

DTIC FILE COPY

USAARL Report No. 88-16

2



AD-A200 433

**Contrast Sensitivity in Army Aviator Candidates:  
Cycloplegia Effects and Population Norms**

DTIC  
ELECTED  
NOV 10 1988  
S D C

By

**Isaac Behar  
William G. Bachman**

**Sensory Research Division**

and

**Walter Egenmaier**

**Lyster U.S. Army Community Hospital**

**September 1988**

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

88 11 00 073

**United States Army Aeromedical Research Laboratory  
Fort Rucker, Alabama 36362-5292**

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188		
1a REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION <b>UNCLASSIFIED</b>			1b RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS			
2a SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3 DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT <b>Approved for public release, distribution unlimited</b>			
2b DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE						
4 PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) <b>USAARL Report No. 88-16</b>			5 MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)			
6a NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION <b>U.S. Army Aeromedical Research Laboratory</b>		6b OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable) <b>SGRD-UAS-VS</b>	7a NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION <b>U.S. Army Medical Research and Development Command</b>			
6c ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) <b>Fort Rucker, AL 36362-5292</b>			7b ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) <b>Fort Detrick Frederick, MD 21701-5012</b>			
8a NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION		8b OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable)	9 PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER			
8c ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)			10 SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS			
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO <b>62787A</b>	PROJECT NO <b>3E162787A879</b>	TASK NO. <b>BG</b>	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO <b>164</b>
11 TITLE (Include Security Classification) <b>Contrast sensitivity in Army aviator candidates: Cycloplegia effects and population norms (U)</b>						
12 PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) <b>Behar, Isaac; Bachman, William G.; Egenmaier, Walter</b>						
13a TYPE OF REPORT <b>Final</b>		13b TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____	14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) <b>1988 September</b>		15 PAGE COUNT <b>25</b>	
16 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION						
17 COSATI CODES			18 SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)			
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP				
<b>06</b>	<b>04</b>		<b>Aviator candidates, contrast sensitivity, cycloplegia, vision standards</b>			
<b>06</b>	<b>05</b>					
19 ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) <b>This study was designed to provide information regarding three aspects of contrast sensitivity testing of aviator candidates: 1. To determine whether contrast sensitivity functions (CSFs) obtained with the VISTECH Visual Contrast Test System (VCTS) are affected by ocular cycloplegia; 2. Since Army aviator candidates differ from the general population by being more highly selected with respect to visual and refractive status, and more homogeneous in age and in an age bracket when vision is optimal, a second purpose was to obtain a large normative sample of CSFs for establishing future contrast sensitivity standards for this population; and 3. To determine whether the VCTS provides useful CSFs under clinical screening conditions in a timely and simple manner. Contrast sensitivity thresholds were obtained at 5 spatial frequencies from 106 aviator candidates, prior to and following the administration of a cycloplegic. Contrast sensitivity functions obtained under cycloplegia were reduced about 20 percent. The CSFs of the aviator candidates are much superior than the general population norms. The VCTS provides useful CSFs under military screening conditions.</b>						
20 DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS			21 ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION <b>UNCLASSIFIED</b>			
22a NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL <b>Chief, Scientific Information Center</b>			22b TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) <b>(205) 255-6907</b>		22c OFFICE SYMBOL <b>SGRD-UAX-S1</b>	

Table of contents

Introduction.....	3
Method.....	4
Subjects.....	4
Procedure.....	4
Results.....	5
Cycloplegia effects.....	5
Binocular-monocular differences.....	6
Aviator candidate VCTS norms.....	7
Comparison with other VCTS norms.....	9
Discussion.....	11
Cycloplegia effects.....	11
Aviator candidate VCTS norms.....	11
Measurement of contrast sensitivity.....	14
Conclusions.....	15
References.....	16
Appendix A.....	19

List of tables

1. Ratios of cycloplegic to precycloplegic contrast sensitivity.....	7
2. Ratios of binocular to monocular contrast sensitivity.....	9
3. VCTS stimulus patch needed to match or exceed the contrast sensitivity of the 10th percent- tile aviator candidate.....	11
4. Group median scores and interquartile ranges (in parentheses) obtained in the present study, compared with those obtained by Corwin and Richman (1986).....	13

List of figures

- 1. Mean contrast sensitivity functions obtained under binocular viewing measured before and after administration of cyclopentolate (N=105)..... 6
- 2. Mean contrast sensitivity functions obtained under monocular viewing measured before and after administration of cyclopentolate (N=105)..... 7
- 3. Mean contrast sensitivity functions obtained under binocular and monocular viewing measured before administration of cyclopentolate (N=106)..... 8
- 4. Contrast sensitivity fuctions for the 90th, 75th, 50th, 25th, and 10th percentile aviator candidates obtained with binocular viewing (N=106)..... 9
- 5. Contrast sensitivity functions for the 90th, 75th, 50th, 25th, and 10 percentile aviator candidates obtained with monocular viewing (N=106)..... 10
- 6. The 10th (bold Xs) and 50th (bold Ls) percentile contrast sensitivity scores obtained under binocular viewing, plotted on the Vistech Evaluation Form. The gray area represents the performance of the middle 90 percent of a general population sample..... 12

