City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

1 **Color Vision Assessment – 1. Visual signals that affect the results of the Farnsworth D-**
2 **15 test**
3

4 Benjamin E W Evans

5 Marisa Rodriguez-Carmona

6 John L Barbur

7

8 Affiliation:

9 Centre for Applied Vision Research, School of Health Sciences,

10 City, University of London, UK.

11

12

13 Corresponding author:

14 Benjamin Evans,

15 City, University of London,

16 Email: benjamin.evans@city.ac.uk

17
18

19

20 **Abstract:**

21 The Farnsworth D-15 test (D-15) is commonly used to screen for moderate to severe

22 congenital color vision deficiency. The aim of this study was to establish reliable D-15

23 statistics for normal, deutan and protan subjects, and to investigate the different visual signals

24 one can use to carry out the test, even in dichromats and rod monochromats. Six hundred and

25 seventy-four subjects were examined using the D-15, the Colour Assessment & Diagnosis

26 (CAD) test and the Nagel anomaloscope. A rod monochromat and five dichromats were

27 tested using the standard D-15 protocol before the caps were separated into two groups and

28 subjects were asked to repeat the task. D-15 spectral radiance data, measured under D65

29 illumination, were used to estimate differences in photoreceptor excitations for each of the

30 caps. When no crossings and up to two adjacent transpositions on the D-15 results diagram

31 are accepted as a pass, 100% of normal trichromats, 54% of deutans and 43% of protans pass

32 the D-15. A rod monochromat and two protanopes and deuteranopes were able to complete

33 the D-15 when the caps were separated into two groups, despite severe loss or even complete

34 absence of color vision. When up to two adjacent transpositions are accepted 50% of color

35 deficient subjects, some with severe red/green loss, pass the D-15. Whilst the D-15 is

36 normally used to screen for moderate to severe color deficiency, subjects with severe loss can

37 still use combined, residual red/green, yellow/blue and luminance signals to pass.

38

39 **Keywords:** Farnsworth D-15, color assessment, color vision deficiency, dichromatism, rod

40 monochromatism

1. Introduction

This is the first in a series of three papers which examined common color assessment tests employed in the clinic to detect early changes in chromatic sensitivity and also in occupations to screen for congenital and / or acquired loss of color vision in order to relate test outcomes to class and severity of color vision loss. This paper evaluates the performance of the Farnsworth D-15 test (D-15) at screening for and classifying color vision deficiency, in addition to appraising the residual signals that enable subjects with reduced chromatic sensitivity to successfully arrange the caps. The second paper[1] evaluates the statistical outcomes of commonly used color assessment tests and examines the efficiency of frequently used single- and multi-test protocols. The third paper[2] assesses the fundamental limits of what one can achieve in color vision assessment and describes a new test that approaches this limit. Following its introduction over 70 years ago[3] the D-15 continues to be used to screen for individuals with reduced chromatic sensitivity in occupational and clinical environments[4–8]. The standard D-15 consists of 16 Munsell hues, mounted in circular casings or 'caps', of approximately 13mm in diameter. Participants are provided with a fixed reference or pilot cap and are asked to select and arrange the remaining caps, one by one, in each instance selecting the cap that appears to be least-different perceptually to the most recently selected cap[9].

Various methods for establishing error scores have been described[10–13] and in a recent study, the type and number of errors subjects make have even been related with some success to the colorimetric characteristics of the caps[14]. In spite of such efforts, the preferred method of interpreting the results of the D-15 in most clinical settings is to plot the subject's arranged sequence on a circular diagram[15,16]. The circular diagram plays a large role in the ease of administration and interpretation of the results. Errors made on the D-15 are classified, based upon their appearance when plotted on the circular diagram, as either being adjacent

66 transposition or major isochromatic crossings. Commonly used 'pass' protocols vary

67 between accepting 1-2 adjacent transpositions[17] to allowing up to 2 major isochromatic

68 crossings[18]; these types of errors are illustrated in more detail in Figures 1c and d.

69 Monochromats, dichromats and anomalous trichromats with reduced or absent chromatic

70 sensitivity are expected to fail, making multiple crossings, whilst those who pass are assumed

71 to have normal trichromatic color vision or close to normal chromatic sensitivity[8,9,19], making

72 at most one to two adjacent transpositions.

73 The Colour Assessment and Diagnosis (CAD) test is a color detection threshold test based on

74 findings from studies designed to investigate how the spatiotemporal characteristics of the

75 background field can be used to desensitise either luminance or chromatic mechanisms[20,21].

76 Further studies on camouflage revealed new ways to isolate the use of color signals without

77 affecting significantly the sensitivity of chromatic mechanisms[22,23]. The standardised version

78 of the CAD test displays moving stimuli buried in dynamic luminance contrast noise and the

79 output is measured in terms of red/green (RG) and yellow/blue (YB) color thresholds[24] that

80 are approximately linearly proportional to the cone contrasts generated by the colored

81 stimulus[25]. The Nagel anomaloscope, when carried out by a trained examiner in the clinic, is

82 considered to be the most accurate test for determining and classifying deutan and protan

83 deficiency[9,26]. Although the disagreement between the anomaloscope matching range and the

84 outcome of the D-15 test has been previously documented by Birch[27], the study used the size

85 of the Rayleigh match as a measure for the severity of loss. Whilst the Nagel anomaloscope is

86 renowned for its accuracy in distinguishing between protanomalous and deuteranomalous

87 observers[28,29], the relationship between the parameters of the match and the subject's overall

88 chromatic sensitivity is known to be generally poor[30].

