Chapter-11.

STRABISMUS FROM A NEURO-OPTOMETRIC PERSPECTIVE

Dr Partha Chowdhury, Dr Brinda Shah

ABSTRACT

Strabismus is a disorder of ocular misalignment that extends beyond abnormalities of the extraocular muscles and their innervation to involve dysfunction of the neural networks responsible for binocular vision. Contemporary neuro-optometry recognizes strabismus as a disorder of cortical and subcortical integration, in which impaired sensory-motor coordination disrupts ocular alignment, fusion, and stereoscopic vision. Persistent misalignment induces adaptive neural responses, including diplopia, suppression, anomalous retinal correspondence (ARC), and reduced stereopsis, which may become reinforced through maladaptive neuroplasticity. The persistence or recurrence of strabismus despite successful optical or surgical correction highlights the critical role of cortical sensory processing in maintaining binocular dysfunction. This chapter provides a comprehensive overview of the neurobiological mechanisms, clinical manifestations, diagnostic evaluation, and rehabilitation strategies for strabismus, emphasizing the importance of integrating brain–eye interactions and neuroplasticity into modern neuro-optometric management.

Keywords: Strabismus; Binocular vision; Neuroplasticity; Neuro-optometry.

11.1 INTRODUCTION

Strabismus affects a significant proportion of the population, with global prevalence estimated at 2-5%. The condition may present in infancy, childhood, or adulthood with varied clinical presentations and prognostic implications. Traditionally, the focus of strabismus management has been on anatomical alignment through surgery or correction of refractive errors. While these methods remain important, they do not address the deeper issue of how the brain processes binocular input. Neuro-optometry challenges this limited view by shifting the focus to cortical suppression, binocular rivalry, and maladaptive developmental plasticity (Wong, 2012). This perspective is critical because strabismus is not purely a cosmetic or mechanical disorder – it is a complex neurodevelopmental condition with cognitive, functional, and psychosocial consequences (Hatt et al., 2008). Children with untreated strabismus are at risk of amblyopia, impaired stereopsis, and reduced academic or visuomotor performance, while adults may experience chronic diplopia, reduced depth perception, and psychosocial distress (Birch, 2013). Thus, neuro-optometry reframes strabismus as a disorder of the visual brain, requiring integrated diagnostic and rehabilitative approaches.

11.2 NEUROBIOLOGICAL BASIS OF STRABISMUS

A. Ocular Motor Control and Neural Pathways: Precise eye alignment depends on the coordinated function of six EOM innervated by cranial nerves III, IV, and VI. These nerves are controlled by brainstem gaze centers like the abducens nucleus, oculomotor nucleus, and trochlear nucleus, with supranuclear input from the frontal eye fields, parietal eye fields, cerebellum, and superior colliculus. Any disturbance in these pathways can lead to ocular misalignment, whether congenital, traumatic, vascular, or inflammatory. Yet, neuro-optometry emphasizes that structural lesions alone cannot fully explain strabismus. Even in cases where ocular motor integrity is restored, misalignment often persists.

This persistence suggests that cortical maladaptation and altered visual encoding reinforce strabismus over time (Ghasia & Shaikh, 2015). Thus, the disorder is not merely motor, but also sensory-neural in nature.

B. Cortical Suppression and Binocular Rivalry: In strabismus, the brain faces the challenge of reconciling two incongruent retinal images. To avoid persistent diplopia and visual confusion, the visual cortex dynamically suppresses input from the deviating eye (Pineles & Velez, 2015). This cortical suppression is initially adaptive, but over time it becomes hardwired, leading to chronic monocular supremacy and amblyopia (Hess & Thompson, 2015). Binocular rivalry mechanisms further complicate the condition. Instead of fusing the two images, the brain alternates perception between them or eliminates one entirely. Functional imaging studies show decreased activation in the primary and extrastriate visual cortices in strabismic subjects, reflecting impaired binocular integration (Hess et al., 2014). This neural adaptation explains why patients may fail to regain stereopsis even after surgical alignment (Levi et al., 2015).

