ZEISS SITA Faster and 24-2C

Visual field testing strategies and protocols

Compendium of peer-reviewed journal articles

January 2025

Seeing beyond

Table of Contents

Click on topic to jump to that section.

SITA Faster Design, Validation and Clinical Comparisons

1. Heijl A, Patella VM, Chong LX, et al. **A New SITA Perimetric Threshold Testing Algorithm: Construction and a Multicenter Clinical Study.** *Am J Ophthalmol*. Feb 2019;198:154-165. doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2018.10.010. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30336129; https://www.ajo.com/article/S0002-9394(18)30592-0/fulltext

2. Phu J, Khuu SK, Agar A, Kalloniatis M. **Clinical Evaluation of Swedish Interactive Thresholding Algorithm-Faster Compared With Swedish Interactive Thresholding Algorithm-Standard in Normal Subjects, Glaucoma Suspects, and Patients With Glaucoma.** *Am J Ophthalmol*. Dec 2019;208:251-264. doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2019.08.013. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31470001

3. Lavanya R, Riyazuddin M, Dasari S, et al. **A Comparison of the Visual Field Parameters of SITA Faster and SITA Standard Strategies in Glaucoma.** *J Glaucoma*. Sep 2020;29(9):783 -788. doi:10.1097/IJG.0000000000001551. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32459685

4. Thulasidas M, Patyal S. **Comparison of 24-2 Faster, Fast, and Standard Programs of Swedish Interactive Threshold Algorithm of Humphrey Field Analyzer for Perimetry in Patients with Manifest and Suspect Glaucoma.** *J Glaucoma*. Nov 2020;29(11):1070-1076. doi:10.1097/IJG.0000000000001611. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32890104; https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/wk/jglau/2020/00000029/00000011/art00013

5. Qian CX, Chen Q, Cun Q, et al. **Comparison of the SITA Faster – A New Visual Field Strategy With SITA Fast Strategy.** *Int J Ophthalmol*. 2021;14(8):1185-1191. doi:10.18240/ijo.2021.08.08. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/34414082

6. Phu J, Kalloniatis M. **A Strategy for Seeding Point Error Assessment for Retesting (SPEAR) in Perimetry Applied to Normal Subjects, Glaucoma Suspects, and Patients with Glaucoma.** *Am J Ophthalmol*. Jan 2021;221:115-130. doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2020.07.047. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32777379

7. Prager AJ, Kang JM, Tanna AP. **Advances in Perimetry for Glaucoma.** *Curr Opin Ophthalmol*. Mar 1 2021;32(2):92-97. doi:10.1097/ICU.0000000000000735. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33443958

8. Mendieta N, Suarez J, Blasco C, Muniz R, Pueyo C. **A Comparative Study between Swedish Interactive Thresholding Algorithm Faster and Swedish Interactive Thresholding Algorithm Standard in Glaucoma Patients.** *J Curr Ophthalmol*. Jul-Sep 2021;33(3):247-252. doi:10.4103/joco.joco_148_20. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/34765810

9. Pham AT, Ramulu PY, Boland MV, Yohannan J. **The Effect of Transitioning from SITA Standard to SITA Faster on Visual Field Performance.** *Ophthalmology*. Oct 2021;128(10):1417-1425. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2021.03.032. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33798655

10. Thulasidas M, Patyal S. Re: Pham et al. **The effect of transitioning from SITA standard to SITA faster on visual field performance** (*Ophthalmology*. 2021:128;1417-1425). *Ophthalmology*. Nov 2021;128(11):e215-e216. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2021.07.021. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/34380596

11. Phu J, Kalloniatis M. **Patient and technician perspectives following the introduction of frontloaded visual field testing in glaucoma assessment.** *Clin Exp Optom*. Aug 2022;105(6):617-623. doi:10.1080/08164622.2021.1965461. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/34402753

12. Rodriguez-Agirretxe I, Loizate E, Astorkiza B, Onaindia A, Galdos-Olasagasti L, Basasoro **A. Validation of the SITA faster strategy for the management of glaucoma.** *Int Ophthalmol*. Aug 2022;42(8):2347-2354. doi:10.1007/s10792-022-02232-6. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/35072855; https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10792-022-02232-6

13. Lee GA, Kong GYX, Liu CH. **Visual fields in glaucoma: Where are we now?** *Clin Exp Ophthalmol*. Mar 2023;51(2):162-169. doi:10.1111/ceo.14210. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/36751125

