International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Various Reactions to the Human Vestibulo-Ocular Reflex of Vertical Translation (TVOR)

Dr Debopriya Ghosh[1], Dr Stephen Gershman[2], Dr Timothy Anderson[3], Peter[4]

[1]Department of Physiology, University College of Medical Sciences. Delhi, India.
[2]Department of Neuroscience, University of Alberta, Canada.
[3]Department of Robotics, Purdue University, USA.
[4]International Space University, France

ABSTRACT

According to geometrical considerations, the human translational vestibulo-ocular reflex (tVOR) should function significantly differently from the angular vestibulo-ocular reflex (aVOR). Particularly, tVOR is unable to steady pictures of both distant and close objects on the retina at the same time. Even though tVOR is claimed to only correct for less than 60% of foveal picture motion in people, the majority of research implicitly assume that it works to stabilise foveal images. Patients with cerebellar ataxia or progressive supranuclear palsy exhibit diminished capacity to raise tVOR responses appropriately while seeing close targets. In spite of intact capacity to converge at close, cerebellar patients experience decreased ability to modify tVOR responses to viewing conditions. The inability to alter tVOR depending on viewing circumstances appears to be a specific vestibular fuctions.

KEYWORDS: Cerebellar ataxia, Locomotion, Human Spaceflight, vestibulo-ocular reflex

INTRODUCTION

Thomas Brandt advocated for viewing research on vestibular reflexes and diseases from the perspective of how the organism obtains steady balance and clear vision. For instance, downbeat nystagmus should not be considered an isolated disease but rather as the disruption of a complex system that ordinarily enables people to stand, walk upright, and see well while moving. 1,2 Such an approach may be used to study the human linear or translational vestibulo-ocular reflex (tVOR), which until recently, mostly due to methodological restrictions, did not attract as much attention as the rotational or angular vestibulo-ocular reflex (aVOR). Thus, aVOR may be quickly examined at the bedside with quick head movements and in the lab using swivel chairs. On the other hand, administering head-on-body translations at the patient's bedside is more difficult, and expensive specific equipment is needed to create linear accelerations when testing tVOR in a lab. Nevertheless, human beings' upright, straight-legged walk causes significant head translations, particularly in the vertical plane (referred to, here, as bob). 3 More research on tVOR is thus necessary. The geometry of the visual criteria for aVOR and tVOR are different. As a result, aVOR is necessary to stabilise pictures during head rotations over the whole visual field and is capable of doing so even looking at optical infinity. Because the head's rotational axis is posterior to the eyes', observing a close target may need eye rotations to be almost 30% greater than the head rotations that create them. 4 As a result, there will be some relative motion between the near image, which is positioned on the retinal fovea, and the distant image, which is located on the retinal periphery, while seeing objects up close. However, tVOR is only activated when viewing objects up close; when viewing objects far away, head movements do not cause retinal image slip and tVOR is not necessary. When seeing a close object, eye rotations caused by tVOR must be significantly more than when watching a distant object in order to maintain the item's image on the fovea. Pictures of the far surround will travel quickly across the retinal periphery if images of the close target are maintained static on the retina. Here, we contend that the human tVOR really induces eye rotations to reduce retinal image motion of the close target with respect to retinal image motion of the far backdrop rather than to stabilise the picture of a close object on the fovea. 6.

CAN TVOR FUNCTION BETTER WHEN TESTED IN A NATURAL ENVIRONMENT?

Figure 1A,B depicts typical tVOR responses of a healthy person undergoing bob at 2 Hz under ambient lighting. However, they are fewer than the "necessary eye movements" determined based on the subject's head motions. It is important to note that the vertical eye movements produced by tVOR increase whilst viewing the close target. Even though the close target's image couldn't have been kept on the fovea during tVOR under our test settings, normal participants occasionally produced saccades. Combining translation and rotation resulted in a slight improvement in tVOR responsiveness. 6 Even with coupled rotation and translation, the median compensation gain only rose from 0.52 at a distance to 0.59 at a close distance. Consequently, despite the fact that the brain appeared to be able to increase eye motion while seeing up close, compensating gain was always insufficient to sustain foveal fixation, particularly up close. Next, we investigated the potential visual demands that tVOR may be reacting to.