DATE	
TIME	
BY	
REMARKS	

A-1



## Introduction

The determination of the visual contrast sensitivity function (CSF) has been identified as a new or emergent technique that offers exciting potential for a more complete assessment of vision in clinical, industrial, and military settings (Committee on Vision, 1985). The ability to detect small individual differences in spatial vision may have a significant application in the military aviation environment. For example, evidence has been presented that components of the CSF were better than conventional, high contrast visual acuity for predicting pilot performance in detecting small, low contrast targets in aircraft simulators (Ginsburg et al., 1982), in the laboratory (Stager and Hameluck, 1986), and in the field (Ginsburg, Easterly, and Evans, 1983).

Initial selection of candidates for flying duty requires that a cycloplegic refraction be accomplished on the individuals (AR 40-501). Bachman and Behar (1987) recently have shown there is a small, but significant loss of sensitivity under cycloplegic conditions. That study used a small number of observers (N=12), and testing was done with a sophisticated contrast sensitivity apparatus (Nicolet CS-2000\*) that is microcomputer controlled and generates test patterns on a video display. A test system of this type would not be appropriate for clinical screening in conjunction with the qualifying flight physical as it is costly, requires calibration and maintenance, administration is too time consuming (about 30 min), and is rather complex. Recently, a wall chart Vision Contrast Test System (VCTS)\* was introduced (Ginsburg, 1984) that produces CSFs similar to those obtained by researchers using video based systems (Ginsburg and Evans, 1985; Corwin and Richman, 1986). The VCTS appears to meet the criteria for a military screening system in that it be quick and easy to administer and score, and is inexpensive.

This study was designed to provide information regarding three aspects of contrast sensitivity testing of aviator candidates: 1. To determine whether CSFs obtained with the VCTS also are affected by ocular cycloplegia; 2. To obtain a large normative sample of CSFs for establishing future contrast sensitivity standards for this population, since Army aviator candidates differ from the general population by being more highly selected with respect to visual and refractive status, and more homogeneous in age and in an age bracket when vision is optimal; 3. To gain experience with the VCTS within the context of military clinical screening conditions.

---

\* See Appendix A

## Method

### Subjects (Ss)

One-hundred and six candidates for rotary-wing aviator training, including four women, volunteered as Ss; half were commissioned officers and half were warrant officer candidates (WOCs). The median ages were 23.3 and 23.9 years, respectively. All WOCs were required to pass a Class 1 flight physical, while the commissioned officers were required to pass a Class 1A flight physical. One S failed to meet the hearing standards so was not available for postcycloplegia testing.

### Procedure

Testing was conducted in conjunction with the qualifying flight physical, with groups of approximately 25 to 30 candidates participating on a given day. Subjects first received contrast sensitivity testing (see below) under normal or undilated conditions. Cycloplegia then was induced using 1 percent cyclopentolate (Cyclogel\*) which is a parasympatholytic drug administered topically to the eye. Each subject received one drop in each eye followed by a second drop after 5 minutes. A minimum of 30 minutes was allowed after administration for maximum effect of the drug. Cyclopentolate blocks the responses of the sphincter muscle of the iris and the accommodative muscle of the ciliary body to cholinergic stimulation, producing pupillary dilation (mydriasis) and paralysis of accommodation (cycloplegia). Subjects then were refracted at the standard examination distance of 20 feet, using both subjective refraction and static retinoscopy to determine spherical and cylindrical components. Optical corrections, to include plano results, then were incorporated into a standard trial frame. Since refractions were done at 20 feet, while CSF testing was done at 10 feet, +0.25 diopter of sphere power was added to each correction to compensate for the reduced viewing distance. Contrast sensitivity testing then was accomplished with the trial frame in place under dilated conditions.

Contrast sensitivity thresholds were obtained using Vistech VCTS 6500 Charts. Testing was performed at the standard viewing distance of 10 feet and at the recommended illumination level (as measured with a Vistech light meter). The VCTS charts permit threshold determination at five spatial frequencies: 1.5, 3, 6, 12, and 18 cycles per degree (cpd); these spatial frequencies are labeled A through E on the Vistech charts. Stimuli consist of circular patches of sinusoidal gratings arrayed in rows and columns. The gratings in each row are of a single spatial frequency, 1.5 cpd in the first row, 3 cpd in the second, etc. Each leftmost patch is of relatively high contrast and contrast

decreases progressively by approximately 0.1 log unit in each of the remaining eight patches in the row. The S's task was to identify the orientation of each grating, which could be vertical, or tilted plus or minus 15 degrees from the vertical. Subjects' responses to each patch in a row were recorded and they were encouraged to guess, if necessary. The contrast of the last correctly identified patch before the first error was scored as the threshold for that spatial frequency, unless three successive correct responses were made immediately following the first error, in which case that error was considered a misreporting or recording error and was ignored. This occurred very infrequently.

