Supplementary Online Content

Korevaar DA, Cohen JF, de Ronde MWJ, Virgili G, Dickersin K, Bossuyt PMM. Reporting weaknesses in conference abstracts of diagnostic accuracy studies in ophthalmology. *JAMA Ophthalmol*. Published online October 8, 2015. doi:10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2015.3577.

This supplementary material has been provided by the authors to give readers additional information about their work.

eTable 1. Search Strategy and Search Results

Searches were performed at http://www.iovs.org/search.dtl?arvomtgsearch=true in January 2015.

In total, 6310 abstracts were accepted at ARVO 2010.

#	Search term	Search results
1	diagnostic accuracy (all)	26
2	sensitivity specificity (all)	91
3	sensitivity specific (all)	49
4	sensitive specificity (all)	12
5	sensitive specific (all)	46
6	“true positive rate” (all)	1
7	“false positive rate” (all)	4
8	“true positive ratio” (all)	1
9	“false positive ratio” (all)	1
10	“true positive fraction” (all)	0
11	“false positive fraction” (all)	0
12	TPR FPR TPF FPF (any)	0
13	“predictive value” (all)	25
14	“predictive values” (all)	8
15	PPV NPV (all)	6
16	“likelihood ratio” (all)	2
17	“likelihood ratios” (all)	2
18	“diagnostic odds ratio” (all)	0
19	“diagnostic odds ratios” (all)	0
20	DOR (all)	0
21	AUC ROC AUROC AUCROC (any)	76
22	“AUC-ROC” (all)	0
23	“receiver operating” (all)	34
24	“receiver operator” (all)	7
25	“c statistic” (all)	0
26	“c index” (all)	2
27	youden (all)	0
28	“diagnostic performance” (all)	18
29	“diagnostic ability” (all)	11
30	“discriminative ability” (all)	3
31	“gold standard” (all)	30
32	“reference standard” (all)	9
33	“reference test” (all)	2
34	“index test” (all)	0
	Results before deduplication	**466**
	Results after deduplication	**271**
	Abstracts of diagnostic accuracy studies included	**126**

eTable 2. Guidance on the Interpretation of Items

Checklist item		Guidance for scoring
TITLE		
1.	Identify the article as a study of diagnostic accuracy in title	1 point if “diagnostic accuracy” or “accuracy” or ”diagnostic” or “diagnosis” or “screening” or any measure of diagnostic accuracy (e.g. sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value etc.) is reported in the title
BACKGROUND AND AIMS		
2.	Rationale for study / background	1 point if at least one sentence on the rationale regarding the diagnostic accuracy part of the study is reported
3.	Research question / aims / objectives	1 point if at least one sentence on the diagnostic accuracy part of the study is reported; terms such as the following suffice if they directly relate to the diagnostic accuracy measures found in the abstract: detection, screening, classification, differentiation, discrimination, identification, prediction, or any measure of accuracy
METHODS		
4.	Study population (at least one of following)	1 point if at least 1 point on the following 4 sub-items:
	a – Inclusion / exclusion criteria	*1 point if at least age, and presenting signs, symptoms or conditions is reported. A sentence such as “patients suspected of [target condition]” also suffices*
	b – Clinical setting	*1 point if the name of the department or hospital is reported, or if it is reported that the study took place in a screening, primary, secondary or tertiary care setting*
	c – Number of centres	*1 point if it is at least clear whether the study took place in one centre or in more than one centre (“multicentre”)*
	d – Study location	*1 point if at least a city or country is reported*
5.	Recruitment dates	1 point if at least the year is reported
6.	Sampling (consecutive vs. random sample)	1 point if explicitly reported, or very clear from the reported information
7.	Data collection (prospective vs. retrospective)	1 point if explicitly reported, or if it was stated that written consent was obtained from each included participant
8.	Study design (case-control vs. cohort)	1 point if “two-gate”, “multiple-gate”, “single-gate”, “one-gate”, “cohort study” or any related term is used; 1 point if the words “control” or “healthy volunteers” or “normal patients” are used in addition to a group with the target condition; 1 point if patients are explicitly reported based on a single set of inclusion criteria
9.	Reference standard	1 point if generic name is provided (e.g. urine culture, colonoscopy); there is no need for details
10.	Information on the index test under evaluation (at least one of following)	1 point if at least 1 point on the following 3 sub-items:
	a – Index test	*1 point if the generic name is reported*
	b – Technical specifications and/or commercial name	*1 point if the name of the device or commercial kit or machine or imaging sequence is reported;*

		in case of a panel of biomarkers, 1 point if the specific names of the biomarkers were reported
	c –Cut-offs or categories of results of index test	*1 point if at least some information on cut-offs or categories is reported*
11.	Whether test readers were masked (at least one of following)	1 point if at least 1 point on the following 2 sub-items:
	a – When interpreting the index test	*1 point if the interpretation of the index test was explicitly masked to the result of the reference standard*
	b – When interpreting the reference standard	*1 point if the interpretation of the reference standard was explicitly masked to the result of the index test*
RESULTS		
12.	Study participants (at least one of following)	1 point if at least 1 point on the following 3 sub-items:
	a – Number of participants	*1 point if number of study participants is reported; 0 points if number of samples, eyes or photos is reported but it is unclear from how many participants they were derived*
	b – Age of participants	*1 point if mean or median age, or age range is reported*
	c – Gender of participants	*1 point if proportion of males/females is reported*
13.	Information on indeterminate results / missing values	1 point if at least some information on indeterminate or missing results is provided
14.	Disease prevalence	1 point if the number or % of participants with the target condition is reported
15.	2x2 table	1 point if numbers from 2x2 table are explicitly reported; for continuous tests that only report an AUC-ROC, 1 point if distribution of test results by results of the reference standard is reported; 0 points for continuous tests that report sensitivity and specificity without providing a 2x2 table at a specific threshold (even when also reporting AUC-ROC)
16.	Estimates of diagnostic accuracy (at least one of following)	1 point if at least 1 point on the following 6 sub-items:
	a – Sensitivity and/or specificity	*1 point if a numeric estimate of sensitivity and/or specificity is reported*
	b – Negative and/or positive predictive value	*1 point if a numeric estimate of predictive values is reported*
	c – Negative and/or positive likelihood ratio	*1 point if a numeric estimate of likelihood ratios is reported*
	d – Area under the ROC curve / C-statistic	*1 point if a numeric estimate of AUC ROC or C-index is reported*
	e – Diagnostic odds ratio	*1 point if a numeric estimate of diagnostic odds ratios is reported*
	f – Accuracy	*1 point if a numeric estimate of accuracy is reported*
17.	95% Confidence intervals around estimates of diagnostic accuracy	1 point if at least one 95% Confidence Interval is reported
18.	Reproducibility of the results of the index test under evaluation	1 point if agreement or any kappa coefficient is calculated, if raw inter-observer variability is reported (e.g. range of accuracy across readers), or coefficients of variation (test-retest reliability)
DISCUSSION / CONCLUSION		

