

## **Abstract**

#### *Purpose:*

The effectiveness of traditional amblyopia therapies is largely restricted to childhood.

However, recovery in adulthood is possible following removal or vision-limiting disease

of the fellow eye. Study of this phenomenon is currently limited to isolated case reports

41 and a few case series, with reported incidence ranging from 19-77%  $1-5$ . We set out to

accomplish two distinct goals: (1) define the incidence of clinically meaningful recovery

and (2) elucidate the clinical features associated with greater amblyopic eye gains.

*Methods:*

A systematic review of 3 literature databases yielded 23 reports containing 109 cases of

patients ≥18 years old with unilateral amblyopia and vision-limiting fellow eye pathology.

*Results:*

 Study 1 revealed 25/42 (59.5%) of adult patients gained ≥2 logMAR lines in the amblyopia eye after FE vision loss. The overall degree of improvement is clinically meaningful (median 2.6 logMAR lines). Study 2 showed that for cases with amblyopic eye visual acuity improvement, recovery occurs within 12 months of initial loss of fellow eye vision. Regression analysis revealed that younger age, worse baseline acuity in the amblyopic eye, and worse vision in the fellow eye independently conferred greater gains in amblyopic eye visual acuity. Recovery occurs across amblyopia types and fellow eye pathologies, although disease entities affecting fellow eye retinal ganglion cells demonstrate shorter latencies to recovery.

*Conclusions:*

Amblyopia recovery after fellow eye injury demonstrates that the adult brain harbors the

neuroplastic capacity for clinically meaningful recovery, which could potentially be

harnessed by novel approaches to treat adults with amblyopia.

#### **Introduction**

 Amblyopia is a prevalent visual disorder resulting from abnormal visual 64 experience during early development<sup> $6-8$ </sup>. The long-standing and current treatment standard involves occlusion via patching or pharmacologic cycloplegia of the fellow eye (FE). While most children with amblyopia experience visual acuity (VA) gains in the amblyopic eye (AE) following standard therapy, improvement is often incomplete and 68 restricted to cases where therapy is initiated before age  $8^{9, 10}$ . As such, treatment of amblyopia is widely considered futile in adults in routine ophthalmic practice.

 There is extensive evidence that at least partial recovery from amblyopia can occur in experimental animal models late in the critical period (when simple occlusion- type interventions fail) and beyond<sup>11-14</sup>. For instance, experiments in mice and cats show that temporary inactivation of retinal ganglion cell (RGC) activity in both eyes or just the FE establishes conditions that enable the rapid and durable recovery from amblyopia<sup>15-17</sup>. This intervention is effective at ages when reversed occlusion 76 (analogous to patch therapy in humans) fails to promote sustained recovery<sup>16, 17</sup>. Enucleation and retinal lesioning similarly promote recovery in visual cortical responses 78 to stimulation of AEs of adult cats, monkeys, and mice<sup>18-22</sup>. Direct limitation of RGC activity is a common theme distinguishing the interventions that successfully drive recovery in older animals from those that do not. Thus, the pre-clinical, experimental

 basis for amblyopia recovery in adulthood is strong and broad, but comprehensive supporting evidence in humans is needed.

 Analogous observations of recovery from amblyopia triggered in human patients who suffer vision-limiting FE disease or loss spans decades of clinical literature. To date, there have been 5 dedicated studies examining amblyopia recovery following FE 86 vision loss; 3 focus on specific FE disorders (ischemic optic neuropathy<sup>1</sup>, age-related 87 macular degeneration<sup>2</sup>, uveal melanoma<sup>3</sup>), and 2 include all causes of FE visual loss<sup>4, 5</sup>. Additionally, numerous isolated reports describe the clinical courses of 1-3 patients in various clinicopathologic contexts. Despite this substantial literature, key features of this important phenomenon, which may hold the key to reversal of amblyopia in adulthood, remain undefined. To begin to fill this knowledge gap, we integrated and analyzed all available

 clinical descriptions of AE VA recovery in the context of FE disease in adults. We aimed to (1) describe the prevalence and magnitude of recovery and (2) answer whether specific clinical metrics influence the magnitude of AE VA gains. We tested the hypotheses that direct FE RGC injury and absence of strabismus would confer greater AE VA improvement.

