



Hatem Barhoom^{1,3}, Gunnar Schmidtman¹, Mahesh R. Joshi¹, Paul H. Artes¹, Mark A. Georgeson²
¹University of Plymouth, Plymouth, UK, ²Aston University, Birmingham, UK, ³Islamic University of Gaza, Palestine




BACKGROUND

- Letters have complex structure, and it is likely that letter bias and similarity between letters are sources of non-random errors in letter identification tasks¹⁻³
- Here we introduce a novel and significant extension to our recently derived model⁴, to reveal the joint effect of bias and similarity in letter identification.

METHODS

- Letter identification task, with sizes spanning the acuity limit; 10 naïve Ss
- 10 Sloan letters, presented singly for 250 ms
- Central and 3° eccentricity in upper and lower visual field
- Method of constant stimuli (1800 trials/subject)





- Data collated as a *stimulus-response matrix*: each cell counts the number of times a given letter was chosen in response to the letter presented.


MODEL

(A) The “noisy template” model⁴ was extended to capture letter biases & effects of between-letter similarity in experimental data.

(B) The optotype correlation matrix⁵ was used to model similarity.




- The Noisy Template Model:
 - A** without biases or similarity.
 - B** with biases but no similarity.
 - C** with similarity but no biases.
- Model parameters are Baseline sensitivity, Bias gradient, Confusion strength.
- The model was fitted to the observed number of responses.




RESULTS

- Data**: stimulus-response matrix (group average).
- Model 1**: prediction with bias and similarity.
- Model 2**: prediction with bias only.
- Model 3**: prediction with similarity only.
- Model comparison using AIC showed that model 1 was favoured over the other two models.
- Chi square (X^2) scores similarly showed that bias & similarity (model 1) predicted the data more closely (smaller X^2 value) than bias or similarity alone did.




Model 1

$x^2 = 19.05$




Model 2

$x^2 = 34.28$



Model 3

$x^2 = 66.40$



CONCLUSIONS

- Letter biases and between-letter similarity together shape the pattern of correct responses (negative diagonal) and errors (off-diagonal) in the letter identification task with Sloan letters.
- In future work, it will be important to investigate the impact of bias and similarity on the estimated acuity using letters as optotypes.

REFERENCES

- Barhoom, H., Joshi, M. R., & Schmidtman, G. (2021). The effect of response biases on resolution thresholds of Sloan letters in central and paracentral vision. *Vision Research*, 187, 110-119.
- McMonnies, C. W. & A. Ho (1996). Analysis of errors in letter acuity measurements. *Clinical and Experimental Optometry* 79(4): 144-151.
- Reich, L. N. & H. E. Bedell (2000). Relative legibility and confusions of letter acuity targets in the peripheral and central retina. *Optometry and Vision Science* 77(5): 270-
- Georgeson, M.A., Barhoom, H., Joshi, M.R., Artes, P.H., & Schmidtman, G. (2022). Revealing the influence of bias in a letter acuity identification task: a noisy template model. *Vision Research*, submitted.
- Fülep, C., Kovács, I., Kránitz, K., & Erdei, G. (2017). Correlation-based evaluation of visual performance to reduce the statistical error of visual acuity. *JOSA A*, 34(7), 1255-1264.