89 The limitations of the D-15, including the potential effects on the D-15 from variation in

90 illuminants, have recently been highlighted[31] and the impact that practice can have on the

91   outcome of the D-15, and the subsequent suitability of the D-15 have been questioned[32,33].

92   Given the extensive use of the D-15 in the clinic, and particularly in occupational settings, the

93   test still has relevance today. It is important to note, and appreciate, in most clinical and

94   occupational settings, the D-15 is employed as a secondary test, used if applicants fail an

95   initial screening test, such as the Ishihara pseudoisochromatic plate test[34]. The principal aim

96   of this study is to evaluate the performance of the D-15 test at screening for and classifying

97   color vision deficiency and to examine the spread in the severity of color vision loss in those

98   who fail and those who pass the most commonly used D-15 protocols. Since many subjects

99   with severe RG color deficiency pass the D-15 test, a secondary aim of the project is to

100   identify the residual signals that enable these subjects to successfully arrange the caps.

101   **2.   Methods**

102   Data for 850 subjects were abstracted from anonymized records collected through the

103   Advanced Vision and Optometric Tests (AVOT) clinic service at City, University of London.

104   All subjects completed the D-15, CAD test and Nagel anomaloscope. Standardised

105   instructions were given prior to all tests. The exclusion criteria were acquired colour vision

106   loss, subjects under 10 years of age, and subjects who returned to the AVOT clinic for

107   multiple assessments. For subjects who returned for repeat visits, only the data from their first

108   visit were used. Following application of the exclusion criteria, the results for 395 deutans,

109   205 protans and 74 normal trichromats were evaluated. The age of subjects ranged from 10 to

110   65 years. Diagnosis of the type of color vision deficiency was determined from the results of

111   the CAD test and the Nagel anomaloscope.

112   The D-15 was illuminated with the new Macbeth easel lamp approximating CIE illuminant

113   D65. The mean luminance of the caps was 16.6 cd/m^2 (SD = 0.45, range: 15.7 to 17.5 cd/m^2).

114   A magnesium oxide reference white surface (R = ~0.94) had a luminance of 87.8 cd/m^2 and

115   CIE 1931 chromaticity of 0.306, 0.324. This corresponds approximately to an illuminance

116   level of 293 lm/m^2.

117   Subjects were instructed to initially select the cap that appeared to be most similar to the pilot

118   or reference cap, and then to select the cap that appeared to be most similar to the last cap that

119   they selected. Upon completing the test subjects were asked to review their arrangement and

120   make any changes, if desired. No feedback was provided during the assessment.

121   The CAD test employs a 10 bit Eizo CS2420 monitor calibrated for luminance and the

122   chromaticity of each primary color using a Konica CS-2000A telespectroradiometer

123   (manufactured by Konica Minolta Inc. with a spectral range of 380 to 780nm. The spectrum

124   was sampled every nm with a bandwidth of just under 1nm). The CAD test runs on an HP

125   ProBook 650 G1 laptop. The standard CAD test uses 16 interleaved color directions specified

126   in CIE 1931 color space. Following each presentation, the subject's task was to press one of

127   four buttons, to indicate the direction of motion of the color-defined stimulus[24]. Before

128   completing the CAD test all subjects were required to complete a short 'learning mode'

129   correctly, to ensure they understood the task. A Type I Nagel anomaloscope was used to

130   measure the Rayleigh color match for all subjects.

131   The outcome of the D-15 was evaluated using two pass criteria, allowing no errors (either

132   major crossings or adjacent transpositions) and accepting up to two adjacent transpositions as

133   a pass on the D-15, in order to pass all normal subjects, as diagnosed by the CAD test and the

134   Nagel Anomaloscope, in the sample. The D-15 classification was determined by splitting the

135   cap order into 15 pairs of sequential caps and passing each pair through a classification grid

136   (Figure 1a). RG CAD thresholds were used to evaluate the relationship between the severity

137   of loss in protans and deutans and the outcome of the D-15.

138   The spectral radiance of each cap when illuminated with D65 was measured using the Konica

139   CS-2000A telespectroradiometer. The spectral radiance data were used in combination with

140   the Smith and Pokorny cone fundaments[35] to estimate cap-specific cone excitations. The

141   spectral luminous efficiency function, V'(λ), was used to calculate the corresponding rod

142   photoreceptor excitations[36].

143   To investigate the residual signals that enable subjects with severe RG deficiency to

144   successfully arrange the D-15 caps we established whether in the absence of normal RG

145   chromatic signals, sequential, monotonic step changes in S cone and rod signals between

146   adjacent caps can provide sufficient information to enable dichromats and rod monochromats

147   to order the caps correctly by minimising the perceptual differences between adjacent caps.

148   To do this, two reduced versions of the D-15 task were created. The illumination was kept

149   constant and no new caps were introduced. The 16 caps employed in the D-15 test were split

150   into two cap subgroups. Given the aim of investigating those with severe RG loss the two cap

151   subgroups were selected based on the measured S-cone and rod excitations shown in Figure

152   3d. The first cap subgroup (caps P-8) exhibit monotonic decrements in S-cone and rod

153   signals, whilst the second cap subgroup (caps 9-15) exhibit positive monotonic increments in

154   S-cone and rod excitations. Note that caps 9 and 10 exhibit approximately equal rod

155   excitations.