#### **Methods**

*Database Search*

 A systematic search of PubMed (1946-), Embase (1947-), and Web of Sciences Core Collection (1900-) databases was conducted using combinations of the following key words: "amblyopia", "recov-", "revers-", "loss", "injury", "visual impairment", "fellow",



reviewed for additional potentially relevant reports not captured in our database

searches. All referenced studies were collected and reviewed in detail, yielding 6

- additional reports meeting criteria. In total, 23 reports (comprised of 109 unique cases)
- were included for analysis (Supplemental Figure 1).
- 
- *Data Extraction:*
- Each report was comprehensively and systematically examined. We extracted all
- parameters of interest for further analysis for each patient when available, including:
- 133 Initial AE VA before the injury, if available, or else at the time of first evaluation after FE vision loss.
- 135 Best measured AE VA after FE vision loss.
- 136 Time interval from FE visual loss to best AE VA measurement (in months). If the
- time fell in the middle of the month or the exact length of time could not be
- determined, the time was rounded to the next month. If months were not
- provided for each timepoint, the difference in years was multiplied by 12. Times
- less than 1 month were rounded to one month.
- 141 FE VA nadir, defined as the worst reported FE VA after onset of FE visual loss
- 142 Patient age at the time of FE loss; age was binned as 18-40, 41-60, and ≥61
- years for analysis.
- All VA measures were converted to the logarithm of the minimum angle of resolution
- (logMAR) scale and rounded to the nearest 0.02 unit (1 letter). AE VA logMAR lines of
- improvement was calculated from best-initial AE VA logMAR values.

*Analysis:* 

 We conducted 2 separate goal-directed studies. Study 1 aimed to determine the incidence and magnitude of AE VA improvement. To minimize the influence of reporting bias, only series reporting consecutive subjects with patient-level data within a defined study period (agnostic to whether recovery occurred for each individual patient) were included (42 cases, 3 series). Study 2 aimed to describe the clinical features associated with AE VA gains and thus focused on only cases with measurable (>0.0 logMAR) improvement (101 cases, 23 reports). Among these, 55 cases specified FE VA measurements (to assess the influence of FE visual loss magnitude), 37 cases specifically reported on the presence/absence of strabismus (for segregation by amblyopia type), 38 cases had a clearly documented cause of FE vision loss (for segregation by direct RGC involvement), and 80 cases specified the timeline from FE vision loss to key AE VA measurement in follow-up (to assess temporal rate of recovery) (Figure 1).

*Statistics:* 

 Normality of data was assessed with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Direct comparisons between two normally distributed groups employed a two-tailed t-test, whereas those involving one or more groups that were not normally distributed employed a Mann-Whitney test. In the case of comparing initial to best AE VA values (which were not normally distributed) a Wilcoxon matched-pairs test was used to assess whether changes in individual case AE VA values changed significantly. A univariate multiple regression was performed (SPSS, IBM, Armonk, NY) with input variables: age, baseline AE VA, FE VA nadir. The output variable was AE VA (logMAR lines) of



*STUDY 1: Incidence of clinically meaningful recovery*

 Of the 109 reports revealed by our review, 23 were isolated case reports or small (≤3 cases) series. To mitigate the effects of reporting bias through underrepresentation of cases without recovery, we analyzed the 42 cases originating from 3 reports containing >3 cases that were agnostic to the occurrence of recovery and included patient-level data.

Among these 42 cases, the median change in AE VA was 2.60 logMAR lines

[IQR:0.95-4.00] . Eight (19.0%) had no AE VA improvement. Among the remaining

cases, 34 (81.0%) had measurable AE VA improvement, 32 (76.2%) gained ≥1 logMAR

line, 25 (59.5%) gained ≥2 logMAR lines, and 21 (50.0%) cases gained ≥3 lines (Figure

2). These findings demonstrate a high incidence of clinically meaningful recovery

among adults after loss of vision in the FE.