WHAT ELEMENTS INFLUENCE TVOR BEHAVIOUR?

Although some researchers have proposed that a variety of variables may be involved, it is a commonly held belief that vergence angle determines tVOR responses9,12,24.25 Studies shows that tVOR responses fell off during monocular viewing, but we weren't sure if this was because convergence was weaker or because there weren't any binocular responses 25. To answer this, studies examined responses obtained when seeing targets with binoculars at three different distances (17 cm, 40 cm, and 200 cm), either directly or through base-out prisms placed in front of the subject's right eye. Despite the fact that the vergence angle is different, it is clear that the tVOR behaviour is same at both viewing distances. This result was constant across all six participants. 6 This conclusion does not imply that vergence effort has no effect on tVOR behaviour; rather, it suggests that binocular visual inputs may be more significant in environments with ambient lighting. The tVOR decreased as a result of monocular gazing, temporary darkness, or strobe illumination;6. Visual tracking eye movements, such as smooth pursuit, don't appear to be the cause of a number of issues, but. First, regardless of target viewing distance, the phase lag of our 2 Hz stimuli was consistently about 19 degrees. This is significantly less than the phase lag values of smooth tracking of a big visual object moving at 2 Hz (median lag of 58 degrees). 6 Second, tVOR can be reduced considerably more effectively during sight of a head-fixed target (such a mirror image) than can be explained by smooth pursuit. 26

AN EXPLANATION FOR THE TVOR BEHAVIOUR

Together, these results led us to the hypothesis that motion parallax, or the relative velocity of the close target with regard to the far backdrop, was a significant predictor of tVOR behaviour. Studies hypothesised that tVOR responses are set to minimise retinal image speed for both the target and the visual background because relative motion discrimination is better at slower rates of retinal image motion. 6,26 This hypothesis predicts that when the near visual object stays constant, mobility of the visual backdrop should affect tVOR behaviour. On a huge flat screen that moved vertically at a different frequency (2.1 Hz) than the platform (2.0 Hz), respondents were instructed to fixate on a target that was close to the earth and was surrounded by horizontal stripes. 26 When a result, as the background's relative motion rose, tVOR dropped (raising the foveal image's slip speed), which tended to balance the foveal target's retinal image slip with regard to the backdrop. As a subject moves across the visual environment naturally, there is a shifting connection between the image slip of a close object and the backdrop. In order to minimise the relative motion of one with regard to the other, it is now believed that the responsiveness of tVOR is modified as a continuous function of retinal image motion of the close target vs far background. In reality, a tVOR compensation increase of 0.6 is all that is needed for objects farther away than around 1 metre in order to lower retinal image motion below 5 degrees/second and enable clear vision. 6

WHAT NEW INFORMATION ABOUT TVOR DOES THE EVIDENCE FROM NEUROLOGICAL ILLNESS PATIENTS OFFER?

A lot of literature has been written about aVOR diseases, which can be caused by many different neurological conditions. 2,29 The impact of neurological disorders on tVOR is far less well understood. According to what we know about aVOR, cerebellar and brainstem illness may result in tVOR anomalies. Examples include skew deviation and ocular tilt response, which are thought to be caused by a central imbalance of otolithic pathways and occur with both brainstem and cerebellar diseases. 30 According to studies, neurological conditions that frequently result in falls would also disturb otolith-spinal reflexes, causing aberrant otolith-ocular reflexes. Patients having two disorders, according to studies: (1) PSP, which early in its progression produces falls; (2) cerebellar ataxias Note that PSP patients are unable to converge because the tVOR's responsiveness does not rise while seeing a close object during bob translation in these individuals. 21 Cerebellar ataxia patients' tVOR similarly fails to rise during close viewing, although they can converge22; a related outcome with translation along the interaural axis has already been documented. 31 Failure to converge is therefore unlikely to constitute the core issue with PSP for the following two reasons: (1) Normal participants exhibit variation of tVOR with viewing distance, not vergence angle, when exposed to ambient light. (2) During close sight, cerebellar patients' tVOR responsivity can converge but not rise. Additionally, PSP impairs vestibular-evoked myogenic potentials (VEMPS), which are produced when a loud click is used to activate the saccular otolithic organ. 21 Therefore, it appears that a certain type of vestibular illnesses includes a lack of the capacity to properly raise tVOR responsivity during sight of a close object. For a deeper understanding of the pathophysiology behind these findings, further research, including the creation of animal models, appears to be required.