Thresholds were obtained first with binocular viewing, then with the left eye only (for half the Ss), followed by testing with the right eye. For the other Ss, the order of monocular testing was reversed. For many Ss, contrast sensitivity was lower for the monocular condition tested second, suggesting that those Ss put pressure on the occluded eye or kept it closed behind the occluder. Because of this possible artifact, only the data for the first monocular condition tested will be reported. In addition, through experimental error, 14 Ss were not tested with the same eye in the first monocular conditions prior to and following cyclopentolate administration; therefore, this comparison is based on a reduced N of 91.

## Results

### Cycloplegia effects

The binocular mean contrast sensitivity for each spatial frequency obtained prior to and following administration of cyclopentolate for the entire group of Ss (N=105) is presented graphically in Figure 1. It may be seen that contrast sensitivity is reduced at all spatial frequencies following cyclopentolate administration; this effect is highly significant statistically ( $F=169.41$ ,  $df=1,104$ ,  $p<.0001$ ). The interaction of cycloplegia and spatial frequency is not significant. The overall ratio of cycloplegic to precycloplegic sensitivity was 0.79, hence, under cycloplegic conditions, the mean contrast sensitivity was reduced by 21 percent. Figure 2 portrays the corresponding results for the first tested monocular conditions (based on the reduced sample size of 91). Again, the cycloplegia effect is highly significant ( $F=84.54$ ,  $df=1,90$ ,  $p<.0001$ ), but, in addition, the interaction of cycloplegia and spatial frequency is significant ( $F=7.66$ ,  $df=4,360$ ,  $p<.0001$ ). The mean ratio of cycloplegic to precycloplegic sensitivity is 0.76, while the ratios for the individual spatial frequencies are given in Table 1.




Figure 1. Mean contrast sensitivity functions obtained under binocular viewing measured before and after administration of cyclopentolate (N=105).

#### Binocular-monocular differences

The mean contrast sensitivity under normal (undilated) viewing conditions is graphically presented in Figure 3 separately for the binocular and first monocular conditions. It may be seen that contrast sensitivity was superior when viewing was binocular; the difference between viewing conditions was highly significant ( $F=149.30$ ,  $df=1,104$ ,  $p<.0001$ ). The ratio of binocular to monocular sensitivity is taken as an indication of binocular summation (Campbell and Green, 1965), and in this study was 1.27 overall, but varied as a function of spatial frequency as shown in Table 2. The interaction between viewing condition and spatial frequency was significant ( $F=4.78$ ,  $df=4,416$ ,  $p<.0009$ ). The difference between viewing conditions cannot be accounted for by inferior performance, for example, with the left eye. Subjects for whom the left eye was tested first did equally well as Ss for whom the right eye was tested first ( $F=1.67$ ,  $df=1,104$ ,  $p=.1990$ ).






Figure 2. Mean contrast sensitivity functions obtained under monocular viewing measured before and after administration of cyclopentolate (N=105).

Table 1.

Ratios of cycloplegic to precycloplegic contrast sensitivity.

Spatial frequency

	1.5	3	6	12	18
Ratio	0.85	0.74	0.73	0.81	0.70

#### Aviator candidate VCTS norms

Data analyses for the contrast sensitivity norms followed those of Corwin and Richman (1986). Histograms of raw scores obtained from all 106 aviator candidates prior to cyclopentolate administration for each spatial frequency were tabulated, from which medians, quartiles, and 10th and 90th percentiles were calculated. These scores then were converted to absolute contrast

using the Value Keys of the 1986 Vistech evaluation forms, interpolating when necessary.




Figure 3. Mean contrast sensitivity functions obtained under binocular and monocular viewing measured before administration of cyclopentolate (N=106).

Figure 4 presents the contrast sensitivity functions for the 90th, 75th, 50th, 25th, and 10th percentile aviator candidate obtained with binocular viewing. Also plotted in this figure are the contrast values for selected stimulus patches. For example, looking at the 1.5 cycle per degree spatial frequency (labeled Row A on the VCTS charts), in order to achieve the level of performance of the 10th percentile observer, one would need to correctly identify the grating orientation of stimulus patch 6 (i.e., have a contrast sensitivity of about 70). Figure 5 displays the corresponding functions obtained with monocular viewing. Table 3 summarizes the values of the lowest stimulus patches that need to be correctly reported in order to meet or exceed the contrast sensitivity of the 10th percentile aviator candidate.