19.	Discussion of diagnostic accuracy results	1 point if at least one or more specific accuracy estimates are discussed (e.g. “had high specificity”), or when general terms are used to discuss the diagnostic accuracy of the test (e.g. “was able to distinguish”) or if a remark on the applicability of the test in clinical practice is made (e.g. “is useful”)
20.	Implications for future research	1 point if at least one recommendation or perspective for future research is provided
21.	Limitation of study	1 point if at least one limitation is discussed

eTable 3. Examples of Complete Reporting of Items Among ARVO Abstracts

Checklist item		Examples of complete reporting
TITLE		
1.	Identify the article as a study of diagnostic accuracy in title	"**Diagnostic Performance** of Novel Morphological Parameters for the **Screening** of Narrow Angles"[1]
BACKGROUND AND AIMS		
2.	Rationale for study / background	"CMV retinitis is a treatable infection of the retina in patients with AIDS. It is a leading cause of blindness in areas of the world most affected by the AIDS epidemic. Early recognition of CMV retinitis is key to saving vision, but ophthalmologists trained for this purpose are often in short supply in the hardest hit areas"[2]
3.	Research question / aims / objectives	"The **purpose** of this study was to evaluate whether the **diagnostic performance** of a novel, global test for dry eye disease (TearLab™ osmolarity) was improved by the addition of markers specific for aqueous deficient or evaporative dry eye"[3]
METHODS		
4.	Study population (at least one of following)	
	a – Inclusion / exclusion criteria	"Inclusion criteria for glaucoma patients were: POAG, IOP > 21mmHg, best-corrected visual acuity of 20/40 or better, spherical equivalent within 5.0 D, = 40 years of age, 2 consecutive abnormal and reliable visual fields. Inclusion criteria for healthy individuals were: IOP < 21 mmHg, best-corrected visual acuity of 20/40 or better, spherical equivalent within 5.0 D, = 40 years of age, 2 consecutive and reliable normal visual fields, open angle on gonioscopy"[4]
	b – Clinical setting	"Forty-eight patients with open-angle glaucoma who were examined in the **glaucoma clinic of Teikyo University School of Medicine Hospital** from July 2008 to September 2009 were studied"[5]
	c – Number of centres	"One-hundred and forty-two from a planned 320 participants have been recruited and tested in a **four centre study** of perimetry instruments (mean age=59, range [18, 83] years)"[6]
	d – Study location	"148 subjects were recruited from glaucoma clinics in **Singapore** with diagnoses of primary angle closure and angle closure glaucoma"[7]
5.	Recruitment dates	"All cases of presumed postoperative endophthalmitis from **2002 to 2008** at a teaching-hospital were included"[8]
6.	Sampling (consecutive vs. random sample)	"Participants, **consecutively** enrolled from January 2009 to June 2009, underwent Stratus OCT (fast RNFL scan, Carl Zeiss Meditec, Dublin, CA) and RTVue OCT (ONH scan and GCC scan, Optovue Inc, Fremont, CA) during the same visit"[9]
7.	Data collection (prospective vs. retrospective)	"In this **prospective** observational study, consecutive subjects recruited from a glaucoma clinic underwent gonioscopy by a single glaucoma specialis"[10]
8.	Study design (case-control vs. cohort)	"60 eyes from 60 **normal subjects** and 63 eyes from 63 **glaucoma patients** attending our institute, were enrolled"[11]
9.	Reference standard	"SITA 24-2 visual field loss (PSD and MD p<5% and

		Glaucoma Hemifield Test outside normal limits) on two consecutive visual fields was used as reference test to define glaucoma patients"[11]
10.	Information on the index test under evaluation (at least one of following)	
	a – Index test	"To compare diagnostic ability in glaucoma detection between **retinal nerve fiber layer (RNFL) thickness measurements obtained by spectral domain optical coherence tomography (OCT) and time domain OCT**"[12]
	b – Technical specifications and/or commercial name	"The participants were imaged with both SD-OCT (**Spectralis; Heidelberg Engineering, Heidelberg, Germany**) and TD-OCT (**Stratus; Carl Zeiss Meditec, Inc., Dublin, CA**) on the same day, and tested with Standard Automated Perimetry (SAP) (**Humphrey Field Analyzer II with Swedish Interactive Thresholding Algorithm [SITA]; Carl Zeiss Meditec, Inc.**) within an interval of one month"[13]
	c –Cut-offs or categories of results of index test	"Ischemic index values ranged from 0.1% to 30%. **An ischemic index of 7%** was 100% sensitive and 83% specific for the presence of neovascularization and 50% sensitive and 100% specific for macular edema"[14]
11.	Whether test readers were masked (at least one of following)	
	a – When interpreting the index test	"EyeCam (Clarity Medical System, Pleasanton, CA) and goniophotography (Topcon Corporation, Tokyo, Japan) were performed in all quadrants of one randomly selected eye and the images were evaluated in a random sequence on different days **by a single observer, masked to clinical findings**"[10]
	b – When interpreting the reference standard	"All clinical measurements were performed by **one experienced clinician who was masked with respect to the measurements performed with the noninvasive methods**, which included dynamic-area high speed videokeratoscopy (HSV), dynamic wavefront sensing (DWS), and lateral shearing interferometry (LSI)"[15]
RESULTS		
12.	Study participants (at least one of following)	
	a – Number of participants	"We examined 30 eyes of **16 patients** with glaucoma (12 POAG, 2 pigment dispersion, 2 PEX, mean MD -4.2±6.5, age 62±6 yrs) and 29 eyes of **17 normal subjects** (age 56±6 yrs, mean MD 1.2±1.4)"[16]
	b – Age of participants	"We examined 30 eyes of 16 patients with glaucoma (12 POAG, 2 pigment dispersion, 2 PEX, mean MD -4.2±6.5, **age 62±6 yrs**) and 29 eyes of 17 normal subjects (**age 56±6 yrs**, mean MD 1.2±1.4)"[16]
	c – Gender of participants	"117 HD-OCT images from 73 subjects (47 female, 26 male) were used for analysis"[17]
13.	Information on indeterminate results / missing values	"From 1.1996 till 12.2009, **146 enucleations were performed** in our institution. **UBM information was available in 18 cases**"[18]
14.	Disease prevalence	"Nine glaucoma patients were identified (**prevalence of 6.5%**)"[19]