156   A rod monochromat, with a visual acuity of 20/200, identified as CNGB3 through genetic

157   testing at Moorfields Eye Hospital London, a tritanope, two protanopes and two deuteranopes

158   were assessed using the two D-15 protocols. The protanope and deuteranope were identified

159   using the Nagel anomaloscope. The tritanope was identified using the CAD test, in which the

160   subject displayed normal RG color thresholds, but exhibited specific loss along the tritan

161   confusion axis that was only limited by the maximum chromatic displacements that can be

162   achieved on the visual display, see Figure 6c. These subjects completed the standard D-15

163   protocol before the caps were separated into two cap subgroups, from caps P-8 and caps 9-15,

164   and subjects were asked to arrange the caps in each cap subgroup as to minimise the

165 perceived differences between each cap, repeating the D-15 protocol with a reduced selection

166 of caps. All subjects arranged the two subgroups within two minutes of being presented with

167 the caps. Informed consent was obtained from all subjects. The study was conducted in

168 compliance with the City, University of London research and ethical guidelines and followed

169 the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki.

3. Results

171 When no crossings and no adjacent transpositions are accepted, 99% of normal trichromats,

172 66% of deuteranomalous trichromats, 60% of protanomalous trichromats, 2% of

173 deuteranopes and 3% of protanopes pass the D-15. When no crossings and up to two adjacent

174 transpositions are accepted, 100% of normal trichromats pass the D-15. The percentage of

175 subjects with congenital color vision deficiency who pass the D-15 are shown in Table 1a.

176 When up to two adjacent transpositions are accepted, 76% of deuteranomalous trichromats,

177 69% of protanomalous trichromats, 3% of deuteranopes and 9% of protanopes pass the D-15.

178 Approximately 74% of anomalous trichromats in this cohort pass, whereas only ~6% of

179 dichromats pass (Table 1b), and 54% of deutans pass compared to 43% of protans (Table 1c).

180 There was 100% agreement between the classification made by the CAD test and the Nagel

181 anomaloscope for all subjects in this study. The classification made by the D-15 in all

182 subjects and in those that fail the D-15, when up to two adjacent transpositions are accepted,

183 is shown in Table 2a and Table 2b, respectively. For all subjects the D-15 correctly classifies

184 94.9% of deuteranopes, 80.9% of protanopes, and 19.8% and 21.6% of deuteranomalous and

185 protanomalous trichromats, respectively. The classification made by the D-15 improves if

186 one only considers those who fail the D-15, when up to two adjacent transpositions are

187 accepted, with 98.2%, 88.9%, 80.9%, and 69.5% of deuteranopes, protanopes,

188 deuteranomalous trichromats, and protanomalous trichromats respectively being classified

189 correctly.

190 All subjects within the cohort had YB CAD thresholds within the normal range for their age.

191 The distributions of RG CAD thresholds in deutans and protans who pass and fail the D-15

192 are shown in Figure 2. The median RG CAD thresholds for deutans that pass the D-15 was

193 5.93 RG CAD units and 10.38 RG CAD units for protans. One CAD unit describes the

194 median RG or YB threshold color signal strengths measured in 330 heathy, young, normal

195 trichromats[24]. Only 50% of normal trichromats have thresholds less than one CAD unit. The

196 maximum RG CAD threshold for those who passed the D-15, when up to two adjacent

197 transpositions were accepted, was 25.81 for deutans and 24.69 RG CAD units for protans.

198 The predicted photoreceptor excitations generated by the D-15 caps are shown in Figure 3d.

199 When two protanopes and two deuteranopes completed the D-15 under the standard protocol

200 their results produced typical error patterns, with participants making multiple major iso-

201 chromatic crossings (Figure 4b and Figure 5b). When the caps were separated into two

202 subgroups, both protanopes and deuteranopes were able to arrange the caps within each

203 subgroup with no errors. When a tritanope completed the same protocol, they were unable to

204 arrange the caps correctly under standard conditions. This was also the case when presented

205 with each of the two subgroups (Figure 6b).

206 Not unexpectedly, a rod monochromat (CNGB3) made several errors on the D-15 test under

207 normal conditions (Figure 7b). When presented with each of the two subgroups, the rod

208 monochromat was able to arrange the caps almost completely correctly, only making one

209 minor transposition (cap 9 and 10 during the first test and interchanging the order of these

210 two caps in repeated tests). These caps have approximately the same rod excitation, see

211 Figure 7d.

212 **4. Discussion**

213 The D-15 pass rates obtained in this study, when up to two adjacent transpositions are

214 accepted, are slightly higher than previous reports, with a similar sample size (N=710), by

215 Birch[16] using a 'circular results diagram' and accepting a maximum of two adjacent

216 transpositions, and higher than Dain and Adams[37], who used a significantly smaller sample

217 size (N=75). Several factors may contribute to this difference, notably the range of severity of

218 loss in the sample and the method of collecting data. As shown in Figure 2 the cohort

219 examined in this study contains a large number of mild protans and deutans, (particularly

220 deutans) with relatively low RG CAD thresholds. Although the cohort contains some younger

221 individuals, previous studies have shown that children aged from 5-12 years are capable of

222 performing color arrangement tests such as the D-15, albeit with a modified protocol[38].

223 However, in more complex tests such as the Farnsworth-Munsell 100-Hue, results in children

224 can also be affected by their nonverbal IQ[39].

225 The two pass criteria investigated highlight the balancing act and limitation present in all tests

226 with variable pass criteria; the maximisation of both sensitivity and specificity. The maximal

227 sensitivity of the D-15 is obtained when one accepts no errors on the D-15 test and, based

228 upon data collected in this study, the specificity is maximised when up to two adjacent

229 transpositions are accepted. Particularly in occupational settings a small number of adjacent

230 transpositions are typically accepted in order to ensure that the small percentage of normal

231 trichromats who make such errors pass the D-15, even if this is at the cost of passing more

232 individuals with color vision deficiency[1]. From the data in this study, by accepting adjacent

233 transpositions, and passing the 1% of normals who make such errors, one is also allowing

234 approximately 10% more anomalous trichromats and 3% more dichromats to pass the D-15.