Table 2.

Ratios of binocular to monocular contrast sensitivity.

	Spatial frequency				
	1.5	3	6	12	18
Ratio	1.52	1.19	1.10	1.26	1.30




Figure 4. Contrast sensitivity functions for the 90th, 75th, 50th, 25th, and 10th percentile aviator candidates obtained with binocular viewing (N=106).

#### Comparison with other VCTS norms

The standardization norms that accompany the VCTS charts were obtained from a sample of the general population wearing habitual eye correction and ranging in age from 10 to 70; and were obtained with binocular viewing. In comparison with that group, as seen in Figure 6, the aviator candidates of the present study exhibited

considerably higher sensitivity at all spatial frequencies. In this figure, the gray area represents the middle 90 percent of general population observers (i.e., 5th to 95th percentile), and the bold Xs and Ls are the 10th and 50th percentiles of the present study. The contrast sensitivity of the median aviator candidate equals or exceeds that of the 95th percentile general population observer, and the contrast sensitivity of the 10th percentile aviator candidate equals or exceeds that of the median general population observer.

Monocular VCTS scores were published by Corwin and Richman (1986) for a sample of second-year optometry students wearing their best refractive correction. Their mean age was 24.7 years which is similar to that of the aviator candidates. Table 4 compares the present results obtained with monocular viewing with those norms. The median VCTS scores of the two groups are very similar, as are the measures of dispersion.




Figure 5. Contrast sensitivity functions for the 90th, 75th, 50th, 25th, and 10th percentile aviator candidates obtained with monocular viewing (N=106).

Table 3.

VCTS stimulus patch needed to match or exceed the contrast sensitivity of the 10th percentile aviator candidate.

	Spatial frequency				
	1.5	3	6	12	18
Binocular	6	7	7	6	6
Monocular	5	6	6	6	5

### Discussion

#### Cycloplegia effects

The first purpose of this study was to determine whether CSFs obtained with the VCTS are affected by ocular cycloplegia. The results indicate the VCTS is in fact sensitive to the introduction of a cycloplegic; a more than 20 percent reduction in sensitivity was found under either binocular or monocular conditions after cycloplegia. Since Ss wore optical corrections for the test distance, this can be attributed to a reduction in retinal image quality due to aberration (Bachman and Behar, 1987).

#### Aviator candidate VCTS norms

The second purpose of this study was to obtain a large normative sample of CSFs for establishing future contrast sensitivity standards for aviator candidates. These standards would serve either of two functions, selection for medical fitness per se or selection for special occupational requirements. The Medical Services Standards of Medical Fitness (AR 40-501) already includes a standard for spatial vision based upon the traditional measure of high contrast acuity. This measure has advantages such as historical success and universal acceptance. Deficits observed in visual acuity immediately alert the practitioner to the presence of an ametropia or other ophthalmological or neurological disorder, and determine the individual's fitness for occupations requiring detail vision.

While visual contrast sensitivity also reflects an aspect of spatial vision, only performance at the higher spatial frequencies is related to visual acuity (Kinney and Luria, 1980); contrast sensitivity for the low and medium spatial frequencies appears to be processed by different neural mechanisms (Regan, 1988). Unlike

Table 4.

Group median scores and interquartile ranges (in parentheses) obtained in the present study, compared with those obtained by Corwin and Richman (1986).

	Spatial frequency				
	1.5	3	6	12	18
Aviator candidates	6.20 (1.34)	7.04 (0.84)	7.39 (1.54)	6.42 (1.67)	6.11 (1.66)
Optometry students	6.50 (1.16)	7.14 (1.14)	6.92 (1.16)	6.50 (1.78)	6.00 (1.44)

visual acuity, which is represented by a single value (e.g., 20/20), contrast sensitivity usually is measured at several spatial frequencies and the overall result is plotted as a contrast sensitivity function. There is no agreement on a procedure for quantifying an average contrast sensitivity value, nor is there a rational basis for doing so, especially since the overall shape of the CSF may be more diagnostic of a given disorder than the absolute contrast sensitivity at any frequency.

If contrast sensitivity testing was given as a matter of routine, deficits observed in the CSF, whether at specific spatial frequencies or overall, "would allow the practitioner to find the first evidence of eye diseases or neurological disorders earlier than with conventional tests or procedures, and occasionally may facilitate differential diagnosis of eye problems" (Woo and Johnson, 1986). For this purpose, the CSF norms obtained in this study may represent a more suitable sample than the general population norms, especially for presumed healthy, young military men. For lack of a more appropriate criterion for establishing medical fitness standards for contrast sensitivity, the use of the 10th percentile values is our arbitrary recommendation for defining a "suspicious zone." If a test of contrast sensitivity routinely is administered early, a longitudinal study could determine whether poor performers - those individuals whose contrast sensitivity at any spatial frequency is below the 10th percentile of our aviator candidate sample, even though well within the general population norms - are more likely to manifest vision-related disorders.