15.	2x2 table	"The *Full Grid method* produced **18 FP, 21 FN, 269 TP and 463 TN** resulting in 92.8% sensitivity, 96.3% specificity and 5% suspects (28 AMD and 13 normals)"[20]
16.	Estimates of diagnostic accuracy (at least one of following)	
	a – Sensitivity and/or specificity	"Punch biopsy showed the following indicators: **Sensibility: 90%; Specificity: 91%**; Positive predictive value: 96%; Negative predictive value: 77%"[21]
	b – Negative and/or positive predictive value	"The **PPV was 5.2%, the NPV 98.9%**"[22]
	c – Negative and/or positive likelihood ratio	"The GDx GPA detected 17 of these eyes (sensitivity 41%, **positive likelihood ratio [LR] 6.9**) and the HRT TCA detected 11 (sensitivity 26%, **positive LR 2.6**)"[23]
	d – Area under the ROC curve / C-statistic	"The FD-OCT parameter GCC thickness showed **AUROCs** 0.93 to 0.95 and sensitivities at 95% specificity 75% to 81%"[12]
	e – Diagnostic odds ratio	"Statistical analysis demonstrated an **odds ratio of 9.71 (95% CI: 3.72-25.40)** for glaucomatous disease if a RAPD was present, with a sensitivity of 66.7% and a specificity of 82.9%"[24]
	f – Accuracy	"Our proposed algorithm achieved a **mean accuracy level of 86.6% (*S.D.*=5.9)** in detecting OD, 87.1% *(S.D.*=6.5) in detecting OD-plus-PPA and 73.5% *(S.D.*=12.8) in detecting PPA" [25]
17.	95% Confidence intervals around estimates of diagnostic accuracy	"Digital fundus photographs were found to have a sensitivity, specificity, **positive predictive value and negative predictive value** of 83.75% (95% CI 75.04, 82.43), 93.88% (95% CI 88.62, 99.13), **91.78% (95% CI 84.80, 98,77) and 87.62 (95% CI 80.84, 94.40)**, respectively, for detecting any retinopathy"[26]
18.	Reproducibility of the results of the index test under evaluation	"Intra-rater reliability was high, with kappas for each grader ranging from 0.93 to 0.96"[2]
DISCUSSION / CONCLUSION		
19.	Discussion of diagnostic accuracy results	"Pediatric ophthalmology fellows in this study generally demonstrated **high diagnostic specificity** in image-based ROP diagnosis. However, **diagnostic sensitivity was lower**, particularly for clinically-significant levels of disease"[27]
20.	Implications for future research	"**Further prospective multi-centered clinical studies would be necessary** to better delineate the utility of this method in the precise categorization of retinoblastoma anterior extension"[18]
21.	Limitation of study	"**Although our series encompasses only a limited number of cases**, the sensitivity and specificity of UBM in the assessment of retinoblastoma anterior extension is interesting"[18]

References with eTable 3:

(1) Tan GS, Li J, He M, Sakata L, Friedman DS, Aung T. Diagnostic Performance of Novel Morphological Parameters for the Screening of Narrow Angles. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:5529.

(2) Skalet AH, Ausayakhun S, Ausayakhun S et al. Telemedicine for Cytomegalovirus (CMV) Retinitis. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:4851.

(3) Sullivan BD, Eldridge DC, Berg M et al. Diagnostic Performance of Osmolarity Combined With Subset Markers of Dry Eye Disease in an Unstratified Patient Population. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:3380.
(4) Costa VP, Vidotti VG, Resende GM et al. Sensitivity and Specificity of Machine Learning Classifiers and Spectral Domain OCT for the Diagnosis of Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:227.
(5) Kawai S, Shimizu S, Shinoda K, Suzuki Y, Mizota A. Sensitivity and Specificity of Spectral-Domain Optical Coherence Tomography. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:244.
(6) Bergin C, Sinapis D, Sinapis A et al. Perimetry Instrument Comparison Study: Comparing the 'Screening' Strategies of Three Perimetry Devices to Discriminate Between Healthy and 'Glaucomatous' Eyes (Interim Results). *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:5508.
(7) Zheng C, Kwoh C, Aquino MD et al. Comparing Machine Learning Classifier for Diagnosing Different Angle Closure Mechanisms from Anterior Segment Optical Coherence Tomography Imaging. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:5542.
(8) Melo GB, Bispo PJM, Regatieri CVS, Yu MCZ, Pignatari ACC, Hofling-Lima AL. Incidence of Endophthalmitis After Cataract Surgery and the Use of Real-Time PCR for Its Diagnosis. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:6053.
(9) Kim J, Kim N, Lee E et al. Comparing the Ganglion Cell Complex and Retinal Nerve Fiber Layer Measurements by Fourier Domain Optical Coherence Tomography to Detect Glaucoma in High Myopia. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:237.
(10) Mani B, Perera SA, Tun TA, Aung T. Diagnostic Performance of Goniophotography and EyeCam for Angle Closure. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:5528.
(11) Michelessi M, Oddone F, Centofanti M et al. Ganglion Cell Complex Analysis With Fourier-Domain OCT: Reproducibility and Diagnostic Accuracy in Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:238.
(12) Benatti E, Verga F, Bochicchio S et al. Evaluation of Retinal Nerve Fiber Layer Thickness Measurements for Glaucoma Detection: Time Domain vs Spectral Domain Optical Coherence Tomography. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:247.
(13) Tavares IM, Kara-Jose A, Barbosa DVC et al. Retinal Nerve Fiber Layer Thickness and Visual Sensitivity Using Spectral-Domain and Time-Domain Optical Coherence Tomography. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:4923.
(14) Prasad P, Tsui I, Heilweil G, Hubschman JP, Schwartz SD. Ischemic Index for the Quantification of Retinal Non-Perfusion in Branch Retinal Vein Occlusion. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:285.
(15) Iskander D, Szczesna DH, Alonso-Caneiro D, Read SA, Collins MJ. Predicting Dry Eye With Noninvasive Techniques of Tear Film Surface Assessment. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:3370.
(16) Bach M, Preiser D, Poloschek CM. Comparison of Pattern-ERG (PERG) and Photopic Negative Response (PhNR) in Glaucoma Suggests Differential Damage Mechanisms. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:5793.
(17) Aung T, Zheng C, Ho CL et al. Novel Anterior Chamber Angle Measurements With High Definition Optical Coherence Tomography Using the Schwalbe's Line as the Landmark. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:3855.
(18) Moulin AP, Gaillard MC, Balmer A, Munier FL. Ultrasound Biomicroscopy Evaluation of Anterior Extension of Retinoblastomas : A Clinico-Pathological Study. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:2075.
(19) Andersson S, Bizios D, Heijl A, Bengtsson BM. Glaucoma Detection With the Stratus and Cirrus OCT in a Population Based Sample. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:222.
(20) Smolek MK, Lebow K, Notaroberto N, Pallikaris A, Vujosevic S. Neural Network Algorithms for a Device to Measure Macular Visual Sensitivity. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:3550.
(21) Carneiro RC, Macedo EMS, Matayoshi S. Punch Biopsy: Effective Diagnostic Test for Detection of Periocular Malignancy ? *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:3516.
(22) Barleon L, Deters C, Hoffmann EM et al. EDMAGS (Evonik-Degussa-Mainz-Glaucoma-Study) IV: The Glaucoma Probability Score of the Heidelberg Retina Tomograph (HRT 3.0) as a Screening Unit for Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:2722.