235 It is important to also consider the manner in which the data were collected. Most individuals

236 who attend the AVOT service at City, University of London do so to complete a color vision

237 assessment to determine whether they pass an occupational color vision standard. Many of

238 these individuals will have previously failed some form of screening test (typically the

239 Ishihara pseudoisochromatic plate test), and although not formally quantified, it is highly

240   likely that some of the individuals in this sample will have encountered other conventional

241   color vision tests (such as the City University test or the D-15), prior to coming to the AVOT

242   service. The impact of practicing the D-15 has been recently discussed in two publications by

243   Ng and Liem[32] and Ng and Morton[33] who demonstrated that color deficient subjects,

244   including dichromats, who initially made errors on the D-15 were able to complete the test

245   correctly after practicing the test. Dain, Atchison and Hovis[31] build upon these ideas and also

246   highlight the potential impact the choice of illumination may have upon the outcome of the

247   D-15. The confounding variable of practice effects and their influence on repeatability and

248   reproducibility is an issue with many conventional methods of color assessment, including

249   the D-15.

250   These limitations are virtually impossible to control if one wishes to consistently use one

251   version of the D-15; one cannot stop members of the public from completing the D-15 at

252   other testing centres or practicing it in their own time. In multiple instances, we have seen

253   applicants who receive an inconclusive color vision diagnosis at an occupational health care

254   assessment and are referred to multiple optometrists for further color vision assessment,

255   before being asked to visit the AVOT clinic at City, University of London. In such cases the

256   applicant, through no fault of their own, has multiple opportunities to practice many

257   conventional color vision tests, including the D-15 and to improve their performance by

258   learning how to make better use of any additional cues.

259   The collection of CAD and D-15 data allows for the direct comparison between the outcome

260   of the D-15 and the severity of loss, as quantified by RG CAD thresholds. This approach has

261   been employed in a recently published study[4] designed to assess the spread in the severity of

262   RG loss in deutan and protan subjects who pass and those who fail the D-15 test when using

263   the Canadian Air Force color assessment protocol for the D-15 test. The results are similar in

264   the two studies and reveal the large variability in the severity of RG color vision loss in both

265   those who pass and those who fail the D-15 protocol. The large difference in sample size, 395

266   deutans and 205 protans examined in this study, and 40 deutan and 28 protans examined in

267   the study by Almustanyir, Hovis and Glaholt[4] as well as the use of different protocols for the

268   D-15, may account for the observed differences, particularly the fewer protans and deutans

269   with less severe loss of RG color vision who fail. The median RG CAD threshold and the

270   interquartile range are lower for subjects that pass the D-15, in both protan and deutan

271   deficiencies (Figure 2a and b). As a consequence, at least 75% of subjects with a congenital

272   color vision deficiency that are dichotomised by the D-15 are being split correctly, and fairly,

273   based upon their RG chromatic sensitivity. This outcome is however of limited value since

274   the D-15 also passes individuals with severe RG chromatic loss (with CAD thresholds up to

275   25.81 RG CAD units) and fails some individuals with RG thresholds below 4.00 CAD units.

276   These observations are of particular significance in occupational environments, where the

277   outcome of the D-15 is used to determine occupational suitability in visually demanding

278   jobs[1,4].

279   The observed variability in RG chromatic sensitivity in color deficient subjects who pass and

280   also in those who fail the D-15 test suggests that the subjects make use of multiple signals to

281   carry out the task. The extent to which subjects make use of these signals will depend both

282   on the signals available and the attention given to any additional clues, with the latter being

283   minimised through the use of standardised instructions.

284   Given that all subjects had normal YB chromatic sensitivity (as measured by the CAD test), it

285   is of interest to know the extent to which the subjects make use of YB color signal changes to

286   pass the test. The expected changes in S-cone photoreceptor excitation when viewing the D-

287   15 caps are shown in Figure 3d. The monotonic decrease in S-cone signals from the pilot cap

288   to cap 8, hint at a potential answer. As one moves across the caps employed in the D-15 one

289   observes a large change in the predicted S-cone photoreceptor signal, accompanied by a

290 slightly smaller change in the predicted rod-photoreceptor excitation. There is relatively low

291 variation in the theoretical M- and L- cone photoreceptor excitation, by contrast, when one

292 moves across the D-15 caps. The predicted photoreceptor excitations do not account for the

293 relative number of photoreceptors in the eye, or post receptoral processing. However, they do

294 provide, at least on a basic level, an indication to the initial signals generated by the D-15

295 caps at the earliest stages of visual processing.

296 A limitation of this approach is the consideration of only 4 categories of photoreceptor in the

297 eye. Intrinsically photosensitive retinal ganglion cells (ipRGCs) have recently been shown to

298 play a role in form vision in the peripheral retina[40] and their impact upon non-image forming

299 visual functions has also been investigated in primate retina[41]. Due to the sparse distribution

300 and large receptive fields involved, ipRGCs are unlikely to notably contribute towards the

301 successful completion of the D-15 task, given the relatively small angular size of each cap

302 and the foveal location of the primary image location[42–44]. The spectral responsivity of

303 ipRGCs overlaps significantly with that of rods. Rod signals are the greatest signal

304 contributor to ipRGCs. The light levels involved in D15 tests are low photopic and therefore

305 most unlikely to involved melanopsin mediated signals. The results and conclusions drawn

306 from our findings remain unchanged even if rod signals associated with ipRGCs contribute to

307 the perceived brightness difference that help with the D15 task in rod monochromats. Further

308 studies are required to fully establish the role ipRGCs may play in hue arrangement tasks,

309 such as the D-15.