CONCLUSIONS

tVOR appears to be poorly adapted to stabilise foveal pictures, and while this is still theoretically conceivable, no earlier study has conclusively confirmed it. Further, if tVOR did stabilise foveal pictures of a close object, geometric considerations suggest that this behaviour would be harmful to good vision of the further surroundings, especially in upright humans with their bouncy way of walking. It seems that the brain employs a variety of visual signals, including motion parallax, which is now known to be encoded in cortical visual region MT, to estimate the distances of nearby targets and their surroundings.32 Unknown tVOR diseases may be brought on by conditions that affect the cerebral cortex, brainstem, or other parts of the brain.

References

1. Büchele W, Brandt T, Degner D. Ataxia and oscillopsia in downbeat-nystagmus vertigo syndrome. Adv Oto-Rhino-Laryngol. 1983; 30:291–297.
2. Brandt, T. Its multisensory syndromes. London: Springer-Verlag; 1999. Vertigo.
3. Massaad F, Lejeune TM, Detrembleur C. The up and down bobbing of human walking: a compromise between muscle work and efficiency.

J Physiol. 2007; 582:789–799. [PubMed: 17463048]

4. Viirre E, Tweed D, Milner K, Vilis T. A reexamination of the gain of the vestibuloocular reflex. Journal of Neurophysiology. 1986; 56:439–450. [PubMed: 3489820]

5. Angelaki DE. Eyes on target: what neurons must do for the vestibuloocular reflex during linear motion. J. Neurophysiol. 2004; 92:20–35. [PubMed: 15212435]

6. Liao K, Walker MF, Joshi A, Reschke MF, Leigh RJ. Vestibulo-ocular responses to vertical translation in normal human subjects. Exp Brain Res. 2008; 185:553–562. [PubMed: 17989972]

7. Bronstein AM, Gresty MA. Short latency compensatory eye movement responses to transient linear head acceleration: a specific function of the otolith-ocular reflex. Exp. Brain Res. 1988; 71:406– 410. [PubMed: 3169173]

8. Israël I, Berthoz A. Contribution of the otoliths to the calculation of linear displacement. J Neurophysiol. 1989; 62:247–263. [PubMed: 2754476]

9. Paige GD. The influence of target distance on eye movement responses during vertical linear motion. Exp Brain Res. 1989; 77:585–593. [PubMed: 2806449]

10. Busettini C, Miles FA, Schwarz U, Carl JR. Human ocular responses to translation of the observer and of the scene: dependence on viewing distance. Exp Brain Res. 1994; 100:484–494. [PubMed: 7813684]

11. Gianna CC, Gresty MA, Bronstein AM. The human linear vestibulo-ocular reflex to transient accelerations: visual modulation of suppression and enhancement. J. Vestib. Res. 2000; 10:227– 238. [PubMed: 11354436]

12. Paige GD, Telford L, Seidman SH, Barnes GR. Human vestibuloocular reflex and its interactions with vision and fixation distance during linear and angular head movement. J Neurophysiol. 1998; 80:2391–2404. [PubMed: 9819251]