(23) Alencar LM, Balasubramaniam M, Bowd C et al. Comparison of the GDx GPA and the HRT TCA for Detection of Glaucomatous Progression. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:4011.
(24) Charalel RA, Lin H, Singh K. Glaucoma Screening Using Relative Afferent Pupillary Defect. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:183.
(25) Laude A, Lu CK, Tang TB et al. Boundary Detection of Optic Disc and Parapapillary Atrophy From Color Fundus Images Using Dual-Channel Color Morphology and Snakes. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:1800.
(26) Ramirez C, Acosta C, Palacio JM, Sanchez JG, Zuluaga LM, Bareno J. Effectiveness of Screening for Diabetic Retinopathy With Non-Mydriatic Camera in Latino Population. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:4679.
(27) Myung JS, Granet DB, Williams SL et al. Accuracy of Retinopathy of Prematurity Diagnosis by Pediatric Ophthalmology Fellows. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:5924.

eReferences. List of Included Abstracts (n=126)

(1) Agurto Rios C, Murray V, Barriga S, Pattichis MS, Bauman WC, Soliz P. Automatic Classification of Diabetic Retinopathy Photographs Using Am-Fm. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:1795.

(2) Ahn ES, Lowder CY, Culver DA. The Use of Chest Computerized Tomography in the Evaluation of Uveitis. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:3778.

(3) Ajtony C, Fustos R, Bernad Z, Biro Z, Mezosi E, Doczi T. Visual Recovery After Surgical Treatment of Chiasmal Compressive Optic Neuropathy. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:1447.

(4) Alencar LM, Balasubramaniam M, Bowd C, Weinreb RN, Zangwill LM, Sample PA et al. Comparison of the GDx GPA and the HRT TCA for Detection of Glaucomatous Progression. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4011.

(5) Anand A, De Moraes CG, Liebmann JM, Ritch R, Tello C. Short-Duration Visual Evoked Potential as an Objective Tool for Screening Refractive Errors. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:3279.

(6) Andersson S, Bizios D, Heijl A, Bengtsson BM. Glaucoma Detection With the Stratus and Cirrus OCT in a Population Based Sample. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:222.

(7) Aung T, Zheng C, Ho CL, Tun TA, Kumar RS, Wong TY et al. Novel Anterior Chamber Angle Measurements With High Definition Optical Coherence Tomography Using the Schwalbe's Line as the Landmark. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:3855.

(8) Bach M, Preiser D, Poloschek CM. Comparison of Pattern-ERG (PERG) and Photopic Negative Response (PhNR) in Glaucoma Suggests Differential Damage Mechanisms. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5793.

(9) Baker KC, Chen YL, Shi L, Lewis JWL, Kugler L, Wang M. Does the Posterior Corneal Elevation Provide the First Indication of Keratoconus? *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4963.

(10) Balasubramanian M, Bowd C, Kriegman DJ, Weinreb RN, Sample PA, Zangwill LM. Detecting Glaucomatous Changes Using Only One Optic Nerve Head Scan Per Exam. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2723.

(11) Baleanu D, Tornow RP, Horn FK, Laemmer R, Kruse FE, Mardin CY. Comparison of Retinal Nerve Fiber Layer Thickness Measurements and Diagnostic Accuracy Between Spectral Domain and Time Domain Optical Coherence Tomography. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:251.

(12) Baranano AE, Keane PA, Walsh AC, Sadda SR. Impact of Scanning Density on Qualitative Assessments From Spectral Domain Optical Coherence Tomography in Neovascular Age-Related Macular Degeneration. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2281.

(13) Barleon L, Deters C, Hoffmann EM, Wahl J, Morfeld P, Lichtmess A et al. EDMAGS (Evonik-Degussa-Mainz-Glaucoma-Study) IV: The Glaucoma Probability Score of the Heidelberg Retina Tomograph (HRT 3.0) as a Screening Unit for Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2722.

(14) Barriga E, Murray V, Agurto C, Pattichis M, Russell SR, Soliz P. Automatic Computer-Based Grading for Age-Related Maculopathy. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:1793.

(15) Beck S, Boehm N, Schlich M, Pfirrmann K, Pfeiffer N, Grus FH. Comparison of Anti-Ocular IgG and IgM Autoantibody Patterns in Glaucoma Patients. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4817.

(16) Beltran-Agullo L, Roca-Obis M, Ayala-Fuentes E, Morilla-Grasa A, Anton-Lopez A. Spectralis SD-OCT and Cirrus SD-OCT: RNFL Thickness Measurement Agreement and Diagnostic Performance in Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:230.