310 The results obtained from dichromats and a rod monochromat who also completed the two

311 protocols demonstrate that protanopes, deuteranopes, and even rod monochromats are able to

312 make use of the relatively large changes in S- cone and rod photoreceptor signals to complete

313 the D-15 test. Protanopes and deuteranopes who make multiple isochromatic crossings under

314 the standard D-15 protocol, made no errors when the caps were split into two groups. This is

315   not unexpected; the diminished or even absent RG color signal differences that prevent

316   typical protan and deutan confusions, particularly major crossings, are no longer possible and

317   caps with equal S-cone excitation are not available within either of the two cap subgroups.

318   The results in the tritanope (Figure 6) suggest strongly that normal RG color signals are not

319   sufficient to pass the D-15 test with no errors, since the tritanope makes multiple errors when

320   presented with the full set of caps and also makes errors when presented separately with each

321   of the two subgroups. The rod monochromat, on the other hand, can only rely on monotonic

322   changes in rod signals which can be used effectively within each subgroup to arrange the

323   caps in the correct sequence. The tritanope makes multiple errors within each subgroup, in

324   spite of normal rod function. An interesting consequence of this finding is that either the

325   presence of normal RG color signals or simply the interaction between M, L and rod signals

326   reduces the effectiveness of monotonic rod signal changes to carry out the test.

327   The results obtained in the rod monochromat merit further discussion. The results shown in

328   Figure 7c reveal the complete absence of both RG and YB color vision with thresholds

329   limited only by the gamut of the visual display employed in the CAD test. Despite making

330   typical confusions expected for a rod monochromat[9] with the standard D-15 protocol, the rod

331   monochromat was able to arrange the caps correctly when they were separated into the two

332   subgroups with only one minor transposition (mixing caps 9 and 10 in the first test). Given

333   that these caps generate almost equal rod photoreceptor signals, as shown in Figure 7d, this

334   result is not unexpected. The results show that monotonic changes in rod photoreceptor

335   signals, when the retina contains only functioning rods, can be used to complete the

336   arrangement of D-15 caps without errors, but only when the ambiguity of equal rod signals is

337   removed by separating the caps within the two subgroups.

338   Systematic diseases and diseases of the retina can result in a reduction in luminance contrast

339   and flicker sensitivity, in addition to loss of RG and / or YB color vision[45,46]. The D-15's

14

340 inability to isolate color signals and to quantify severity of RG and YB loss impact its

341 usefulness as a test for use in occupational settings. However, in the clinic where one wishes

342 to distinguish those with acquired visual loss that can affect chromatic sensitivity, but may

343 not be specific to just color vision from those with normal, healthy vision, a test that requires

344 the use of multiple visual signals to complete, such as the D-15, may prove to be sensitive

345 and effective in achieving this aim.

346 **5. Conclusion**

347 When the D-15 protocol allows for up to two adjacent transpositions, 50% of color deficient

348 subjects (approximately 54% of deutans and 43% of protans), some with severe loss of RG

349 color vision, pass the test. Given these large percentages of deutans and protans who pass the

350 D-15, the ability of the test to classify the type of color vision deficiency in anomalous

351 trichromats is very poor. This test is also unfair to some of the subjects who fail. Many of

352 those who pass the D-15 protocol have marked loss of RG color vision, whilst subjects with

353 significantly less marked loss, fail.

354 In this study we demonstrate that neither RG nor YB color signals in isolation are sufficient

355 to pass the D-15 test with no errors. The results also show that a subject can make use of

356 monotonic changes in rod signals to arrange the caps in the correct sequence, but only in rod

357 monochromats when rod signals do not interact with other cone signals.

358

362

363 **ORCID**

364 *Benjamin E W Evans*

365   https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6611-4500

366

367   **Disclosures:**

368

369

Figure 1. Classification grid for the Farnsworth D-15 test employed in this study (a), the key for the classification grid (b), and two D-15 results diagrams with example matches (c) and (d). The common practice used in the majority of clinical and occupational environments relies on 'visual inspection' and identification of adjacent transpositions and major crossings on a D-15 results diagram. The classification grid shown in (a) is used in the color research laboratory at City, University of London to make the process less subjective and open to interpretation. The subject's D-15 cap order yields 15 sets of sequential pairs and each pair can be then be linked through the classification grid to one of six types of matches (b). The overall D-15 classification is determined by the largest sum of errors (e.g., if an individual makes 4 'protan' crossings and 2 'deutan' crossings, the D-15 classification would be 'protan'). In the event when an individual makes the same number of errors for two types of error, the classification is 'indeterminate'. Examples of the six match types are shown in the D-15 results diagrams (c) and (d) for protan (i), deutan (ii), tritan (iii), adjacent transpositions (iv), deutan and protan (v), and normal matches (vi). 'Protan & deutan' errors count as both a protan and a deutan error.

Figure 2. The variability in RG CAD thresholds for subjects with congenital deutan deficiency (a) and congenital protan deficiency (b) who pass or fail the Farnsworth D-15 test when 0 major crossings and up to 2 adjacent transpositions are accepted as a pass. The results are from 395 deutan and 205 protan subjects examined with the Farnsworth D-15, CAD and Nagel anomaloscope. The results are shown using box plots where the median RG CAD threshold (red line) and the interquartile range are shown for each plot.

Figure 3. Measured data and theoretical photoreceptor excitations for a normal trichromat. Sections (a) and (b) show the recorded Farnsworth D-15 test results for a normal trichromat. This individual's CAD test results are displayed in CIE 1931 color space (c). The normal trichromat's CAD thresholds lie within the grey ellipse that indicates the normal range of CAD thresholds expected for this subject's age. Section (d) shows the predicted photoreceptor excitations for each of the Farnsworth D-15 caps when illuminated with a lamp designed to approximate a D65 illuminant. These predictions were generated by measuring the spectral radiance of each of the 16 caps when illuminated with the D65 illuminant.

