A comparison of two perimeter strategies: The oculus CLIP strategy and the full-threshold strategy.

Published: 14-07-2010
Last updated: 03-05-2024

Evaluation of the CLIP strategy of glaucomatous loss

Ethical review	Approved WMO
Status	Recruiting
Health condition type	Glaucoma and ocular hypertension
Study type	Observational non invasive

Summary

ID

NL-OMON34051

Source
ToetsingOnline

Brief title
A comparison of two perimeter strategies

Condition

- Glaucoma and ocular hypertension

Synonym
Primary Open Angle Glaucoma; Glaucoma

Research involving
Human

Sponsors and support

Primary sponsor: Universitair Medisch Centrum Groningen
Source(s) of monetary or material Support: Ministerie van OC&W

Intervention

Keyword: Comparison, Glaucoma, Perimeter, Twinfield

Outcome measures

Primary outcome

Full-threshold and CLIP: Mean Deviation (MD). The MD is a widely used parameter

that reflect the severity of glaucomatous defects.

Secondary outcome

N/A.

Study description

Background summary

The full-threshold (FT), the Swedish Interactive Threshold Algorithm (SITA) and the supra-threshold (ST) are three well known and most used strategies of the Humphrey Field Analyzer (HFA) for the detection and follow-up of glaucoma patients. Less known is the Twinfield Oculus perimeter, which has the same full- and suprathreshold strategies, and the internally developed Continuous Light Increment Perimetry (CLIP). The Twinfield perimeter has several advantages over the HFA and particularly the CLIP strategy, with a short test time, is a potentially interesting development (unreliable examinations are correlated with fatigue making short test time essential). However, there is a shortage of good comparative studies concerning the CLIP strategy.

Study objective

Evaluation of the CLIP strategy of glaucomatous loss

Study design

Sectional comparison between two perimeter strategies: full-threshold vs CLIP.

Study burden and risks

Minimal burden: 2x10, 2x5 and 2x2 minutes (last one concerns supra- threshold strategy, see study design in research protocol) looking at a screen en pushing

a button when a light spot is seen. The visit is scheduled during a regular visit to our outpatient clinic.

Applies to glaucoma patients who are already being monitored with threshold perimetry, therefore, there is no risk involved of unexpected findings (e.g. detecting disease in a previously healthy individual).

Contacts

Public
Universitair Medisch Centrum Groningen

Hanzeplein 1
Postbus 30.001 9700 RB Groningen
NL
Scientific
Universitair Medisch Centrum Groningen

Hanzeplein 1
Postbus 30.001 9700 RB Groningen
NL

Trial sites

Listed location countries

Netherlands

Eligibility criteria

Age
Adults (18-64 years)
Elderly (65 years and older)

Inclusion criteria

Glaucoma patients aged 18 years or older that visit our outpatient clinic for a regular appointment and provide informed consent.

Exclusion criteria

Best corrected Visual Acuity < 0.5 caused by non-glaucomatous pathology
Visual Field Loss caused by non-glaucomatous pathology

Study design

Design

Study type: Observational non invasive

Masking:	Open (masking not used)
Control:	Uncontrolled
Primary purpose:	Diagnostic

Recruitment

NL

Recruitment status:	Recruiting
Start date (anticipated):	20-07-2010
Enrollment:	36
Type:	Actual

Ethics review

Approved WMO

Date:	14-07-2010
Application type:	First submission
Review commission:	METC Universitair Medisch Centrum Groningen (Groningen)

Study registrations

Followed up by the following (possibly more current) registration

No registrations found.

Other (possibly less up-to-date) registrations in this register

No registrations found.

In other registers

Register	ID
CCMO	NL32823.042.10