(17) Benatti E, Verga F, Bochicchio S, Bertuzzi F, Esempio G, Rulli E et al. Evaluation of Retinal Nerve Fiber Layer Thickness Measurements for Glaucoma Detection: Time Domain vs Spectral Domain Optical Coherence Tomography. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:247.

(18) Bergin C, Sinapis D, Sinapis A, Moosavi R, Verdon-Roe GM, Crabb DP et al. Perimetry Instrument Comparison Study: Comparing the 'Screening' Strategies of Three Perimetry Devices to Discriminate Between Healthy and 'Glaucomatous' Eyes (Interim Results). *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5508.

(19) Borchman D, Foulks GN, Yappert MC. Changes in Human Meibum With Age and Meibomian Gland Dysfunction. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:3383.

(20) Brown K, Sewell J, Travison T. Enhancement of Retinal Lesion Detection Using P200C Scanning Laser Ophthalmoscopy. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2302.
(21) Carneiro RC, Macedo EMS, Matayoshi S. Punch Biopsy: Effective Diagnostic Test for Detection of Periocular Malignancy ? *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:3516.
(22) Charalel RA, Lin H, Singh K. Glaucoma Screening Using Relative Afferent Pupillary Defect. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:183.
(23) Chiquet C, Ball PM, Pernollet M, Pavese P, Maurin M, Quesada JL et al. Usefulness of T-Spot TB in the First-Line Check-Up of Uveitis Patients. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5857.
(24) Costa VP, Vidotti VG, Resende GM, Silva FR, Cremasco F, Dias M et al. Sensitivity and Specificity of Machine Learning Classifiers and Spectral Domain OCT for the Diagnosis of Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:227.
(25) Coupland SG, Al-Breiki D, Hurley B, Leonard BC, Brownstein J, Noei F. Sensitivity and Specificity of Functional Correlates in Diabetic Macular Edema. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:3257.
(26) Di Matteo F, Miserocchi E, Modorati G, Colucci A, Berchicci L, Bandello F. Role of Systemic Investigations and Characteristic Ocular Signs for the Diagnosis of Ocular Sarcoidosis. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:3772.
(27) Dimitrov PN, Vingrys AJ, Robman LD, Makeyeva GA, Aung K, Varsamidis M et al. Monitoring Progression of AMD Through Visual Function Loss. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4522.
(28) Domanico D, Perrotta E, Esposito M, Bianchi S, Moretti M, Vingolo EM. Relationship Between Retinal Thickness in Optical Coherence Tomography (OCT) and Fluorescein Angiography (FA) in Diabetic Patients. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4675.
(29) Echegaray S, Zamora G, Luo W, Kardon R, Morales J, Soliz P. Automated Classification of Papilledema Using Frisen Grading and OCT Measurements. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:1775.
(30) Eid C, Li G, Fontaine O, Lawrence J, Harasymowycz PJ. Bayesian Estimation of the Performance of Frequency Doubling Perimetry (FDT), Confocal Scanning Laser Ophthalmoscopy (HRT) and GDx Variable Corneal Compensation (GDx-VCC) Scanning Laser Polarimetry for Glaucoma Screening in the Absence of a Gold Standard for Glaucoma Diagnosis. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2738.
(31) Fernandes DB, Moura FC, Pereira SA, Callegaro D, Marchiori PE, Monteiro MLR. Evaluation of Retinal Nerve Fiber Layer Thickness Measurements in Longitudinally Extensive Transverse Myelitis. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:652.
(32) Ferreras A, Pajarin AB, Pablo LE, Calvo P, Monsalve B, Fogagnolo P et al. Logistic Regression Analysis for Glaucoma Diagnosis Using Spectral Domain Optical Coherence Tomography. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:225.
(33) Fingeret M, Klein R, Sloane A, Canellos E. Selective Perimetry: Comparing Heidelberg Edge Perimetry and Frequency-Doubling Technology Perimetry in Detecting Glaucomatous Loss. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5509.
(34) Gangaputra S, Diabetic Retinopathy Clinical Research N. Comparison of Film and Digital Fundus Photographs in Assessing Diabetic Retinopathy. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2278.
(35) Garcia I, Etxebarria J, Soria J, Gonzalez N, Martinez I, Rodriguez I et al. Molecular Diagnosis of Limbal Deficiency by RT-PCR: Detection of Mucin MUC5AC Transcript in Corneal Epithelium. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2381.
(36) Gelman R, Martinez-Perez ME, Flynn JT, Chiang MF. Pilot Study of Machine-Learning Classifiers for Plus Disease Diagnosis in ROP. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5926.
(37) Gelman SK, Gelman R, Barnes AH, Martinez-Perez M, Casper DS, Flynn JT et al. Quantitative Analysis of Standard Published Photograph for Plus Disease Using Arterial Tortuosity and Venous Diameter. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5224.
(38) Ghodasra DH, Thuangtong A, Karp K, Ying GS, Mills M, Wilson CM et al. Change in Retinal Vessel Width and Tortuosity in Eyes at Risk for Retinopathy of Prematurity. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5925.
(39) Giancardo L, Meriaudeau F, Karnowski TP, Tobin K, Li Y, Chaum E. An Algorithm for Automated Diagnosis of Clinically Significant Macular Edema in a Teleophthalmology Network. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4657.