Figure 4. Measured data and computed photoreceptor excitations expected for a protanope. Sections (a) and (b) show the recorded Farnsworth D-15 test results for an individual with protanopia. The patient's CAD test results are shown in section (c). Section (d) shows the predicted photoreceptor excitations for each of the Farnsworth D-15 caps when viewed by an individual with protanopia. When separated in to two groups, the protanope arranges all caps in the sequence recorded for normal trichromats, with no errors in each group.

(a) Deuteranope

| 0 | 1 | 15 | 2 | 14 | 3 | 13 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 11 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 8 |

(b) Protan / Deutan / Tritan plot

(c) CAD test results

(d) Log (photoreceptor excitation) vs D15 cap number

Figure 5. Measured data and theoretical photoreceptor excitations for a deuteranope. Sections (a) and (b) show the recorded Farnsworth D-15 test results for an individual with deuteranopia. The patient's CAD test results are shown in section (c). Section (d) shows the predicted photoreceptor excitations for each of the Farnsworth D-15 caps when viewed by an individual with deuteranopia. When separated in to two groups, the deuteranope arranges all caps in the sequence recorded for normal trichromats, with no errors in each group.

Figure 6. Measured data and theoretical photoreceptor excitations for a tritanope. Sections (a) and (b) show the recorded Farnsworth D-15 test results for an individual with tritanopia. The patient's CAD test results are shown in section (c). Section (d) shows the predicted photoreceptor excitations for each of the Farnsworth D-15 caps when viewed by an individual with tritanopia. When separated in to two groups, the tritanope is unable to arrange all caps in the sequence recorded for normal trichromats, making multiple errors in each group.

Figure 7. Measured data and theoretical photoreceptor excitations for a rod monochromat
(CNGB3). Sections (a) and (b) show the recorded Farnsworth D-15 test results for an
individual with rod monochromacy. The patient's CAD test results are shown in section (c).
Section (d) shows the predicted photoreceptor excitations for each of the Farnsworth D-15
caps when viewed by an individual with rod monochromacy. When separated in to two
groups, the rod monochromat arranges the caps almost completely correctly, only making one
minor transposition (cap 9 and 10 during the first test and interchanging the order of these
two caps in repeated tests).

Outcome of the Farnsworth D-15 test

Type of colour deficiency	Number of subjects	Percentage of subjects who pass using different pass criteria	
		No adjacent transpositions are accepted	Up to two adjacent transpositions are accepted
(a)			
Deuteranopia	117	1.7	3.4
Deuteranomalous trichromatism	278	65.5	75.5
Protanopia	89	3.4	9.0
Protanomalous trichromatism	116	59.5	69.0
(b)			
Anomalous trichromats	394	63.7	73.6
Dichromats	206	2.4	5.8
(c)			
Deutan	395	46.6	54.2
Protan	205	35.1	42.9

Table 1. Farnsworth D-15 pass/fail statistics for a sample of 600 subjects with congenital color vision deficiency, when 0 major crossings and 0 adjacent transpositions, and 0 major crossings and up to 2 adjacent transpositions are accepted as a pass. One normal trichromat (~1%) made adjacent transpositions and a pass protocol that allowed subjects to make 0 major crossings and up to 2 adjacent transpositions was the most stringent protocol needed to pass all normal subjects (N=74) investigated.

Classification outcome of the Farnsworth D-15 test

Type of colour deficiency	Number of subjects	Classification made by the Farnsworth D-15 (%)				
		Normal	Deutan	Protan	Tritan	Indeterminate
(a)						
Deuteranopia	117	1.7	94.9	0.0	0.0	3.4
Deuteranomalous trichromatism	278	65.4	19.8	0.0	0.4	14.4
Protanopia	89	3.4	4.5	80.9	0.0	11.2
Protanomalous trichromatism	116	59.5	3.4	21.6	0.0	15.5
(b)						
Deuteranopia	113	0.0	98.2	0.0	0.0	1.8
Deuteranomalous trichromatism	68	0.0	80.9	0.0	1.5	17.6
Protanopia	81	0.0	4.9	88.9	0.0	6.2
Protanomalous trichromatism	36	0.0	11.1	69.5	0.0	19.4

Table 2. The percentage of subjects that fall into each Farnsworth D-15 classification category for all subjects (a) and for subjects that fail the D-15, when up to two adjacent transpositions are accepted (b). The classification made by the Farnsworth D-15 was determined using the classification grid shown in Figure 1a and the type of color vision deficiency was determined using the Nagel anomaloscope and the CAD test. There was 100% agreement between the CAD test and Nagel anomaloscope.

References

466   1.   Rodríguez-Carmona M, Evans BEW, Barbur JL. Color Vision Assessment: 2. Color
467   assessment outcomes using single and multi-test protocols. *Color Res Appl.*
468   2020;Submitted.

469   2.   Barbur JL, Rodríguez-Carmona M, Evans BEW. Color Vision Assessment: 3. An
470   efficient two-step color assessment protocol. *Color Res Appl.* 2020;Submitted.

471   3.   Farnsworth D. *Farnsworth Dichotomous Test for Color Blindness.* San Antonio, TX,
472   US: Psychological Corporation; 1947.

