.036, = 0.171).

For the Center condition, ((16) = -2.226, = 0.041, Cohen’s = 0.303, = 1.727)

The two-way repeated measures ANOVA revealed a significant main effect on the VF location and interaction ((2.212, 35.398) = 7.779, p = 0.001, = 0.327, = 237.739; (2.92, 46.716) = 3.099, p = 0.037, = 0.162, = 1.857). The UVF produces larger pupil dilation than the left and Right VFs ((16) = 4.086, = 0.005; (16) = 3.399, = 0.011; (16) = 2.622, = 0.055; (16) = 2.357, = 0.095; (16) = 1.554, = 0.28; )

((16) = 5.518, = 0.032, = 0.256; (16) = 1.084, = 0.313, = 0.063; (16) = 1.362, = 0.26, = 0.078; (16) = 0.127, = 0.726, = 0.008 )

in line with the previous studies **(Hong et al., 2001; Sabeti et al., 2011; Tan et al., 2001; Wilhelm et al., 2000)**.

For the Center condition, ((16) = -2.016, = 0.061, Cohen’s = 0.287, = 1.264)

## Figure 3