(40) Gilbert RM, Isenberg J, Fernandes BF, Ndao M, Belfort RN, Burnier MN. Detecting Novel Biomarkers in Ocular Vogt-Koyanagi-Harada Syndrome Using SELDI-TOF-MS. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4849.
(41) Goncalves AC, Silva LN, Gebrim EMS, Monteiro MLR. Objective Quantification of Orbital Apex Crowding to Detect Dysthyroid Optic Neuropathy Using Multidetector Computed Tomography. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:3916.
(42) Grus FH, Boehm N, Beck S, Schlich M, Lossbrandt U, Pfeiffer N. Autoantibody Profiles in Tear Fluid as a Diagnostic Tool in Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:6110.
(43) Gundogan FC, Oz O, Demirkaya S, Sobaci G. Color Vision Testing versus Pattern Visual Evoked Potentials in Multiple Sclerosis. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5471.
(44) Heo H, Kim HG, Park SW. Comparison of Scanning Laser Polarimetry With Variable Corneal Compensation and Optical Coherence Tomography in Preperimetric Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4896.
(45) Hoesl LM, Tornow RP, Schrems WA, Horn FK, Mardin CY, Kruse FE et al. Influence of Typical Scan Score on Diagnostic Performance of Scanning Laser Polarimetry and Optical Coherence Tomography. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:241.
(46) Holland GN, Manukian N, Kalyani PS, Yoon DC, Keorochana N, Keenan JD et al. Development of Pattern Recognition Software for Automated Computer Detection of AIDS-Related Cytomegalovirus Retinitis on Digital Fundus Photographs. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4852.
(47) Horn FK, Mardin CY, Baleanu D, Laemmer R, Bellios N, Juenemann AM et al. Analysis of Peripapillary Nerve Fiber Layer Thickness (Assessed by SOCT) With Automated Classification and Correction for Individual Optic Disk Locations. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:260.
(48) Hougaard JL, Heijl A, Andersson S, Bizios D, Bengtsson B. Effects of Quality Differences in Spectral Domain OCT on Glaucoma Diagnostics. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:255.
(49) Hubbard LD, Sun W, Cleary PA, Hainsworth DP, Peng Q, Susman RA et al. Comparability of Digital vs. Film Grading of Diabetic Retinopathy Severity in DCCT/EDIC. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4674.
(50) Isenberg J, Belfort RN, Fernandes BF, Belfort R, Burnier MN, Ndao M. Eight Novel Serum Biomarkers for Ocular Toxoplasmosis by Mass Spectroscopy. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2905.
(51) Iskander D, Szczesna DH, Alonso-Caneiro D, Read SA, Collins MJ. Predicting Dry Eye With Noninvasive Techniques of Tear Film Surface Assessment. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:3370.
(52) Jonnadula G, Senthil S, Addepalli UK, Rao HL, Garudadri CS. Diagnostic Accuracy of Macular Inner Retinal and Peripapillary Retinal Nerve Fiber Layer Measurements by RTVue Spectral Domain OCT in Early Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:218.
(53) Kawai S, Shimizu S, Shinoda K, Suzuki Y, Mizota A. Sensitivity and Specificity of Spectral-Domain Optical Coherence Tomography. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:244.
(54) Keller K, Boehm D, Grus FH. Proline-Rich Protein 4 is Elevated in Tear Fluid of Breast Cancer Patients. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4871.
(55) Kim J, Kim N, Lee E, Kim S, Byeon S, Seong G et al. Comparing the Ganglion Cell Complex and Retinal Nerve Fiber Layer Measurements by Fourier Domain Optical Coherence Tomography to Detect Glaucoma in High Myopia. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:237.
(56) Kolic M, Maddess TL, Essex RW, James AC. Effect of Intra Ocular Lens Implants on Diagnostic Performance of Multifocal Objective Perimetry in Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5513.
(57) Konno B, Prata TS, Lima VC, Leite MT, Castro DE, Castro LC et al. Macular Ganglion Cell Complex versus Peripapillary Retinal Nerve Fiber Layer Analysis for Assessment of Early Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2742.
(58) Laude A, Lu CK, Tang TB, Murray AF, Henderson RD, Deary IJ et al. Boundary Detection of Optic Disc and Parapapillary Atrophy From Color Fundus Images Using Dual-Channel Color Morphology and Snakes. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:1800.
(59) Lewis KT, Crowder K, Replogle W, Fratkin J. Risk Factors Predictive of a Positive Temporal Artery Biopsy. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:1457.

(60) Lima BD, Perry JD, Lewis C. CT Scan Evidence of Optic Nerve Dysfunction in Patients with Thyroid Eye Disease. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:3917.
(61) Liu YY, Chen M, Ishikawa H, Wollstein G, Schuman J, Rehg J. Automated Macular Pathology Diagnosis in Three-Dimensional (3D) Spectral Domain Optical Coherence Tomography (SD-OCT) Images. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:1772.
(62) Lorenz K, Schlich M, Boehm N, Kramann C, Pfeiffer N, Grus F. Detection of Autoantibody Patterns in Sera of Patients with Pseudoexfoliation Syndrome, Pseudoexfoliation Glaucoma and Cataract (Control Group). *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:6111.
(63) Luce D. Methodology for Keratoconus Risk Indices Using Ocular Response Analyzer (ORA) Waveform Analysis. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4983.
(64) Machida S, Tamada K, Oikawa T, Yokoyama D, Kaneko M, Kurosaka D. Sensitivity and Specificity of Photopic Negative Response of Focal Electoretinogram to Discriminate Glaucomatous Eyes. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:3267.
(65) Maddess T, Carle CF, Kolic M, Essex RW, James AC. Diagnostic Power and Reproducibility of Multifocal Pupillographic Perimetry in Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5505.
(66) Malik R, Schlottmann PG, Carter A, White E, Hogg CR, Holder GE et al. The Sensitivity of the Photopic Negative Response of the Flash ERG for the Detection of Glaucomatous Optic Neuropathy is Comparable to Global Visual Field Indices. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4334.
(67) Mani B, Perera SA, Tun TA, Aung T. Diagnostic Performance of Goniophotography and EyeCam for Angle Closure. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5528.
(68) Melo GB, Bispo PJM, Regatieri CVS, Yu MCZ, Pignatari ACC, Hofling-Lima AL. Incidence of Endophthalmitis After Cataract Surgery and the Use of Real-Time PCR for Its Diagnosis. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:6053.
(69) Michael R, Mikielewicz M, Kotliar K, Barraquer RI. The Usability of the New Waveform Parameters From the Ocular Response Analyzer in the Characterization of Keratoconus. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4984.
(70) Michelessi M, Oddone F, Centofanti M, Tanga L, Lotito S, Roberti G et al. Ganglion Cell Complex Analysis With Fourier-Domain OCT: Reproducibility and Diagnostic Accuracy in Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:238.
(71) Mishra A, Artes PH, Sharpe GP, Nicolela MT. Sensitivity of Spectralis OCT Circumpapillary Retinal Nerve Fibre Layer Thickness Measurements and Relationships With Visual Field Damage in Three Distinct Types of Morphological Disc Damage in Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4915.
(72) Moulin AP, Gaillard MC, Balmer A, Munier FL. Ultrasound Biomicroscopy Evaluation of Anterior Extension of Retinoblastomas : A Clinico-Pathological Study. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2075.
(73) Murakami Y, Silva R, Moshfeghi DM. Stanford University Network for Diagnosis of Retinopathy of Prematurity: Four-Year Experience With Telemedicine Screening. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5923.
(74) Mwanza JC, Oakley JD, Anderson DR, Budenz DL. Ability of CirrusTM HD-OCT Optic Disc Measurements to Discriminate Between Normal and Glaucomatous Eyes. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:224.
(75) Myung JS, Granet DB, Williams SL, Espiritu MJ, Lee TC, Chan RVP et al. Accuracy of Retinopathy of Prematurity Diagnosis by Pediatric Ophthalmology Fellows. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5924.
(76) Nallasamy N, Keila PS, Hamrah P, Dana R. Rapid Automatic Keratocyte Analysis From in vivo Confocal Microscopy of the Cornea. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5664.
(77) Oleszczuk JD, Bergin C, Schnyder C, Crabb D, Sharkawi E. Octopus Standard Automated Perimetry, Pulsar Perimetry, Moorfields Motion Displacement Test and Heidelberg Retinal Tomography in Glaucoma Detection - A Comparison of Diagnostic Accuracy. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4911.
(78) Ott DL, Buehren J, Klaproth OK, Schwarz R, Kohnen T. Analysis of Corneal Wavefront Aberrations for Differentiation Between Keratoconus, Pellucid Marginal Degeneration and Normal Eyes. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4975.

