Correlation between predicted and actual sensitivity

A) Goldmann size III

Predicted sensitivity ($S_P$) (dB)

Actual measured sensitivity ($S_A$) (dB)

Pearson $r = 0.6817$

$R^2 = 0.4647$

$p < 0.0001$

B) Goldmann size V
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$p < 0.0001$
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**Supplementary Figure 1:** 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’ when using the bootstrapped normative distribution. 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.