*STUDY 2: Features influencing amblyopic eye recovery*



*Hypothesis-driven categorical clinical feature influence on recovery*





#### **Discussion**

 Although conventional occlusion therapy is not effective in adults with amblyopia, gains in AE VA following FE vision loss is common. Integration and analysis of reported cases demonstrate that the adult visual system retains the capacity for plasticity necessary for recovery from amblyopia. These results show that 60% of adults with amblyopia who experience FE vision loss will gain at least 2 lines of AE VA. Amblyopia treatment trials in children <8 years of age reporting an average of 2-3 logMAR lines of improvement following 3-6 months of occlusion treatment suggest that the prevalence of 258 recovery is substantial<sup>8</sup>. By comparison, only 25% of 13–17-year-olds (and 47% of treatment naïve 13–17-year-olds) gain ≥2 lines of AE VA following 2-6 hours of daily 260 . patching<sup>26</sup>. While randomized control trials in adults are not available, this comparison 261 suggests that the rate of AE VA improvement seen after FE vision loss markedly exceeds conventional occlusion therapy.

 We focused our study of clinical factors on cases with some degree of AE VA improvement to avoid over-representation of recovered cases by inclusion of isolated reports. In this sample, we found that improvement is generally observed within 12 months following FE vision loss, and further gains after this time point are less common. 267 Most amblyopia is associated with anisometropia, strabismus, or both. A history of or presence of strabismus did not influence the degree of AE VA recovery in our study 269 despite more blunted gains<sup>28</sup> and higher rates of regression<sup>29</sup> in conventionally treated strabismic compared to anisometropic amblyopia. Given that previous research indicates that temporary inactivation of FE RGCs promotes recovery from amblyopic rearing in mice and cats, we postulated that direct RGC involvement may be required to enable the plasticity necessary to drive recovery in older age, but our results suggest 274 this is not necessarily the case<sup>15, 16</sup>. We noted comparable rates of recovery in outer 275 retinal disorders such as age-related macular degeneration<sup>2</sup> and uveal melanoma<sup>3</sup> as 276 with ischemic optic neuropathy<sup>1</sup>. FE injury directly involving RGC damage did not affect the magnitude of AE VA gains but did confer a faster rate of recovery. Though the current analyses focus on injuries involving damage to RGCs, future work could potentially compare pre-retinal (e.g. corneal, lenticular) and retinal/optic nerve disorders. 280 It is well-documented that the success of amblyopia treatment depends on patient age, and that adults generally do not respond to conventional amblyopia 282 treatment methods<sup>8, 10, 11, 30, 31</sup>. Although our analysis was restricted to adult patients, we were curious whether patient age at the time of FE loss would be a factor associated with degree of AE VA improvements. Linear regression analysis showed that younger age, greater severity of vision loss in the FE, and worse initial AE VA independently

 influenced the degree of improvement in the AE VA. These results may be applied in clinical contexts to prognosticate the degree of AE recovery in new cases of FE vision loss.

 Our study has several limitations, mainly stemming from factors inherent to the nature of meta-analyses. The availability and reliability of data could not be controlled in this systematic literature review spanning many decades, journals and report types. Subgroup analyses and linear models engaged fractions of our sample because of inconsistencies in reported details between cases and reports, and thus there is some susceptibility to bias within our sample. This underscores the importance of our post- hoc analysis, which demonstrated no systematic biases of report type on either the primary outcome measure or the factors found to be influential through linear modeling. Despite these inherent limitations, the relative infrequency of this clinical problem (owing to a need for two separate ophthalmic conditions in each eye: amblyopia and vision- limiting FE pathology) necessitates meta-analysis as the only feasible means to test our hypotheses. However, advancement of means to build and integrate large medical databases could provide another means to study this phenomenon in the future, provided that the minimal patient-level details such as laterality are available. 303 The Bienenstock, Cooper, and Munro (BCM) theory of metaplasticity<sup>32</sup> provides a 304 useful conceptual framework to understand how FE vision loss can drive AE recovery<sup>14</sup>.

The BCM theory posits that the threshold for cortical synaptic potentiation changes as a

function of the history of integrated post-synaptic neuronal activity. In this clinical

context, the reduction in visual cortical activity following FE vision loss lowers the

plasticity threshold to enable potentiation of synapses serving the AE, ultimately





**associated with greater amblyopic eye visual acuity improvement. (A)** Effect sizes



 eligibility criteria for inclusion in the meta-analysis. Eligible papers then had their individual bibliographies reviewed. Non-duplicate references were retrieved, and 39 additional sources were screened for relevance. 10 ultimately were reviewed in full, and 6 of these met eligibility criteria and were included in the final meta-analysis. In total 23 reports comprised of 109 cases were included. PRISMA guidelines were used for this 383 documentation .