SITA Faster Reliability Metrics

1. Anderson G, Graves N. **Effects of response style on SITA Standard 24-2C and SITA Faster 24-2C visual field tests.** *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2020;61(7):3885-3885. https://iovs.arvojournals.org/article.aspx?articleid=2768291
2. Phu J, Kalloniatis M. **The Frontloading Fields Study (FFS): Detecting Changes in Mean Deviation in Glaucoma Using Multiple Visual Field Tests Per Clinical Visit.** *Transl Vis Sci Technol.* Nov 1 2021;10(13):21. doi:10.1167/tvst.10.13.21. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/34779836
3. Heijl A, Patella VM, Flanagan JG, et al. **False Positive Responses in Standard Automated Perimetry.** *Am J Ophthalmol.* Jan 2022;233:180-188. doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2021.06.026. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/34283973
4. Camp AS, Long CP, Patella VM, Proudfoot JA, Weinreb RN. **Standard Reliability and Gaze Tracking Metrics in Glaucoma and Glaucoma Suspects.** *Am J Ophthalmol.* Feb 2022;234:91-98. doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2021.06.038. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/34280366
5. Phu J, Kalloniatis M. **The Frontloading Fields Study: The Impact of False Positives and Seeding Point Errors on Visual Field Reliability When Using SITA-Faster.** *Transl Vis Sci Technol.* Feb 1 2022;11(2):20. doi:10.1167/tvst.11.2.20 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/35142783
6. Phu J, Kalloniatis M. **Gaze tracker parameters have little association with visual field metrics of intrasession frontloaded SITA-Faster 24-2 visual field results.** *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt.* Sep 2022;42(5):973-985. doi:10.1111/opo.13006. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/35598152
7. Costa VP, Zangalli CS, Jammal AA, et al. **24-2 SITA Standard versus 24-2 SITA Faster in Perimetry-Naive Normal Subjects.** *Ophthalmol Glaucoma.* Mar-Apr 2023;6(2):129-136. doi:10.1016/j.ogla.2022.08.006. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/35985477; https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2589419622001569?via%3Dihub
8. Tan JCK, Kalloniatis M, Phu J. **Frontloading SITA-Faster Can Increase Frequency and Reliability of Visual Field Testing at Minimal Time Cost.** *Ophthalmol Glaucoma.* Sep-Oct 2023;6(5):445-456. doi:10.1016/j.ogla.2023.03.006. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/36958625; https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2589419623000649?via%3Dihub
9. Tan JCK, Agar A, Kalloniatis M, Phu J. **Quantification and Predictors of Visual Field Variability in Healthy, Glaucoma Suspect, and Glaucomatous Eyes Using SITA-Faster.** *Ophthalmology.* Jun 2024;131(6):658-666. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2023.12.018. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/38110124; https://www.aaojournal.org/article/S0161-6420(23)00909-0/abstract

24-2C Test Pattern – Applications and Clinical Comparisons

1. Lee GC, Monhart M, Callan T, et al. **Performance of a modified 24-2 test pattern using SITA Faster.** *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2018;59(9):6032-6032. https://iovs.arvojournals.org/article.aspx?articleid=2693900
2. Lee GC, Yu S, Callan T, Durbin MK, Covita A, Severin T. **Diagnostic Efficacy of 24-2 and 24-2C SITA Faster Global Summary Indices.** *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2019;60(9):2455-2455. https://iovs.arvojournals.org/article.aspx?articleid=2746216
3. Callan T, Lee GC, Yu S, et al. **Evaluation of the SITA Standard 24-2C visual field test.** *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2020;61(7):3876-3876. https://iovs.arvojournals.org/article.aspx?articleid=2769130
4. Lee GC, Callan T, Yu S, et al. **Comparison of 24-2C SITA Standard test times to legacy SITA tests.** *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2020;61(7):3879-3879. https://iovs.arvojournals.org/article.aspx?articleid=2769355

5. Chakravarti T, Moghadam M, Proudfoot JA, Weinreb RN, Bowd C, Zangwill LM. **Agreement Between 10-2 and 24-2C Visual Field Test Protocols for Detecting Glaucomatous Central Visual Field Defects.** *J Glaucoma*. Jun 1 2021;30(6):e285-e291. doi:10.1097/IJG.0000000000001844. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33813563

6. Carpenter A, Callan T, Yu S, et al. **Diagnostic efficacy of 24-2C SITA Standard global summary indices.** *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2022;63(7):1264 – A0404-1264 – A0404. https://iovs.arvojournals.org/article.aspx?articleid=2782783

7. Harrison L, Chen A, Chen PP, Luong P. **Pointwise Comparison of the 24-2C and 10-2 for Central Field Defects.** *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2022;63(7):1251 – A0391-1251 – A0391. https://iovs.arvojournals.org/article.aspx?articleid=2782177

8. Lee GC, Cunningham B, Chong L, et al. **Perimetric simulations of 24-2C SITA Standard visual fields.** *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2022;63(7):1255 – A0395-1255 – A0395. https://iovs.arvojournals.org/article.aspx?articleid=2782363