Contrast sensitivity also has been proposed as a criterion for selecting individuals for designated military occupations (Ginsburg, 1981), for example, those requiring superior target acquisition skills. However, the early apparent success by Ginsburg and his collaborators (cited above) in relating pilot contrast sensitivity scores with target acquisition performance

has not been replicated by other researchers (Kruk and Regan, 1983; Kruk et al., 1983; O'Neal and Miller, 1987; Irvin et al., 1988). A current Army study is investigating the relationship between laboratory measures of vision, including contrast sensitivity, and target acquisition performance of infantry gunners (Levine, 1987). Needless to say, because of the inconsistent outcomes of different studies and the very limited sampling of MOS-relevant tasks, it would be premature and unfair to suggest contrast sensitivity standards be used for military occupational selection at the present time.

#### Measurement of contrast sensitivity

The final purpose of this study was to gain some experience with the VCTS within the context of military clinical screening conditions in which large groups receive physical assessment. Among the criteria of a useful test is that it be simple to administer and score. Training of technicians in the use of the VCTS is not as straight-forward as letter charts, but was accomplished in about an hour. The administration and scoring of the test were found to be acceptably simple and quick (about 3 minutes for each test condition), and from the viewpoint of the examinees the test was not too difficult or tedious. If "blank" responses are not allowed, the VCTS is a three-alternative forced-choice test which is relatively free of subjective criterion shifts (Vaegan and Halliday, 1982; Higgins et al., 1984).

Performance on the test has been found to improve slightly but significantly on retest (Woo and Bohnsack, 1986). Thus, if contrast sensitivity testing were to be included in the flight physical visual test battery, we recommend that it first be accomplished with binocular viewing to familiarize the examinee with this nontraditional test and to minimize practice effects during monocular testing.

Although the VCTS charts are in wide use, alternative test charts for low-contrast spatial vision exist, including the Regan Low-contrast Letter Acuity Charts (Regan and Neima, 1983), the Pelli-Robson Letter Sensitivity Chart (Pelli, Robson, and Wilkins, 1988), and the Bailey-Lovie chart. Letter charts for measuring contrast sensitivity have the advantage that naming letters is easier than identifying grating orientation (and not subject to left-right confusions). Performance on letter charts has been reported to have higher test-retest reliability than does the VCTS and to be less susceptible to subject errors (Rubin, 1988). As these are relatively new tests, there exists no standardized performance on any letter contrast sensitivity test for any military population.

### Conclusions

The contrast sensitivity function is a technique that offers a more complete assessment of visual function than does the traditional determination of visual acuity. It is recommended that a test of contrast sensitivity be incorporated into the standard flight physical.



### References

- Bachman, W. G., and Behar, I. 1987. The effects of cycloplegia on the visual contrast sensitivity function. Aviation, space and environmental medicine. 58:339-342.
- Campbell, F. W., and Green, D. G. 1965. Monocular versus binocular visual acuity. Nature. 208:191-192.
- Committee on Vision. 1985. Emergent techniques for assessment of visual performance. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Corwin, T. R., and Richman, J. E. 1986. Three clinical tests of the spatial contrast sensitivity function: A comparison. American journal of optometry & physiological optics. 63:413-418.
- Department of the Army. 1987. Army Regulation 40-501. Medical services standards of medical fitness. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army.
- Ginsburg, A. P. 1981. Proposed new vision standards for the 1980's and beyond: Contrast sensitivity. Air Force Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, OH: AFAMRL-TR-80-121.
- Ginsburg, A. P. 1984. A new contrast sensitivity vision test chart. American journal of optometry & physiological optics. 61:403-407.
- Ginsburg, A. P., Evans, D. W., Sekuler, R., and Harp, S. 1982. Contrast sensitivity predicts pilots' performance in aircraft simulators. American journal of optometry & physiological optics. 59:105-109.
- Ginsburg, A. P., Easterly, J., and Evans, D. W. 1983. Contrast sensitivity predicts target detection field performance of pilots. In: Proceedings of the Human Factors Society 27th annual meeting.
- Ginsburg, A. P., and Evans, D. W. 1985. Initial results of rapid clinical screening using a new contrast sensitivity vision test chart. Paper presented to the Optical Society of America, Lake Tahoe, Nevada.
- Higgins, K. E., Jaffe, M. J., Coletta, N. J., Caruso, R. C., and de Monasterio, F. M. 1984. Spatial contrast sensitivity: Importance of controlling the patient's visibility criterion. Archives of ophthalmology. 102:1035-1041.