# **Supplemental Figure 2: Assessing potential bias in primary outcome measure (logMAR lines of recovery) by report type. (A)** AE VA (logMAR lines) improvement segregated by report type (ns *p*=0.098; Mann-Whitney test). Error bars indicate 95% 388 confidence interval. Black dotted line indicates the median ( $y = 5.0$  logMAR lines of AE VA improvement) for all cases, regardless of report type. **(B)** Forest plot comparing the median logMAR lines of AE VA improvement (black dots) with 95% confidence intervals (error bars) for all case series containing >3 cases individually and pooled case reports and case series containing ≤3 cases. The number of reported cases and authors for 393 each report of case series comprise the y-axis labels. Red dotted line  $(x = 5.0)$  indicates the median logMAR lines of AE VA improvement for all cases, regardless of report type.

## **Supplemental Table 1: Summary of individual case details**

 A table of all included cases and factors analyzed. Author/Paper: yellow indicates this case was included in Study 1, and grey indicates it was not. Lines of improvement: green indicates this case was included in Study 2, and red indicates it was not. Time to best (months) and Worst FE VA (logMAR): orange indicates this information was

- available and included in the analysis, and grey indicates it was not. Binned age: pink
- indicates patients aged 18-40 (group 1), yellow indicates patients aged 41-60 (group 2),
- and green indicates patients aged 61+ (group 3). History of strabismus: orange
- indicates patients with a history or presence of strabismus, purple indicates patients
- without a history or presence of strabismus, and grey indicates patients that were not
- included in this analysis (either because this information was not available or because
- the patient did not show AE VA improvement). RGC Damage: red indicates patients
- with RGC damage, blue indicates patients without RGC damage, and grey indicates
- patients excluded from this analysis because the RGC status was unclear.
- 

# **References:**

 1. Resnick HH, Bear MF, Gaier ED. Partial Recovery of Amblyopia After Fellow Eye Ischemic Optic Neuropathy. *J Neuroophthalmol* 2023;43:76-81.

 2. El Mallah MK, Chakravarthy U, Hart PM. Amblyopia: is visual loss permanent? *The British journal of ophthalmology* 2000;84:952-956.

 3. Vagge A, Shields CL, Shields JA, Pointdujour-Lim R, Schnall B. Visual improvement in amblyopic eye following treatment-induced vision loss in dominant eye with uveal melanoma. *The British journal of ophthalmology* 2020;104:202-207.

 4. Rahi JS, Logan S, Borja MC, Timms C, Russell-Eggitt I, Taylor D. Prediction of improved vision in the amblyopic eye after visual loss in the non-amblyopic eye. *Lancet* 2002;360:621-622.

 5. Vereecken EP, Brabant P. Prognosis for vision in amblyopia after the loss of the good eye. *Arch Ophthalmol* 1984;102:220-224.

 6. Fu Z, Hong H, Su Z, Lou B, Pan CW, Liu H. Global prevalence of amblyopia and disease burden projections through 2040: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The British journal of ophthalmology* 2020;104:1164-1170.

 7. Maurer D, Mc KS. Classification and diversity of amblyopia. *Vis Neurosci* 2018;35:E012.

 8. Birch EE. Amblyopia and binocular vision. *Progress in retinal and eye research* 2013;33:67-84.

 9. Holmes JM, Lazar EL, Melia BM, et al. Effect of age on response to amblyopia treatment in children. *Arch Ophthalmol* 2011;129:1451-1457.

 10. Holmes JM, Levi DM. Treatment of amblyopia as a function of age. *Vis Neurosci* 2018;35:E015.

 11. Hensch TK. Critical period plasticity in local cortical circuits. *Nature reviews Neuroscience* 2005;6:877-888.

 12. Hensch TK, Quinlan EM. Critical periods in amblyopia. *Vis Neurosci* 2018;35:E014.

 13. Spolidoro M, Sale A, Berardi N, Maffei L. Plasticity in the adult brain: lessons from the visual system. *Exp Brain Res* 2009;192:335-341.

 14. Leet MP, Bear MF, Gaier ED. Metaplasticity: a key to visual recovery from amblyopia in adulthood? *Curr Opin Ophthalmol* 2022;33:512-518.

15. Fong MF, Mitchell DE, Duffy KR, Bear MF. Rapid recovery from the effects of

 early monocular deprivation is enabled by temporary inactivation of the retinas. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 2016;113:14139-14144.