9. Su S, Callan T, Yu S, et al. Comparison of 24-2C SITA Standard and 24-2C SITA Faster. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2022;63(7):1267 – A0407-1267 – A0407. https://iovs.arvojournals.org/article.aspx?articleid=2783014

10. Meshkin RS, Zhao Y, Elze T, Boland MV, Friedman DS. **Remote Video Monitoring of Simultaneous Visual Field Testing.** *J Glaucoma*. Jul 1 2022;31(7):488-493. doi:10.1097/IJG.0000000000002045. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/35763679; https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/wk/jglau/2022/00000031/00000007/art00004

11. Trouilloud A, Ferry E, Boucart M, et al. **Impact of glaucoma on the spatial frequency processing of scenes in central vision.** *Vis Neurosci.* Feb 8 2023;40:E001. doi:10.1017/S0952523822000086. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/36752177

12. Behera G, Nath A, Ramasamy A, Kaliaperumal S. **Comparing Static Perimetry Protocols of Central Field Testing among Patients with Glaucoma.** *Optom Vis Sci*. Jun 1 2023;100(6):406-411. doi:10.1097/OPX.0000000000002020. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/37129640

13. Kha R, Macken O, Mitchell P, et al. **The Australian Eye and Ear Health Survey (AEEHS): Study protocol for a population-based cross-sectional study.** *PLoS One*. 2024;19(5):e0301846. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0301846. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/38820367

14. Rianti N, Satari K, Prahasta A, Rifada RM, Umbara S. **Comparison of SITA Standard 24-2 with SITA Faster 24-2c Program on Humphrey Field Analyzer in Assessing Visual Field Defects of Glaucoma Patients.** *Ophthalmologica Indonesiana*. Feb 12 2024;49(S1):50-57. doi:10.35749/a4syph39. https://doi.org/10.35749/a4syph39; https://ophthalmologica-indonesiana.com/index.php/journal/article/download/100929/403.pdf

15. Nishijima E, Fukai K, Sano K, et al. **Comparative Analysis of 24-2C, 24-2, and 10-2 Visual Field Tests for Detecting Mild-Stage Glaucoma With Central Visual field Defects.** *Am J Ophthalmol*. Dec 2024;268:275-284. doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2024.07.024. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/39094994

16. Tan JCK, Yohannan J, Ramulu PY, et al. **Visual field testing in glaucoma using the Swedish Interactive Thresholding Algorithm (SITA).** *Surv Ophthalmol*. Jan-Feb 2025;70(1):141-152. doi:10.1016/j.survophthal.2024.09.005. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/39349186

Guided Progression Analysis (GPA™) with SITA Faster

1. Phu J, Kalloniatis M. **Viability of Performing Multiple 24-2 Visual Field Examinations at the Same Clinical Visit: The Frontloading Fields Study (FFS).** *Am J Ophthalmol*. Oct 2021;230:48-59. doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2021.04.019. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33951444
2. Le CT, Fiksel J, Ramulu P, Yohannan J. **Differences in visual field loss pattern when transitioning from SITA standard to SITA faster.** *Sci Rep*. Apr 29 2022;12(1):7001. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-11044-8. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/35488026
3. Chen RI, Gedde SJ. **Assessment of visual field progression in glaucoma.** *Curr Opin Ophthalmol*. Mar 1 2023;34(2):103-108. doi:10.1097/ICU.0000000000000932. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/36378107; https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/wk/icu/2023/00000034/00000002/art00003
4. Tan JCK, Phu J, Go D, et al. **Evaluation of the Consistency of Glaucomatous Visual Field Defects Using a Clustered SITA-Faster Protocol.** *Ophthalmology*. Nov 2023;130(11):1138-1148. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2023.06.018. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/37385298
5. Wang H, Kalloniatis M, Tan JCK, Phu J. **Frontloading visual field tests detect earlier mean deviation progression when applied to real-world-derived early-stage glaucoma data.** *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt*. Mar 2024;44(2):426-441. doi:10.1111/opo.13270. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/38226742
6. Phu J, Tan J, Kalloniatis M. **Multiple (frontloaded) visual field tests increase identification of very slow mean deviation progression in glaucoma.** *Can J Ophthalmol*. Oct 2024;59(5):311-323. doi:10.1016/j.jcjo.2023.07.023. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/37652089