13. Ramat S, Zee DS. Ocular motor responses to abrupt interaural head translation in normal humans. J. Neurophysiol. 2003; 90:887–902. [PubMed: 12672783]

14. Ramat S, Straumann D, Zee DS. The interaural translational VOR: suppression, enhancement and cognitive control. J. Neurophysiol. 2005; 94:2391–2402. [PubMed: 15901755]

15. Tian JR, Mokuno E, Demer JL. Vestibulo-ocular reflex to transient surge translation: complex geometric response ablated by normal aging. J Neurophysiol. 2006; 95:2042–2054. [PubMed: 16551841]

16. Moore ST, Hirasaki E, Cohen B, Raphan T. Effect of viewing distance on the generation of vertical eye movements during locomotion. Exp. Brain Res. 1999; 129:347–361. [PubMed: 10591907]

17. Pozzo T, Berthoz A, Lefort L. Head stabilization during various locomotor tasks in humans. I. Normal subjects. Exp Brain Res. 1990; 82:97–106. [PubMed: 2257917]

18. Bloomberg JJ, Reschke MF, Huebner WP, Peters BT. The effects of target distance on eye and head movement during locomotion. Ann NY Acad Sci. 1992; 656:699–707. [PubMed: 1599174]

19. Das VE, Dell'Osso LF, Leigh RJ. Enhancement of the vestibulo-ocular reflex by prior eye movements. J. Neurophysiol. 1999; 81:2884–2892. [PubMed: 10368405]

20. Crane BT, Demer JL. Human gaze stabilization during natural activities: translation, rotation, magnification, and target distance effects. J Neurophysiol. 1997; 78:2129–2144. [PubMed: 9325380]

21. Liao K, Wagner J, Joshi A, Estrovich I, Walker MF, Strupp M, Leigh RJ. Why do patients with PSP fall? Evidence for abnormal otolith responses. Neurology. 2008; 70:802–809. [PubMed: 18199830]

22. Liao K, Walker MF, Leigh RJ. Abnormal vestibular responses to vertical head motion in cerebellar ataxia. Ann. Neurol. 2008 In Press.

23. Haustein W. Considerations on Listing's Law and the primary position by means of a matrix description of eye position control. Biol Cybern. 1989; 60:411–420. [PubMed: 2719979]

24. Paige GD. Linear vestibulo-ocular reflex (LVOR) and modulation by vergence Acta. Otolaryngol. 1991; 481 Suppl:282–286.

25. Schwarz U, Miles FA. Ocular responses to translation and their dependence on viewing distance. I. Motion of the observer. J Neurophysiol. 1991; 66:851–864. [PubMed: 1753290]

26. Liao K, Walker MF, Joshi A, Reschke MF, Wang Z, Leigh RJ. A reinterpretation of the purpose of the translational vestibulo-ocular reflex in human subjects. Prog. Brain Res. 2008; 171 In press.

27. Nakayama K. Biological image motion processing: a review. Vision Res. 1985; 25:625–660. [PubMed: 3895725]

28. Howard, IP.; Rogers, BJ. Depth from Motion Parallax. In: Howard, IP.; Rogers, BJ., editors. Seeing in Depth. Vol. volume 2. Toronto: I.

Porteus; 2002. p. 411-443.

29. Leigh, RJ.; Zee, DS. The Neurology of Eye Movements (Book/DVD). Fourth Edition. New York: Oxford University Press; 2006.
30. Brandt T, Dieterich M. Vestibular syndromes in the roll plane: topographic diagnosis from brain stem to cortex. Annals of Neurology. 1994; 36:337–347. [PubMed: 8080241]
31. Wiest G, Tian JR, Baloh RW, Crane BT, Demer JL. Otolith function in cerebellar ataxia due to mutations in the calcium channel gene. CACNA1A Brain. 2001; 124:2407–2416.
32. Nadler JW, Angelaki DE, Deangelis GC. A neural representation of depth from motion parallax in macaque visual cortex. Nature. 2008; 452:642–645. [PubMed: 18344979]