473   4.   Almustanyir A, Hovis J, Glaholt MG. Predicting the Farnsworth–Munsell D15 and
474   Holmes–Wright-A lantern outcomes with computer-based color vision tests. *J Opt Soc*
475   *Am A.* 2020;37(4):A1. doi:10.1364/JOSAA.381305

476   5.   Dain SJ. Clinical colour vision tests. *Clin Exp Optom.* 2004:276-293.

477   6.   Margrain TH, Birch J, Owen CG. Colour vision requirements of firefighters. *Occup*
478   *Med (Chic Ill).* 1996;46(2):114-124. doi:10.1093/occmed/46.2.114

479   7.   Dain SJ, Casolin A, Long J, Hilmi MR. Color vision and the railways: Part 1. The
480   railway LED lantern test. *Optom Vis Sci.* 2015;92(2):138-146.
481   doi:10.1097/OPX.0000000000000460

482   8.   Dain SJ, Wood JM, Atchison DA. Sunglasses, traffic signals, and color vision
483   deficiencies. *Optom Vis Sci.* 2009;86(4):e296-e305.
484   doi:10.1097/OPX.0b013e318199d1da

485   9.   Birch J. *Diagnosis of Defective Colour Vision.* Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann; 2001.

486   10.   Foutch BK, Stringham JM, Lakshminarayanan V. A new quantitative technique for
487   grading Farnsworth D-15 color panel tests. *J Mod Opt.* 2011;58(19-20):1755-1763.
488   doi:10.1080/09500340.2011.573881

489   11.   Bowman KJ. A Method for Quantitative Scoring of the Farnsworth Panel D-15. *Acta*
490   *Ophthalmol.* 1982;60(6):907-916. doi:10.1111/j.1755-3768.1982.tb00621.x

491   12.   Atchison DA, Bowman KJ, Vingrys AJ. Quantitative scoring of panel tests for
492   assessment of colour vision in age related maculopathy. *Clin Exp Optom.*
493   1991;74(1):6-10. doi:10.1111/j.1444-0938.1991.tb04600.x

494   13.   Vingrys AJ, King-Smith PE. A quantitative scoring technique for panel tests of color
495   vision. *Investig Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 1988;29(1):50-63.

496   14.   Almustanyir A, Hovis J. Trichromatic And Dichromatic Colorimetric Analyses Of The
497   Farnsworth-Munsell D-15 Color Vision Test. In: *Proceedings of the 29th Quadrennial*
498   *Session of the CIE*. International Commission on Illumination, CIE; 2019:909-916.
499   doi:10.25039/x46.2019.PO012

500   15.   Pacheco-Cutillas M, Edgar DF, Sahraie A. Acquired colour vision defects in
501   glaucoma---their detection and clinical significance. *Br J Ophthalmol.*
502   1999;83(12):1396-1402. doi:10.1136/bjo.83.12.1396

503   16.   Birch J. Pass rates for the Farnsworth D15 colour vision test. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt.*
504   2008;28(3):259-264. doi:10.1111/j.1475-1313.2008.00566.x

505 17. Birch J, Chisholm CM. Occupational colour vision requirements for police officers. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt*. 2008;28(6):524-531. doi:10.1111/j.1475-1313.2008.00605.x

507 18. Pokorny J, Collins B, Howett G, et al. Procedures for Testing Color Vision: Report of working group 41. *Natl Res Counc*. 1981. doi:10.1097/00006324-198211000-00014

509 19. Atchison DA, Pedersen CA, Dain SJ, Wood JM. Traffic Signal Color Recognition Is a Problem for Both Protan and Deutan Color-Vision Deficients. *Hum Factors*. 2003;45(3):495-503. doi:10.1518/hfes.45.3.495.27247

512 20. Barbur JL, Holliday IE, Ruddock KH. The spatial and temporal organisation of motion perception units in human vision. *Acta Psychol (Amst)*. 1981;48(1-3):35-47.

514 21. Barbur JL, Ruddock KH. Spatial characteristics of movement detection mechanisms in human vision. II. Chromatic stimuli. *Biol Cybern*. 1980;37(2):93-98.

516 22. Barbur JL, Harlow AJ, Plant GT. Insights into the Different Exploits of Colour in the Visual Cortex. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci*. 1994;258(1353):327-334. doi:10.1098/rspb.1994.0181

519 23. Barbur JL. "Double-blindsight" revealed through the processing of color and luminance contrast defined motion signals. *Prog Brain Res*. 2004;144:243-259. doi:10.1016/S0079-6123(03)14417-2

522 24. Barbur JL, Rodriguez-Carmona M. Colour vision requirements in visually demanding occupations. *Br Med Bull*. 2017;122(1):51-77. doi:10.1093/bmb/ldx007

524 25. Rodriguez-Carmona M, O'Neill-Biba M, Barbur JL. Assessing the severity of color vision loss with implications for aviation and other occupational environments. *Aviat Sp Environ Med*. 2012;83(1):19-29. doi:10.3357/ASEM.3111.2012

527 26. Jägle H, Pirzer M, Sharpe LT. The Nagel anomaloscope: its calibration and recommendations for diagnosis and research. *Graefe's Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol*. 2005;243(1):26-32. doi:10.1007/s00417-004-0893-z

530 27. Birch J. Failure of concordance of the Farnsworth D15 test and the Nagel anomaloscope matching range in anomalous trichromatism. *Vis Neurosci*. 2008;25(3):451-453. doi:10.1017/S0952523808080231

533 28. Barbur JL, Rodriguez-Carmona M, Harlow JA, Mancuso K, Neitz J, Neitz M. A study of unusual Rayleigh matches in deutan deficiency. *Vis Neurosci*. 2008;25(3):507-516. doi:10.1017/S0952523808080619

536 29. Jägle H, Sharpe LT. The Nagel anomaloscope : its calibration and recommendations for diagnosis and research. 2005:26-32. doi:10.1007/s00417-004-0893-z

538 30. Wright WD. *Researches on Normal & Defective Colour Vision*. Kimpton; 1946.

