UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MARA

DEVELOPMENT OF BUARI-CHEN MALAY READING CHART AND ITS APPLICATION IN READING INVESTIGATION AND MAGNIFICATION PRESCRIPTION IN PERIPHERAL VISUAL FIELD DEFECTS

NOOR HALILAH BUARI

Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy**

Faculty of Health Sciences

December 2022

ABSTRACT

Background: A well-designed, valid, and reliable reading assessment tool in a native language is crucial in a clinical setting. Reading research can reflect daily reading among persons with normal vision and vision disorders. Visual field defects (VFD) affect reading and other visual functions, including peripheral ones. Magnification approaches can improve readability. Previous research has not investigated a new reading tool's direct application in reading investigation, especially in diverse directions of peripheral VFD. The thesis explains how a new Malay reading investigation tool was developed and validated. Employing a new reading tool, reading, visual functions, and magnification approaches using acuity reserve methods were undertaken. Methods: A cross-sectional study explored 3 research stages. In Phase 1, 22 participants tested a new reading tool. Reading charts with contextual sentences and random words were developed for the Buari-Chen Malay Reading Chart (BCMRC). Intra-and inter-chart reliability was validated. Phase 2 tested reading and visual functions in 11 participants (22 eyes) with different directional visual field defects (VFD) (i.e., similar and opposite direction or mixed). Distance visual acuity (DVA), near reading acuity (NRA), and contrast sensitivity (CS) in different directional VFD were examined. Phase 3 compares reading magnification strategies using acuity reserve (fixed versus individual). Reading magnification (RM) and equivalent viewing power (EVP) were calculated, and aided reading performance with low vision devices was investigated. Near reading acuity, critical print size (CPS), and maximum reading speed (MRS) were compared. Results: BCMRC has strong internal reliability (contextual sentences, α =0.82; random words, α =0.85) and acceptable external reliability (α =0.76 against MNRead; α =0.80 against Bailey-Lovie). The similar directional VFD significantly influenced reading [H(2) =6.67, p = 0.036]. NRA demonstrated a difference with directional VFD (H(2) = 6.35, p = 0.042). CS in similar directional VFD showed significant results [H(2) = 6.354, p =0.035]. DVA was not varied in any VFD pattern. The individual method's for RM and EVP were lower than the fixed method's [RM: t(20)=2.74, p=0.01; EVP: t(20)=2.36, p=0.03]. The aided reading performance comparison indicated no significant difference between the fixed and individual methods for NRA [U=43.50, z=-1.24, p=0.27], CPS [U=56.00, z=-0.32, p=0.80], and MRS [t(20) = -1.34, p = 0.20]. Fixed method [t(7)=-1.34, p=0.20]. 1.01, p = 0.342] and individual method [t(7)= -0.58, p = 0.731] were not significantly different in the same or opposite VFD for aided reading using low vision devices. Conclusions: The new BCMRC has high internal and external reliability. The present outcomes highlighted the detrimental effects of a similar directional visual field defect on reading. Directional peripheral VFDs impacted near reading acuity and contrast sensitivity. Distance visual acuity wasn't affected by peripheral VFD. Individual and fixed acuity reserve approaches calculated magnification differently. Individual acuity reserve gave lower magnification and EVP but did not influence aided reading performance with low vision devices. Individual and fixed VFD reading speeds were similar in any directional VFD. The unique contribution of this study to the field of low vision rehabilitation is that the BCMRC can be proposed to vision practitioners as an instrument for near visual acuity testing and reading evaluation in vision rehabilitation among Malay native speakers and those with visual field disorder. It could assist practitioners in managing patients with vision problems interfering with the ability to read.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The completion of this Ph.D. thesis results from several years of hard work, whereby I have been accompanied and supported by many people. First, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the higher management of the Faculty of Health Sciences led by Prof. Dr. Zulkhairi Hj Amom, Prof. Madya Dr. Siti Nazrina Camalxaman, and Prof. Madya Dr. Nur Islami. They are the ones who believe in me and provide me with unlimited support and encouragement toward the completion of this thesis. I am deeply grateful to have an advisor, Prof Dr. Norhani Mohidin; she has given me insightful comments, suggestions, and guidance in thesis completion.

I would like to thank my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Chen Ai Hong, who gave me invaluable advice, assistance, and experience in this Ph.D. journey. Then, thank you to Prof. Dr. Susan J. Leat, my co-supervisor, who gave me valuable advice on planning of the experiments and assisted me in the earlier stage.

I would also like to thank all the staff and postgraduate students in the Centre for Optometry Studies, Faculty of Health Sciences, for their help and encouragement in many different areas. The approval for data collection at the Clinical Training Centre (CTC), Faculty of Medicine, UiTM Selangor, was very much appreciated.