- Irvin, G. E., Kang, R. N., Spravka, J. J., and O'Neal, M. R., 1988. Correlational investigation of contrast sensitivity and visual acuity in the detection of approaching aircraft. Aviation, space, and environmental medicine. 59:463.
- Kinney, J. A. S., and Luria, S. M. 1980. Factor analysis of perceptual and cognitive abilities tested by different methods. Perceptual and motor skills. 50:59-69.
- Kruck, R., and Regan, D. 1983. Visual test results compared with flying performance in telemetry-tracked aircraft. Aviation, space, and environmental medicine. 54:906-911.
- Kruck, R., Regan, D., Beverly, K. I., and Longridge, T. 1983. Flying performance on the advanced simulator for pilot training and laboratory tests of vision. Human factors. 25:457-466.
- Levine, R. R. 1987. Research protocol: Target acquisition predictor study (TAPS). US Army Aeromedical Research Laboratory, Fort Rucker, Alabama.
- O'Neal, M. R., and Miller, R. E. II. 1987. Further investigation of contrast sensitivity and visual acuity in pilot detection of aircraft. Proceedings of the Human factors society - 31st annual meeting. 1189-1193.
- Pelli, D. G., Robson, J. G., and Wilkins, A. J. 1988. The design of a new letter chart for measuring contrast sensitivity. Clinical vision science. 2:187-199.
- Regan, D. 1988. Low-contrast letter charts and sinewave grating tests in ophthalmological and neurological disorders. Clinical vision science. 2:235-250.
- Regan, D., and Neima, D. 1983. Low-contrast letter charts as a test of visual functions. Ophthalmology. 90:1192-1200.
- Rubin, G. S. 1988. Reliability and sensitivity of clinical contrast sensitivity tests. Clinical vision science. 2:169-177.
- Stager, P., and Hameluck, D. 1986. Contrast sensitivity and visual detection in search and rescue. Technical Report prepared under DSS Contract No. 01SE.97711-3-7527 for the Defence and Civil Institute of Environmental Medicine, Downsview, Ontario, Canada.
- Vaegan and Halliday, B. L. 1982. A forced-choice test improves clinical contrast sensitivity testing. British journal of ophthalmology. 66:477-491.

Woo, G. C., and Bohnsack, H. 1986. Comparison of the distance and near Vistech Vision Contrast Test Systems (VCTS). Canadian Journal of Optometry. 48:12-15,54.

Appendix A

Alcon Laboratories, Inc.  
P. O. Box 1959  
6201 South Freeway  
Fort Worth, TX 76134

Nicolet Biomedical Division  
5225-4 Verona Road  
P. O. Box 4287  
Madison, WI 53711-0287

Vistech Consultants, Inc.  
1372 N. Fairfield Road  
Dayton, OH 45432

Initial distribution

Commander  
U.S. Army Natick Research  
and Development Center  
ATTN: Documents Librarian  
Natick, MA 01760

Naval Submarine Medical  
Research Laboratory  
Medical Library, Naval Sub Base  
Box 900  
Groton, CT 05340

Commander/Director  
U.S. Army Combat Surveillance  
& Target Acquisition Lab  
ATTN: DELCS-D  
Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703-5304

Commander  
10th Medical Laboratory  
ATTN: Audiologist  
APO NEW YORK 09180

Commander  
Naval Air Development Center  
Biophysics Lab  
ATTN: G. Kydd  
Code 60B1  
Warminster, PA 18974

Naval Air Development Center  
Technical Information Division  
Technical Support Detachment  
Warminster, PA 18974

Dr. E. Hendler  
Human Factors Applications, Inc.  
295 West Street Road  
Warminster, PA 18974

Under Secretary of Defense  
for Research and Engineering  
ATTN: Military Assistant  
for Medical and Life Sciences  
Washington, DC 20301

Commander  
U.S. Army Research Institute  
of Environmental Medicine  
Natick, MA 01760

U.S. Army Avionics Research  
and Development Activity  
ATTN: SAVAA-P-TP  
Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703-5401

U.S. Army Research and Development  
Support Activity  
Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703

Chief, Benet Weapons Laboratory  
LCWSL, USA ARRADCOM  
ATTN: DRDAR-LCB-TL  
Watervliet Arsenal, NY 12189

Commander  
Man-Machine Integration System  
Code 602  
Naval Air Development Center  
Warminster, PA 18974

Commander  
Naval Air Development Center  
ATTN: Code 6021 (Mr. Brindle)  
Warminster, PA 18974

Commanding Officer  
Naval Medical Research  
and Development Command  
National Naval Medical Center  
Bethesda, MD 20014

