Ctori, I. & Huntjens, B. (2014). Does foveal anatomy influence macular pigment and its spatial profile? A bi-racial study. Acta Ophthalmologica, 92(s253), doi: 10.1111/j.1755-3768.2014.1665.x



City Research Online

Original citation: Ctori, I. & Huntjens, B. (2014). Does foveal anatomy influence macular pigment and its spatial profile? A bi-racial study. Acta Ophthalmologica, 92(s253), doi: 10.1111/j.1755-3768.2014.1665.x

Permanent City Research Online URL: http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/16517/

Copyright & reuse

City University London has developed City Research Online so that its users may access the research outputs of City University London's staff. Copyright © and Moral Rights for this paper are retained by the individual author(s) and/ or other copyright holders. All material in City Research Online is checked for eligibility for copyright before being made available in the live archive. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to from other web pages.

Versions of research

The version in City Research Online may differ from the final published version. Users are advised to check the Permanent City Research Online URL above for the status of the paper.

Enquiries

If you have any enquiries about any aspect of City Research Online, or if you wish to make contact with the author(s) of this paper, please email the team at publications@city.ac.uk.

CTORI, I. and HUNTJENS, B. (2014), **Does foveal anatomy influence macular pigment and its spatial profile? A biracial study.** Acta Ophthalmologica, 92: 0. doi:10.1111/j.1755-3768.2014.1665.x

Abstract

Purpose To investigate the relationship of foveal architecture with macular pigment optical density (MPOD) and its spatial profile in south Asian and white females.

Methods Foveal anatomy measurements, obtained using optical coherence tomography (Spectralis OCT; Heidelberg), were collected from 46 south Asian (age 21 ± 3 years) and 38 white healthy females (age 26 ± 5 years). Spatial distribution of MPOD, measured by heterochromatic flicker photometry, was classified as a typical exponential or an atypical profile.

Results South Asian compared to white females had thinner central retinas (220 \pm 14µm vs. 228 \pm 19µm; P = 0.02), wider foveas (2526 \pm 247µm vs. 2296 \pm 228µm; P < 0.0005) and higher central MPOD (0.56 \pm 0.18 vs. 0.44 \pm 0.23; P = 0.001), after controlling for age. Central MPOD was greater in those with an atypical (0.61 \pm 0.21) compared to a typical MPOD profile (0.47 \pm 0.17, P < 0.005). Only white females presenting a typical MPOD profile showed a significant correlation between central MPOD and central retinal thickness (p = 0.403, P = 0.03) and between the foveal pit and MPOD profile slope gradients from 0 to 0.8° (r = -0.522, P = 0.004). We found no association between foveal width and central MPOD in either ethnicity regardless of MPOD profile type (P = 0.90).

Conclusion Our findings show that there are significant differences in retinal morphology and central MPOD between south Asian and white females. However, foveal anatomy seems to correlate with central MPOD only in white females with typical MPOD profiles. We hypothesize

that higher central MPOD associated with atypical MPOD profiles and south Asian ethnicity is not related to central foveal anatomy, but a feature of an individual's congenital constitution.