Correlation between predicted and actual sensitivity

A) Goldmann size III

Pearson $r = 0.4594$
$R^2 = 0.2110$
$p < 0.0001$

B) Goldmann size V

Pearson $r = 0.6141$
$R^2 = 0.3771$
$p < 0.0001$

Difference plot between predicted and actual sensitivity

C) Goldmann size III

D) Goldmann size V

Defect depth measured using stimuli within or near Ac (dB)
Supplementary Figure 2: A comparison of sensitivity predicted by the model ($S_P$) and actual measured sensitivities ($S_A$) for Goldmann size III (GIII, black) and Goldmann size V (GV, red) at locations where stimulus size within or near the size of Ac (spatially equated stimuli, SES) detected an ‘event’ after points which had reached the measurement floor when using SES, with the bootstrapped normative cohort (note the difference in x-axis scale compared to Supplementary Figure 1). Top row: the correlation between $S_P$ and $S_A$ for GIII (A) and GV (B). Pearson’s $r$, $R^2$ and $p$-values shown on each figure. Bottom row: difference plot between $S_P$ and $S_A$ (in dB) as a function of visual field defect depth (in dB) when measured SES for GIII (C) and GV (D). The dashed black line indicates no difference between $S_P$ and $S_A$ ($y = 0$), and the yellow area indicates the region of ±3 dB, which is the approximate test-retest variability of the instrument.