Director  
Army Audiology and Speech Center  
Walter Reed Army Medical Center  
Washington, DC 20307-5001

COL Franklin H. Top, Jr., MD  
Walter Reed Army Institute  
of Research  
Washington, DC 20307-5100

HQ DA (DASG-PSP-0)  
Washington, DC 20310

Naval Research  
Laboratory Library  
Code 1433  
Washington, DC 20375

Harry Diamond Laboratories  
ATTN: Technical Infor-  
mation Branch  
2800 Powder Mill Road  
Aberdelphi, MD 20783-1197

U.S. Army Materiel Systems  
Analysis Agency  
ATTN: Reports Processing  
Aberdeen Proving Ground  
MD 21005-5017

U.S. Army Ordnance Center  
and School Library  
Building 3071  
Aberdeen Proving Ground,  
MD 21005-5201

U.S. Army Environmental Hygiene  
Agency Laboratory  
Building E2100  
Aberdeen Proving Ground,  
MD 21010

Technical Library  
Chemical Research  
and Development Center  
Aberdeen Proving Ground,  
MD 21010-5423

Commander  
U.S. Army Institute  
of Dental Research  
Walter Reed Army Medical Center  
Washington, DC 20307-5300

Naval Air Systems Command  
Technical Air Library 950D  
Rm 278, Jefferson Plaza II  
Department of the Navy  
Washington, DC 20361

Naval Research Laboratory Library  
Shock and Vibration Infor-  
mation Center, Code 5804  
Washington, DC 20375

Director  
U.S. Army Human Engineer-  
ing Laboratory  
ATTN: Technical Library  
Aberdeen Proving Ground,  
MD 21005-5001

Commander  
U.S. Army Test  
and Evaluation Command  
ATTN: AMSTE-AD-H  
Aberdeen Proving Ground,  
MD 21005-5055

Director  
U.S. Army Ballistic  
Research Laboratory  
ATTN: DRXBR-OD-ST Tech Reports  
Aberdeen Proving Ground,  
MD 21005-5066

Commander  
U.S. Army Medical Research  
Institute of Chemical Defense  
ATTN: SGRD-UV-AO  
Aberdeen Proving Ground,  
MD 21010-5425

Commander  
U.S. Army Medical Research  
and Development Command  
ATTN: SGRD-RMS (Ms. Madigan)  
Fort Detrick, Frederick, MD 21701

Commander  
U.S. Army Medical Research  
Institute of Infectious Diseases  
Fort Detrick, Frederick,  
MD 21701

Director, Biological  
Sciences Division  
Office of Naval Research  
600 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217

Commander  
U.S. Army Materiel Command  
ATTN: AMCDE-S (CPT Broadwater)  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Commandant  
U.S. Army Aviation  
Logistics School  
ATTN: ATSQ-TDN  
Fort Eustis, VA 23604

U.S. Army Training  
and Doctrine Command  
ATTN: ATCD-ZX  
Fort Monroe, VA 23651

Structures Laboratory Library  
USARTL-AVSCOM  
NASA Langley Research Center  
Mail Stop 266  
Hampton, VA 23665

Naval Aerospace Medical  
Institute Library  
Bldg 1953, Code 102  
Pensacola, FL 32508

Command Surgeon  
U.S. Central Command  
MacDill Air Force Base  
FL 33608

Air University Library  
(AUL/LSE)  
Maxwell AFB, AL 36112

Commander  
U.S. Army Medical Bioengineering  
Research and Development Lab  
ATTN: SGRD-UBZ-I  
Fort Detrick, Frederick,  
MD 21701

Defense Technical  
Information Center  
Cameron Station  
Alexandria, VA 22313

U.S. Army Foreign Science  
and Technology Center  
ATTN: MTZ  
220 7th Street, NE  
Charlottesville, VA 22901-5396

Director,  
Applied Technology Laboratory  
USARTL-AVSCOM  
ATTN: Library, Building 401  
Fort Eustis, VA 23604

U.S. Army Training  
and Doctrine Command  
ATTN: Surgeon  
Fort Monroe, VA 23651-5000

Aviation Medicine Clinic  
TMC #22, SAAF  
Fort Bragg, NC 28305

U.S. Air Force Armament  
Development and Test Center  
Eglin Air Force Base, FL 32542

U.S. Army Missile Command  
Redstone Scientific  
Information Center  
ATTN: Documents Section  
Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5241

U.S. Army Research and Technology  
Laboratories (AVSCOM)  
Propulsion Laboratory MS 302-2  
NASA Lewis Research Center  
Cleveland, OH 44135

AFAMRL/HEX  
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433

University of Michigan  
NASA Center of Excellence  
in Man-Systems Research  
ATTN: R. G. Snyder, Director  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

John A. Dellinger, MS, ATP  
University of Illinois-  
Willard Airport  
Savoy, IL 61874