Structure – Function Relationship

1. Chakravarti T, Moghadam M, OH WH, et al. **Agreement between structural and functional tests for detecting central glaucomatous defects.** *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2020;61(9):PB0098-PB0098. https://iovs.arvojournals.org/article.aspx?articleid=2770475
2. Kresch YS, Tsamis E, Liebmann JM, De Moraes CG, Hood DC. **A comparison of the 24-2, 24-2C and 10-2 test locations to the region of arcuate defects seen on OCT retinal ganglion cell probability maps.** *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2020;61(7):1975-1975. https://iovs.arvojournals.org/article.aspx?articleid=2769699
3. Phu J, Kalloniatis M. **Ability of 24-2C and 24-2 Grids to Identify Central Visual Field Defects and Structure-Function Concordance in Glaucoma and Suspects**. *Am J Ophthalmol*. Nov 2020;219:317-331doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2020.06.024. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32621896
4. Phu J, Kalloniatis M. **Comparison of 10-2 and 24-2C Test Grids for Identifying Central Visual Field Defects in Glaucoma and Suspect Patients.** *Ophthalmology*. Oct 2021;128(10):1405-1416. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2021.03.014. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33722636
5. Hong JW, Baek MS, Lee JY, Song MK, Shin JW, Kook MS. **Comparison of the 24-2 and 24-2C Visual Field Grids in Determining the Macular Structure-Function Relationship in Glaucoma.** *J Glaucoma*. Oct 1 2021;30(10):887-894. doi:10.1097/IJG.0000000000001928. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/34387259; https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/wk/jglau/2021/00000030/00000010/art00009

6. Rafla D, Khuu SK, Kashyap S, Kalloniatis M, Phu J. **Visualising structural and functional characteristics distinguishing between newly diagnosed high-tension and low-tension glaucoma patients.** *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt*. 2023;43(4):771-787. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC10946885/pdf/OPO-43-771.pdf

7. Balas M, Mathew DJ. **Secondary open-angle glaucoma in a young male related to dimethylamylamine supplementation.** *Can J Ophthalmol*. Aug 2023;58(4):e171-e175. doi:10.1016/j.jcjo.2023.02.011. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/36965509

8. Rafla D, Kalloniatis M, Phu J. **The effect of macular visual field test density on central structure-function concordance in glaucoma.** *Clin Exp Optom*. Mar 14 2024:1-10. doi:10.1080/08164622.2024.2319767. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/38484727

9. Du KH, Kamalipour A, Moghimi S. **Central visual field in glaucoma: An updated review.** *Taiwan J Ophthalmol*. Jul-Sep 2024;14(3):360-370. doi:10.4103/tjo.TJO-D-24-00042. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/39430344

10. Tong J, Phu J, Alonso-Caneiro D, et al. **Exploring the relationship between 24-2 visual field and widefield optical coherence tomography data across healthy, glaucoma suspect and glaucoma eyes.** *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt*. Nov 2024;44(7):1484-1499. doi:10.1111/opo.13368. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/39056571

Neuro-Ophthalmology and Other Non-Glaucoma Applications

1. Yamane MLM, Odel JG. **Introducing the 24-2C Visual Field Test in Neuro-Ophthalmology.** *J Neuroophthalmol*. Dec 1 2021;41(4):e606-e611. doi:10.1097/WNO.0000000000001157. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33417411; https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/wk/jno/2021/00000041/00000004/art00044

2. De Luca M, Baroncini M, Matano A, et al. **Sensitivity and Specificity of the Brentano Illusion Test in the Detection of Visual Hemi-Field Deficits in Patients with Unilateral Spatial Neglect.** *Brain Sci*. Jun 9 2023;13(6):937. doi:10.3390/brainsci13060937. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/37371415

3. Saffra NA, Emborgo TS, Ranka MP, Kirsch DS. **Progressive myelinated retinal nerve fibers in a 10-year-old boy with Crouzon syndrome after craniofacial surgery.** *Am J Ophthalmol Case Rep*. Dec 2023;32:101904. doi:10.1016/j.ajoc.2023.101904. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/37521804

4. De Luca M, Zeri F, Matano A, et al. **Sensitivity and Specificity of Qualitative Visual Field Tests for Screening Visual Hemifield Deficits in Right-Brain-Damaged Stroke Patients.** *Brain Sci*. Feb 29 2024;14(3):235. doi:10.3390/brainsci14030235. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/38539623

5. Chapman-Davies A, Chapman-Davies R. **Rare presentation of peripapillary staphyloma with normal visual acuity.** *Clin Exp Optom*. May 5 2024:1-3. doi:10.1080/08164622.2024.2341834. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/38706092

en-INT_31_200_0244IV CZ-II/2025 International edition: Only for sale in selected countries.

Carl Zeiss Meditec, Inc.
5300 Central Parkway
Dublin, CA 94568
USA
www.zeiss.com
www.zeiss.com/med/contacts

EC REP **Carl Zeiss Meditec AG**
Goeschwitzer Str. 51-52
07745 Jena
Germany
www.zeiss.com
www.zeiss.com/med/contacts