539 31. Dain SJ, Atchison DA, Hovis JK. Limitations and Precautions in the Use of the Farnsworth-Munsell Dichotomous D-15 Test. *Optom Vis Sci*. 2019;96(9):695-705. doi:10.1097/opx.0000000000001420

542 32. Ng JS, Liem SC. Can the farnsworth D15 color vision test be defeated through practice? *Optom Vis Sci*. 2018;95(5):452-456. doi:10.1097/OPX.0000000000001218

544 33. Ng JS, Morton WA. Case Report: Invalidation of the Farnsworth D15 Test in Dichromacy Secondary to Practice. *Optom Vis Sci*. 2018;95(3):272-274.

546   doi:10.1097/OPX.0000000000001184

547   34.   Cole BL. Assessment of inherited colour vision defects in clinical practice. *Clin Exp*
548   *Optom*. 2007;90(3):157-175. doi:10.1111/j.1444-0938.2007.00135.x

549   35.   DeMarco P, Pokorny J, Smith VC. Full-spectrum cone sensitivity functions for X-
550   chromosome-linked anomalous trichromats. *J Opt Soc Am A*. 1992;9(9):1465.
551   doi:10.1364/JOSAA.9.001465

552   36.   Wyszecki G, Stiles WS. *Color Science: Concepts and Methods Quantitative Data and*
553   *Formulae*. Vol 8. 2nd Ed. Wiley New York; 1982.

554   37.   Dain SJ, Adams AJ. Comparison of the standard and Adams desaturated D-15 tests
555   with congenital colour vision deficiencies. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt*. 1990;10(1):40-45.
556   doi:10.1111/j.1475-1313.1990.tb01105.x

557   38.   Dain SJ, Ling BY. Cognitive abilities of children on a gray seriation test. *Optom Vis*
558   *Sci*. 2009;86(6):E701-E707. doi:10.1097/OPX.0b013e3181a59d46

559   39.   Cranwell MB, Pearce B, Loveridge C, Hurlbert AC. Performance on the Farnsworth-
560   Munsell 100-hue test is significantly related to nonverbal IQ. *Investig Ophthalmol Vis*
561   *Sci*. 2015;56(5):3171-3178. doi:10.1167/iovs.14-16094

562   40.   Allen AE, Martial FP, Lucas RJ. Form vision from melanopsin in humans. *Nat*
563   *Commun*. 2019;10(1):1-10. doi:10.1038/s41467-019-10113-3

564   41.   Patterson SS, Kuchenbecker JA, Anderson JR, Neitz M, Neitz J. A Color Vision
565   Circuit for Non-Image-Forming Vision in the Primate Retina. *Curr Biol*.
566   2020;30(7):1269-1274.e2. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2020.01.040

567   42.   Markwell EL, Feigl B, Zele AJ. Intrinsically photosensitive melanopsin retinal
568   ganglion cell contributions to the pupillary light reflex and circadian rhythm. *Clin Exp*
569   *Optom*. 2010;93(3):137-149. doi:10.1111/j.1444-0938.2010.00479.x

570   43.   Cao D, Chang A, Gai S. Evidence for an impact of melanopsin activation on unique
571   white perception. *J Opt Soc Am A*. 2018;35(4):B287. doi:10.1364/JOSAA.35.00B287

572   44.   Schmidt TM, Do MTH, Dacey D, Lucas R, Hattar S, Matynia A. Melanopsin-positive
573   intrinsically photosensitive retinal ganglion cells: From form to function. *J Neurosci*.
574   2011;31(45):16094-16101. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4132-11.2011

575   45.   Bi W, Gillespie-Gallery H, Binns A, Barbur JL. Flicker sensitivity in normal aging—
576   monocular tests of retinal function at photopic and mesopic light levels. *Investig*
577   *Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2016;57(2):387-395. doi:10.1167/iovs.15-16481

578   46.   Rauscher FG, Chisholm CM, Edgar DF, Barbur JL. Assessment of novel binocular
579   colour, motion and contrast tests in glaucoma. *Cell Tissue Res*. 2013;353(2):297-310.
580   doi:10.1007/s00441-013-1675-x

581

582   **Author Biographies**

583   **Benjamin Evans** is a PhD student in the department of optometry and vision science at City,
584   University of London. His research interests include color vision assessment and the

585 development of novel methods for the efficient and effective screening of normal
586 trichromatic color vision.

587 **Marisa Rodriguez-Carmona** studied Physics at Imperial College London before receiving
588 her doctoral degree for work on 'Variability in chromatic sensitivity' at the Centre for
589 Applied Vision Research at City, University of London. She is currently a lecturer in Optics
590 and Visual Science at City, University of London and leads the Physics and Optics modules.
591 Her research interests include the study of sex related differences in color vision and the
592 optimisation of colour assessment protocols in the clinic and in occupations.

593 **John Barbur** combines fundamental vision science with applied and clinical research. His
594 main interests include mesopic vision, pupil responses and eye movements, blindsight, spatial
595 and chromatic vision, scattered light and the development of novel techniques and
596 instrumentation to study vision, both in the lab and in the clinic. Work on camouflage led to
597 insights into the processing of luminance and colour signals, the development of the Colour
598 Assessment and Diagnosis (CAD) test and more recently, the Colour Vision Screener (CVS)
599 test. These and other Advanced Vision and Optometric Tests (AVOT) were developed over
600 several years and found important applications in both clinical work and in visually-
601 demanding occupations.