Project Officer  
Aviation Life Support Equipment  
ATTN: ANCFD-ALSE  
4300 Goodfellow Blvd.  
St. Louis, MO 63120-1798

Commander  
U.S. Army Aviation  
Aviation Systems Command  
ATTN: DRSAV-ED  
4300 Goodfellow Blvd  
St. Louis, MO 63120

Commanding Officer  
Naval Biodynamics Laboratory  
P.O. Box 24907  
New Orleans, LA 70189

U.S. Army Field Artillery School  
ATTN: Library  
Snow Hall, Room 14  
Fort Sill, OK 73503

Commander  
U.S. Army Health Services Command  
ATTN: HSOP-SO  
Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234-6000

U.S. Air Force Institute  
of Technology (AFIT/LDEE)  
Building 640, Area B  
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433

Henry L. Taylor  
Director, Institute of Aviation  
University of Illinois-  
Willard Airport  
Savoy, IL 61874

Commander  
U.S. Army Aviation  
Systems Command  
ATTN: DRSAV-WS  
4300 Goodfellow Blvd  
St. Louis, MO 63120-1798

Commander  
U.S. Army Aviation  
Systems Command  
ATTN: SGRD-UAN-AL (MAJ Lacy)  
4300 Goodfellow Blvd., Bldg 105  
St. Louis, MO 63120

U.S. Army Aviation  
Systems Command  
Library and Information  
Center Branch  
ATTN: DRSAV-DIL  
4300 Goodfellow Blvd  
St. Louis, MO 63120

Federal Aviation Administration  
Civil Aeromedical Institute  
CAMI Library AAC 64D1  
P.O. Box 25082  
Oklahoma City, OK 73125

Commander  
U.S. Army Academy  
of Health Sciences  
ATTN: Library  
Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234

Commander  
U.S. Army Institute  
of Surgical Research  
ATTN: SGRD-USM (Jan Duke)  
Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234-6200



Director of Professional Services  
AFMSC/GSP  
Brooks Air Force Base, TX 78235

U.S. Army Dugway Proving Ground  
Technical Library  
3Bldg 5330  
Dugway, UT 84022

U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground  
Technical Library  
Technical Library  
Yuma, AZ 85364

AFFTC Technical Library  
6520 TESTG/ENXL  
Edwards Air Force Base,  
CAL 93523-5000

Commander  
Code 3431  
Naval Weapons Center  
China Lake, CA 93555

Aeromechanics Laboratory  
U.S. Army Research  
and Technical Labs  
Ames Research Center,  
M/S 215-1  
Moffett Field, CA 94035

Sixth U.S. Army  
ATTN: SMA  
Presidio of San Francisco,  
CA 94129

Commander  
U.S. Army Aeromedical Center  
Fort Rucker, AL 36362

Directorate  
of Combat Developments  
Bldg 507  
Fort Rucker, AL 36362

U.S. Air Force School  
of Aerospace Medicine  
Strughold Aeromedical Library  
Documents Section, USAFSAM/TSK-4  
Brooks Air Force Base, TX 78235

Dr. Diane Damos  
Department of Human Factors  
ISSM, USC  
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0021

U.S. Army White Sands  
Missile Range  
Technical Library Division  
White Sands Missile Range,  
NM 88002

U.S. Army Aviation Engineering  
Flight Activity  
ATTN: SAVTE-M (Tech Lib)  
Stop 217  
Edwards Air Force Base,  
CA 93523-5000

U.S. Army Combat Developments  
Experimental Center  
Technical Information Center  
Bldg 2925  
Fort Ord, CA 93941-5000

Commander  
Letterman Army Institute  
of Research  
ATTN: Medical Research Library  
Presidio of San Francisco,  
CA 94129

Director  
Naval Biosciences Laboratory  
Naval Supply Center, Bldg 844  
Oakland, CA 94625

Commander  
U.S. Army Aviation Center  
and Fort Rucker  
ATTN: ATZQ-CDR  
Fort Rucker, AL 36362

Directorate  
of Training Development  
Bldg 502  
Fort Rucker, AL 36362

Chief  
Army Research Institute  
Field Unit  
Fort Rucker, AL 36362

Commander  
U.S. Army Safety Center  
Fort Rucker, AL 36362

U.S. Army Aircraft Development  
Test Activity  
ATTN: SIEBG-MP-QA  
Cairns AAF  
Fort Rucker, AL 36362

Chief  
Human Engineering Laboratory  
Field Unit  
Fort Rucker, AL 36362

Commander  
U.S. Army Aviation Center  
and Fort Rucker  
ATTN: ATZQ-T-ATL  
Fort Rucker, AL 36362

President  
U.S. Army Aviation Board  
Cairns AAF  
Fort Rucker, AL 36362