(79) Palaio H, Cristovao L, Faria de Abreu J. Automated "Disease/No Disease" Grading in a Screening Programme for Diabetic Retinopathy. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5349.
(80) Panganiban MN, Castro DE, Lee Y, Mattox C. RNFL Thickness and Central Angle of RNFL Thinning Measures Obtained From Cirrus HD-OCT: Their Correlation and Their Ability to Detect Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:249.
(81) Patel N, Chowdhury HR, Leung R, Sivaprasad S. Sensitivity and Specificity of Time-Domain versus Spectral-Domain Optical Coherence Tomography in the Diagnosis of Diabetic Macular Edema. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4390.
(82) Patel S, Zarbin MA, Bhagat N. Diagnostic Value of Clinical Examination and Radiographic Imaging in Identification of Intraocular Foreign Bodies in Open Globe Traumatic Injuries. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5667.
(83) Pathai S, Gilbert C, Lawn SD, Deshpande A. Sensitivity and Specificity of Clinical Parameters and CD4 Count in Predicting HIV-Associated Eye Disease. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4853.
(84) Patty LE, Wu S, Torres M, Varma R, Group L. Validity of Self-Reported Diagnosis and Treatment Among Latinos in the Los Angeles Latino Eye Study. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5358.
(85) Perrotta E, De Marco U, Salvatore S, Di Crescenzo C, Vingolo EM. Imaging of Choroidal Nevus With Spectral Domain Optical Coherence Tomography. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:1015.
(86) Prasad P, Tsui I, Heilweil G, Hubschman JP, Schwartz SD. Ischemic Index for the Quantification of Retinal Non-Perfusion in Branch Retinal Vein Occlusion. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:285.
(87) Prata TS, Lima VC, Castro DPE, Castro LC, Pacheco MA, Dimantas M et al. Influence of Optic Disc Size on the Diagnostic Performance of Macular Ganglion Cell Complex and Peripapillary Retinal Nerve Fiber Layer Analyses in Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4924.
(88) Rabin JC, Gooch J, Rubin R, Linnemeyer S, Foxworth M. Cone Specific Diagnosis of Normal and Abnormal Color Vision. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:6301.
(89) Ramirez C, Acosta C, Palacio JM, Sanchez JG, Zuluaga LM, Bareno J. Effectiveness of Screening for Diabetic Retinopathy With Non-Mydriatic Camera in Latino Population. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4679.
(90) Rao HL, Zangwill LM, Weinreb RN, Sample PA, Leite MT, Alencar LM et al. Effect of Disease Severity on the Diagnostic Accuracy of RTVue Spectral Domain OCT. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2978.
(91) Resch H, Resch-Wolfslehner C, Brela B, Schmidt-Erfurth U, Schubert R, Vass C. Comparison of Macular Retinal Ganglion Cell Plus Inner Plexiform Layer Measurement of 16 Sectors Surrounding the Fovea Obtained With HR-OCT in Healthy Subjects and Glaucoma Patients. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:232.
(92) Roberts KF, Kulkarni SV, Artes PH. Performance of the Ethnicity-Specific Moorfields Regression Analysis and Quantile Regression Analysis in the St Kitts Eye Study. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2732.
(93) Saad A, Luce D, Gatinel D. Biomechanical Profiles of Keratoconus Suspect Eyes. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4987.
(94) Sabeti F, Maddess T, James A. Dichoptic Multifocal Pupillography Identifies Retinal Dysfunction in Early Age-Related Macular Degeneration. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2794.
(95) Saika M, Nakagawa T, Kitaguchi Y, Hirohara Y, Mihashi T, Maeda N et al. Cut-Off Values in Root Mean Square(rms) of Ocular Higher-Order Aberrations for Differentiating Normal Eyes From Pathological Conditions. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:3967.
(96) Sanfilippo P, Cardini A, Sigal IA, Ruddle J, Chua B, Hewitt A et al. A Geometric Morphometric Assessment of the Optic Cup in Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5560.
(97) Sassani PP, Sample PA, Vizzeri G, Nguyen B, Weinreb RN, Medeiros F et al. The Influence of Race on the Detection of Glaucoma Using Scanning Laser Polarimetry With Variable Corneal Compensation in the African Descent and Glaucoma Evaluation Study (ADAGES) and Diagnostic Innovations in Glaucoma Study (DIGS). *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2731.
(98) Schnyder CC, Oleszczuk J, Bergin C, Ferrini W, Rivier D, Verdon-Roe GM et al. Examining the Agreement of Structural Loss Measured With Heidelberg Retinal Tomograhy and Functional Loss With Standard Automated Perimetry (SAP; Octopus), Pulsar Perimetry (PP), and Moorfields Motion Displacement Test (MDT) Perimetry. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4902.