 16. Fong MF, Duffy KR, Leet MP, Candler CT, Bear MF. Correction of amblyopia in cats and mice after the critical period. *Elife* 2021;10.

 17. Duffy KR, Fong MF, Mitchell DE, Bear MF. Recovery from the anatomical effects of long-term monocular deprivation in cat lateral geniculate nucleus. *J Comp Neurol* 2018;526:310-323.

 18. Harwerth RS, Smith EL, 3rd, Crawford ML, von Noorden GK. Effects of enucleation of the nondeprived eye on stimulus deprivation amblyopia in monkeys. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 1984;25:10-18.

 19. Hendrickson A, Boles J, McLean EB. Visual acuity and behavior of monocularly deprived monkeys after retinal lesions. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 1977;16:469-473.

 20. Kratz KE, Spear PD, Smith DC. Postcritical-period reversal of effects of monocular deprivation on striate cortex cells in the cat. *Journal of neurophysiology* 1976;39:501-511.

 21. Hoffmann KP, Lippert P. Recovery of vision with the deprived eye after the loss of the non-deprived eye in cats. *Hum Neurobiol* 1982;1:45-48.

 22. Drager UC. Observations on monocular deprivation in mice. *Journal of neurophysiology* 1978;41:28-42.

 23. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2021;372:n71.

 24. Clogg CC, Petkova E, Haritou A. Statistical methods for comparing regression coefficients between models. *American journal of sociology* 1995;100:1261-1293.

 25. Brame R, Paternoster R, Mazerolle P, Piquero A. Testing for the equality of maximum-likelihood regression coefficients between two independent equations. *Journal of quantitative criminology* 1998;14:245-261.

 26. Scheiman MM, Hertle RW, Beck RW, et al. Randomized trial of treatment of amblyopia in children aged 7 to 17 years. *Arch Ophthalmol* 2005;123:437-447.

 27. Levi DM, McKee SP, Movshon JA. Visual deficits in anisometropia. *Vision Res* 2011;51:48-57.

 28. Woodruff G, Hiscox F, Thompson JR, Smith LK. Factors affecting the outcome of children treated for amblyopia. *Eye (Lond)* 1994;8 ( Pt 6):627-631.

29. Levartovsky S, Oliver M, Gottesman N, Shimshoni M. Factors affecting long term

results of successfully treated amblyopia: initial visual acuity and type of amblyopia. *The* 

*British journal of ophthalmology* 1995;79:225-228.

- 30. Bear MF. Bidirectional synaptic plasticity: from theory to reality. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 2003;358:649-655.
- 31. Wu C, Hunter DG. Amblyopia: diagnostic and therapeutic options. *Am J Ophthalmol* 2006;141:175-184.
- 32. Bienenstock EL, Cooper LN, Munro PW. Theory for the development of neuron
- selectivity: orientation specificity and binocular interaction in visual cortex. *J Neurosci* 1982;2:32-48.
- 33. Philpot BD, Espinosa JS, Bear MF. Evidence for altered NMDA receptor function as a basis for metaplasticity in visual cortex. *J Neurosci* 2003;23:5583-5588.
- 34. Cho KK, Khibnik L, Philpot BD, Bear MF. The ratio of NR2A/B NMDA receptor subunits determines the qualities of ocular dominance plasticity in visual cortex.
- *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 2009;106:5377-5382.
- 35. Linden ML, Heynen AJ, Haslinger RH, Bear MF. Thalamic activity that drives
- visual cortical plasticity. *Nature neuroscience* 2009;12:390-392.

#### **Figure 1**

Study 1: Determine the incidence of AEVA improvement following FEVA loss

Papers that include both positive and negative results (n=3) Cases included in these papers (n=42)

 Cases with a timecourse to amblyopic eye improvement (n=80)

Papers included in meta- analysis (n=23) Total number of cases  $(n=109)$ 

Study 2: Describe cases with AEVA improvement

Papers reporting some degree<br>of AEVA improvement after<br>FEVA loss (n=23)<br>Cases in which some degree Cases in which some degree of recovery occurred (n=101)

 Cases with fellow eye acuity (n=55)

Cases with strabismus status (n=37)

 Cases with a clear cause of vision loss (n=38)









**Figure 5**