C. Abnormal Sensory Fusion and Neural Encoding: In normal vision, retinal disparity is processed to support stereopsis and depth perception. In strabismus, this encoding is disturbed, resulting in abnormal sensory fusion or ARC. ARC represents an attempt by the brain to establish a pseudo-binocular correspondence between mismatched retinal points. While this avoids diplopia, it also locks the visual system into a maladaptive state that complicates rehabilitation (Sireteanu, 2000). Studies using visual evoked potentials (VEPs) validate delayed conduction and reduced amplitude responses in strabismic subjects, highlighting disrupted cortical synchrony in binocular processing (Wong, 2012).

11.3 CLINICAL MANIFESTATIONS

Strabismus presents a wide spectrum, with manifestations varying by chronicity, age of onset, and degree of deviation.

- **In Infants and Children:** Strabismus often presents as constant or intermittent deviations. Suppression mechanisms prevail, preventing diplopia but leading to amblyopia and loss of stereopsis (Birch, 2013). Children with early-onset strabismus often fail to develop fine stereoscopic vision, which can impair visuomotor coordination, reading fluency, and spatial awareness.
- **In Adults:** Since suppression mechanisms are less plastic post-childhood, adults who acquire strabismus often experience persistent, disabling diplopia. In some cases, they develop compensatory head postures or eccentric fixation strategies to minimize visual conflict.
- **Functional and Psychosocial Consequences:** Beyond the direct visual deficit, strabismus impacts self-esteem, social interaction, and quality of life (Hatt et al., 2008). Studies have shown that strabismus is associated with higher levels of depression and anxiety, particularly in adults who acquire the condition later in life. The persistence of functional impairment even after apparent correction of ocular alignment underscores the importance of considering strabismus as a disorder of neural encoding rather than simply one of mechanical alignment.

11.4 DIAGNOSTIC APPROACHES

Traditional diagnostic tools like the cover-uncover test, Hirschberg corneal reflex test, and prism bar cover test remain essential in quantifying the angle of deviation. However, neuro-optometry expands diagnostics to assess sensory integration and cortical adaptation.

- **Sensory Tests:** The Worth Four-Dot Test (WFDT), Bagolini striated lenses, and synoptophore evaluation provide insight into suppression, fusion, and ARC (Scheiman & Wick, 2014).
- **Electrophysiological Tools:** Binocular VEPs can measure cortical responses to binocular input, providing objective evidence of suppression and fusion defects (Wong, 2012).
- **Neuroimaging:** fMRI and diffusion tensor imaging have demonstrated altered connectivity between the visual cortex and ocular motor regions in strabismic subjects (Ghasia & Shaikh, 2015).
- **Eye-Tracking Technologies:** Digital platforms can quantify ocular deviations, fixation stability, and vergence responses, allowing for real-time monitoring of rehabilitation progress.

These diagnostic approaches highlight the shift from a purely mechanical to a neuro-functional assessment of strabismus.

11.5 REHABILITATION STRATEGIES

A. Optical and Orthoptic Interventions: Refractive correction remains the first step in managing accommodative or partially accommodative strabismus. Prisms are widely used to neutralize diplopia and reduce fusional demand. Orthoptic exercises are designed to improve fusional reserves, vergence control, and accommodative-

convergence balance (Ciuffreda et al., 2008). Importantly, from a neuro-optometric viewpoint, these interventions serve not only as mechanical corrections but as cortical training stimuli, encouraging binocular reintegration.

B. Neuroplasticity-Driven Approaches: Recent years have seen a paradigm shift toward therapies targeting cortical plasticity. Dichoptic training where separate visual stimuli are presented to each eye is designed to reduce suppression and promote binocular fusion (Hess et al., 2014). Virtual reality (VR) and digital gaming platforms extend this approach, offering dynamic, interactive binocular stimulation that may accelerate recovery of stereopsis (Vedamurthy et al., 2015; Kelly et al., 2016). Pharmacological adjuncts like dopaminergic agents are under investigation for their potential to enhance synaptic plasticity and visual learning. These approaches reflect a growing emphasis on harnessing cortical adaptability in rehabilitation.

C. Surgical Interventions and Post-Surgical Rehabilitation: EOM surgery remains critical for large-angle deviations. However, neuro-optometry emphasizes that surgery addresses only alignment—it does not ensure binocular function. Post-surgical orthoptic and binocular therapy are therefore crucial in retraining the cortex to accept and integrate aligned input (Scheiman & Wick, 2014). Without such neural rehabilitation, patients may regress into suppression or diplopia despite successful surgical outcomes.