Special thanks are also dedicated to all participants for their voluntary participation in this research. The Exploratory Research Grant Scheme (600-RMI/ERGS 5/3) (59/2012) and Fundamental Research Grant Scheme (600-RMI/FRGS 5/3 (119/2014) from the Ministry of Higher Education of Malaysia funded this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CON | FIRMATION BY PANEL OF EXAMINERS | ii | |
|----------------------|---|-----|--|
| AUTHOR'S DECLARATION | | | |
| ABST | TRACT | iv | |
| ACK | NOWLEDGEMENT | v | |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | | | |
| LIST | FOF TABLES | ix | |
| LIST | FOF FIGURES | Х | |
| LIST | FOF SYMBOLS | xi | |
| LIST | COF ABBREVIATIONS | xii | |
| СНА | APTER ONE INTRODUCTION | 1 | |
| 1.1 | Introduction | 1 | |
| 1.2 | Problem Statement | 6 | |
| 1.3 | Research Questions | 8 | |
| 1.4 | Research Objectives | 8 | |
| 1.5 | Research Hypothesis | 8 | |
| 1.6 | Significance of Study | 9 | |
| 1.7 | Thesis Framework | 10 | |
| СНА | APTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW | 13 | |
| 2.1 | Visual System and Its Function | 13 | |
| 2.2 | Reading | | |
| | 2.2.1 Reading Models | 15 | |
| | 2.2.2 Factors Affecting Reading | 18 | |
| | 2.2.3 Assessment of Reading | 21 | |
| | 2.2.4 Reading Assessment Tools | 26 | |
| 2.3 | Reading and Visual Field Defect | | |
| | 2.3.1 Visual Field Defect | 33 | |
| | 2.3.2 Peripheral Visual Field Defect | 34 | |
| | 2.3.3 Classification of Peripheral Visual Field Defect | 36 | |
| | 2.3.4 Visual Field Defect and The Impact on Reading | 41 | |
| | 2.3.5 Visual Field Defect and The Impact on Visual Function | 43 | |
| 2.4 | Reading Rehabilitation for Visual Field Defect | | |
| | 2.4.1 Magnification for Low Vision Rehabilitation | 46 | |
| | 2.4.2 Acuity Reserve in Low Vision Reading | 47 | |
| | 2.4.3 Reading with Magnifier | 48 | |
| | | | |

| CHAI | PTER THREE | DEVELOPMENT | OF | READING | PERFORMANCE |
|-----------------------|------------------|-------------|----|---------|-------------|
| INVESTIGATION TOOL 51 | | | | | |
| 3.1 | Introduction | | | | 51 |
| 3.2 | Specific Objecti | ves | | | 53 |
| 3.3 | Methods | | | | 54 |

| | 3.3.1 | Sampling | 54 |
|-----|-------------|---|----|
| | 3.3.2 | Experimental Procedures | 55 |
| 3.4 | Statist | tical Analysis | 58 |
| 3.5 | Results | | 60 |
| | 3.5.1 | Descriptions of BCMRC | 60 |
| | 3.5.2 | Internal Validity Investigation of BCMRC | 61 |
| | 3.5.3 | External Reliability Investigation of BCMRC | 64 |
| 3.6 | Discussions | | 66 |
| | 3.6.1 | Internal Reliability Investigation of BCMRC | 69 |
| | 3.6.2 | External Reliability Investigation of BCMRC | 70 |
| 3.7 | Concl | usions | 70 |

CHAPTER FOUR INVESTIGATION OF THE READING AND VISUAL FUNCTIONS IN DIFFERENT DIRECTIONAL VISUAL FIELD DEFECT PATTERNS 72

| 4.1 | Introdu | uction | 72 |
|-----|-------------|---|------|
| 4.2 | Specif | ic Objectives | 75 |
| 4.3 | Sampl | ing | 76 |
| | 4.3.1 | Sampling Grouping | 77 |
| 4.4 | Experi | mental Procedures | 85 |
| 4.5 | Statist | ical Analysis | 88 |
| 4.6 | Result | S | 88 |
| | 4.6.1 | Reading Performance in a Different Directional Visual Field Defect | 88 |
| | 4.6.2 | Visual Functions in a Different Directional Visual Field Defect | 89 |
| 4.7 | Discussions | | |
| | 4.7.1 | Reading Performance in a Different Directional Visual Field Defects | s 91 |
| | 4.7.2 | Visual Functions in a Different Directional Visual Field Defects | 94 |
| 4.8 | Conclu | usions | 98 |

| CHAPTER FIVE COMPARISON OF TWO ESTIMATED MAGNIFIC | ATION |
|---|-----------|
| TECHNIQUES FOR READING PRESCRIPTION | 99 |
| 5.1 Introduction | 99 |
| 5.2 Specific Objectives | 101 |
| 5.3 Sampling | 102 |
| 5.4 Experimental Procedures | 103 |
| 5.5 Statistical Analysis | 107 |
| 5.6 Results | 108 |
| 5.6.1 Comparison of Reading Magnification Prescription Approaches | s 108 |
| 5.6.2 Reading Performance Between Different Magnification App | proaches |
| | 112 |
| 5.6.3 Comparison of Aided Reading Speed in Different Directional Pe | eripheral |

| | | VFD | 114 |
|-----|--------|---|-----|
| 5.7 | Discus | sions | 114 |
| | 5.7.1 | Comparison of Reading Magnification Prescription Approaches | 114 |
| | 5.7.2 | Reading Performance in Different Magnification Approaches | and |
| | | Directional Peripheral VFD | 116 |
| 5.8 | Conclu | usions | 117 |