(99) Schulze A, Lamparter J, Pfeiffer N, Hoffmann EM. Comparison of Optic Disc Topographic Measurements Using Fourier-Domain Optical Coherence Tomography and Confocal Scanning Laser Ophthalmoscopy in Glaucoma Patients and Normal Subjects. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4895.
(100) Sejpal KD, Johnson D, Yu F, Hamilton DR. Advanced Assessment of Corneal Biomechanical Properties in Normal and Keratoconic Eyes Using the Ocular Response Analyzer. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4991.
(101) Shimabukuro M, Higashiura R, Fuchihata M, Nakagawa T, Koh S, Inoue T et al. Screening of Keratoconus and Keratoconus Suspects Using Rotating Scheimpflug Corneal Topography. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4992.
(102) Sinapis D, Sinapis A, Bergin C, Moosavi R, Russell RA, Verdon-Roe GM et al. Perimetry Instrument Comparison Study: Comparing the Diagnostic Performance of Four Threshold Perimetry Tests to Discriminate Between Healthy and 'Glaucomatous' Eyes (Interim Analysis). *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5504.
(103) Sinha Roy A, Ambrosio R, Canedo ALC, Guerra FP, Lousada R, Dupps WJ. Zernike Analysis of Abnormal Corneal Thickness and Biomechanical Characteristics of Keratoconus Eyes. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4635.
(104) Skalet AH, Ausayakhun S, Ausayakhun S, Jirawison C, Keenan JD, Khouri C et al. Telemedicine for Cytomegalovirus (CMV) Retinitis. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4851.
(105) Smolek MK, Lebow K, Notaroberto N, Pallikaris A, Vujosevic S. Neural Network Algorithms for a Device to Measure Macular Visual Sensitivity. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:3550.
(106) Stevens AM, Leloup E, De Bacquer D, Kestelyn PG, Stalmans I, Tant M et al. Glaucoma and Fitness to Drive. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:208.
(107) Sullivan BD, Eldridge DC, Berg M, Kosheleff V, Porreco A, Truitt J et al. Diagnostic Performance of Osmolarity Combined With Subset Markers of Dry Eye Disease in an Unstratified Patient Population. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:3380.
(108) Tan GS, Li J, He M, Sakata L, Friedman DS, Aung T. Diagnostic Performance of Novel Morphological Parameters for the Screening of Narrow Angles. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5529.
(109) Tavares IM, Kara-Jose A, Barbosa DVC, Almeida ED, Leite MT, Endo ATNH et al. Retinal Nerve Fiber Layer Thickness and Visual Sensitivity Using Spectral-Domain and Time-Domain Optical Coherence Tomography. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4923.
(110) Tomidokoro A, Hangai M, Yoshimura N, Araie M, Group DOS. Sensitivity and Specificity of Thickness Measurements of Macular Ganglion Cell Layer and Ganglion Cell Complex Using Spectral-Domain OCT for Diagnosis of Preperimetric or Early Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:216.
(111) Ude KT, Boehm N, Wiegand M, Pfeiffer N, Grus FH. Dig Deeper Into the Tear Proteome: Advanced Protein Profiling in Dry Eye Patients. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4140.
(112) Usui S, Ikuno Y, Miki A, Matsushita K, Yasuno Y. Evaluation of the Choroidal Thickness Using High Penetration Optical Coherence Tomography With Long Wavelength in Highly Myopic Normal Tension Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2747.
(113) Vass C, Resch H, Resch-Wolfslehner C, Brela B, Fuchsjaeger-Mayrl G, Schubert R et al. Diagnostic Value of Macular Nerve Fiber Layer and Compound Ganglion Cell Plus Inner Plexiform Layer in Glaucoma Compared to Healthy Volunteers. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2739.
(114) Vezzola D, Viola F, Villani E, Barteselli G, Magnani F, Verga F et al. Infrared Ophthalmoscopy as Diagnostic Tool for Neurofibromatosis Type 1. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2267.
(115) Wainess RM, Dustin L, Rao NA, International VKHS. Ethnic Variations in Vogt-Koyanagi-Harada Disease Presentation. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:3539.
(116) Walsh AC, Wildey RC, Lara C, Ouyang Y, Sadda SR. Detection of Fundus Abnormalities Using 3D-OCT versus Mydriatic Color Fundus Imaging. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:3863.
(117) Wang Y, Garway-Heath DF, Sinapis C, Zhu H, Healey PR, Mitchell P. The Application of Scanning Laser Polarimetry (gdxvcc) in an Older Population and Its Diagnostic Value to Glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2975.

(118) Wong AM, Colpa L. Sensitivity and Specificity of a New "Upright-Supine Test" to Differentiate Skew Deviation From Other Causes of Vertical Strabismus. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:1582.
(119) Wong DW, Liu J, Tan N, Zhang Z, Yin F, Li H et al. Automatic Detection of Peripapillary Atrophy in Digital Fundus Photographs. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:1798.
(120) Yamaguchi M, Kamao T, Kawasaki S, Mizoue S, Shiraishi A, Kataoka H et al. Ocular Surface Thermographer: A New Device for Dry Eye Screening. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:3365.
(121) Yamauchi Y, Kemma H, Amano Y, Kuroda A, Agawa T, Kawakami S et al. Possible Automated Screening of Age-Related Macular Degeneration. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:294.
(122) Ying GS, Maguire MG, Dobson V, Quinn GE, Kulp MT, Cyert LA et al. Validity of Noncycloplegic Retinoscopy, Retinomax Autorefractor and SureSight Vision Screener for Detecting VIP-Targeted Eye Conditions. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:1704.
(123) Zanei A, Vattovani O, Di Stefano G, Ravalico G, Tognetto D, Da Pozzo S. The Diagnostic Ability of the GDx-VCC Nerve Fiber Indicator (NFI) in Separating Healty From Glaucomatous Eyes. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:4898.
(124) Zheng C, Kwoh C, Aquino MD, See J, Chia A, Lin W et al. Comparing Machine Learning Classifier for Diagnosing Different Angle Closure Mechanisms from Anterior Segment Optical Coherence Tomography Imaging. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:5542.
(125) Zhu H, Crabb DP, Artes PH. Improving the Classification of Abnormal Optic Discs Using Shape Analysis. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:2727.
(126) Zhuang H, Wang Y, Zhou X, Xu J. A Novel Method for Tear Fluorescein Clearance Test Using Pentacam Scheimpflug Imaging System. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010; 51:3369.