11.6 FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN NEURO-OPTOMETRIC STRABISMUS CARE

The future of strabismus management lies in multimodal, brain-centered rehabilitation. Neuromodulation techniques like transcranial magnetic stimulation are being explored to enhance cortical responsiveness to binocular training. Machine learning applied to eye-tracking data may allow for precise phenotyping of strabismus, enabling highly individualized therapy protocols. Furthermore, the integration of AI-driven virtual rehabilitation platforms holds promise for at-home, continuous neuro-optometric care.

11.7 CONCLUSION

Strabismus is no longer sufficiently explained by ocular mechanics alone- it must be understood as a disorder of both the ocular motor system and cortical sensory integration. Suppression, ARC and loss of stereopsis are the neuro visual signatures of this condition. By combining traditional surgical and optical approaches with advances neuro optometric approaches that target cortical plasticity, it is possible to move beyond cosmetic correction towards a genuine restoration of binocular vision. This reframing signifies a major step forward in the scientific and clinical management of strabismus, confirming the central role of the brain in the recovery of visual function.

11.8 BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Hess, R. F., & Thompson, B. (2015). New insights into the neural basis of amblyopia. Current Opinion in Neurobiology, 35, 162–168. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2015.09.005
2. Hess, R. F., Thompson, B., & Baker, D. H. (2014). Binocular vision in amblyopia: Structure, suppression and plasticity. Ophthalmic and Physiological Optics, 34(2), 146–162. https://doi.org/10.1111/opo.12123
3. Birch, E. E. (2013). Amblyopia and binocular vision. Progress in Retinal and Eye Research, 33, 67–84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.preteyeres.2012.11.001
4. Levi, D. M., Knill, D. C., & Bavelier, D. (2015). Stereopsis and amblyopia: A mini-review. Vision Research, 114, 17–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2015.01.002
5. Sireteanu, R. (2000). The binocular visual system in amblyopia. Strabismus, 8(1), 39–51.
6. Tycheson, L. (2014). Status of the binocular visual system in strabismus and amblyopia. Current Opinion in Ophthalmology, 25(5), 411–416. https://doi.org/10.1097/ICU.0000000000000079
7. Kelly, K. R., Jost, R. M., Dao, L., Beauchamp, C. L., Leffler, J. N., & Birch, E. E. (2016). Binocular iPad game vs patching for treatment of amblyopia in children: A randomized clinical trial. JAMA Ophthalmology, 134(12), 1402–1408. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2016.4224
8. Vedamurthy, I., Nahum, M., Huang, S. J., Zheng, F., Bayliss, J., Bavelier, D., & Levi, D. M. (2015). A dichoptic custom-made action video game as a treatment for adult amblyopia. Vision Research, 114, 173–187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2015.04.008
9. Hatt, S. R., Leske, D. A., Liebermann, L., & Holmes, J. M. (2018). Comparing outcome criteria from a parent's and child's perspective in strabismus surgery. Journal of AAPOS, 22(3),

199–203.e1. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaapos.2018.01.017
10. Ghasia, F. F., & Shaikh, A. G. (2015). Neural circuits for binocular vision and their adaptation in strabismus. Current Opinion in Neurobiology, 33, 195–203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2015.05.004
11. Pineles, S. L., & Velez, F. G. (2015). Understanding and managing suppression in strabismus. Current Opinion in Ophthalmology, 26(5), 399–403. https://doi.org/10.1097/ICU.0000000000000194
12. Wong, A. M. F. (2012). New concepts concerning the neural mechanisms of amblyopia and their clinical implications. Canadian Journal of Ophthalmology, 47(5), 399–409. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcjo.2012.05.002
13. Ciuffreda, K. J., Tannen, B., & Rutner, D. (2008). Optometric management of binocular vision disorders. Butterworth-Heinemann.
14. Scheiman, M., & Wick, B. (2014). Clinical management of binocular vision: Heterophoric, accommodative, and eye movement disorders (4th ed.). Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Hatt, S. R., Leske, D. A., & Holmes, J. M. (2008). Comparison of quality of life instruments in adults with strabismus. American Journal of Ophthalmology, 146(6), 924–928. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajo.2008.07.021