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Discussion.

Jonkers: Miss Velzeboer has investigated her material in an exemplary manner. In so far as it was possible to obtain an insight into her figures in a short time, my attention was drawn to the relatively poor results. It should be borne in mind with regard to the results of orthoptic training that these are mainly dependent on the person who conducts the training. What I mean to say is that if all the circumstances, such as knowledge, apparatus, etc., are the same, the results will be influenced to a high degree by the person who applies orthoptic training.

Psychological analysis of a group of squinting patients always reveals traumatic circumstances in their lives. In some cases one is bound to believe that strabismus might be an expression of a “spastic” mental attitude. It is evident that in these cases local therapy will fail without thorough psychotherapy.

I cannot dwell upon this matter now. It will certainly be dealt with later. In our country we shall have to collect the results of the few who apply orthoptic training and to consider critically each other’s work and results. Further I can only praise the work done.

Keiner thanked the speaker for her extensive and precise investigation, which he called a new important Dutch opinion on the value of orthoptic training for certain anomalies brought about by or during squinting, in addition to recent American and English publications (Burian, Lancaster, Douglas).

Regarding the cases reported in which correct eye position was obtained he re-emphasized the marked tendency to spontaneous correction of strabismus convergent, which renders it uncertain whether treatment alone or nature also effected the cure. Further, he doubted the efficacy of the general principle of orthoptic training: training of the central fusion reflexes. He believed that in training, particularly in the beginning, the peripheral fusion should be more emphasized. The field of vision of the usual apparatus is generally too small for this purpose.

Results of an Investigation on Depth Perception at a Distance of 50 Metres.

By G. TEN DOESSCHATE (Utrecht).

Will be published in extenso elsewhere.

With a three-rod apparatus (distance of the two fixed rods to the test person’s eyes = 50 m.) the findings were:

For 100 test persons: V.O.D. and V.O.S. > 6/6
mean error of adjustment 91.6 cm. (parallax angle ± 4.68”)
average error of adjustment 103.5 cm. (parallax angle ± 5.26”)

‘ The smallest errors were made by:
Test person K.: mean error: 12.6 cm.
(Pupil distance 60 mm.) average error: 15.7 cm. (parallax angle 0.61")
Test person H.: average error: 11.0 cm.
(Pupil distance 63mm.) mean error: 12.8cm. (parallax angle 0.59”).
The middle rod was adjusted:
too near: ± 70.2%
too far: ± 29.5%
approx. correctly: ± 0.3%.