

A Comparison of Vessel Density in Primary Open-Angle Glaucoma and Normal-Tension Glaucoma Patients Using OCT Angiography [Letter]

Mohammed Rajib Haque¹, Lily Hoque²

¹Accident and Emergency, Calderdale and Huddersfield Foundation Trusts, Huddersfield, UK; ²General Practice, Bradford Teaching Hospital Foundation Trusts, Bradford, UK

Correspondence: Mohammed Rajib Haque, Email mrhaque@doctors.org.uk

Dear editor

We read with interest the article by Zehavi-Dorin et al¹ comparing vessel density in Primary Open-Angle Glaucoma (POAG) and Normal-Tension Glaucoma (NTG). We commend the authors for their rigorous severity-matching using Hodapp-Parrish-Anderson criteria and thoughtful study design. We write to offer several methodological considerations that may warrant further discussion and help contextualize their conclusion that “vascular factors may play a more prominent role in the early stages of NTG”.¹

Statistical Significance and the Vascular Hypothesis

The authors report a “trend toward significance” ($p = 0.058$) for lower peripapillary vessel density in early NTG. While this is an intriguing observation, we note that after adjustment for multiple comparisons, this difference was not statistically significant ($p = 0.301$).¹ We respectfully suggest that this non-significant finding might alternatively indicate that global vessel density metrics are not sufficiently sensitive to distinguish between POAG and NTG when severity is matched. We would be interested to know the authors’ perspective on the statistical basis for their conclusion regarding vascular factors in early NTG given the adjusted p -value of 0.301.

The authors note that “the RNFL thickness appeared to follow a similar trend to vessel density”.¹ Given the well-established correlation between vessel density and RNFL thickness in both healthy^{2,3} and glaucomatous eyes,⁴ we wonder whether the observed patterns in vessel density might reflect parallel structural changes. We would be interested to learn whether a multivariate analysis adjusting for RNFL thickness was performed, as this could help clarify if the microvascular changes represent an independent finding.

Additional Data That May Inform Interpretation

The authors report similar IOPs on the day of OCTA (13.9 ± 3.4 mmHg for POAG vs 13.3 ± 2.4 mmHg for NTG),¹ suggesting patients were on treatment. Since Holló⁵ demonstrated that significant IOP reduction can increase peripapillary vessel density, we wonder whether information on baseline untreated IOP, treatment regimens, and disease duration might be available. This additional context could help readers better understand whether the observed vessel density reflects underlying disease pathophysiology or potential treatment effects.

The authors acknowledge that “systemic hypertension, cardiovascular status, or topical and systemic medications” were not collected.¹ We appreciate this transparent acknowledgment. Given that NTG is associated with systemic vascular dysregulation^{6,7} and that conditions such as hypertension, sleep apnoea, and carotid stenosis can affect retinal vessel density,^{8–10} future studies incorporating these variables might help further elucidate the relationship between vessel density and NTG pathophysiology.

The authors focused on global metrics, noting that “sectoral or focal changes” were not examined.¹ Since NTG frequently presents with focal neuroretinal rim notching¹¹ and global averaging might potentially mask regionally specific changes,^{12,13} we wonder whether a sectoral analysis might reveal additional insights that complement the global findings reported in this study.

An Alternative Perspective

We find the authors’ alternative hypothesis particularly compelling: “As ganglion cell death progresses, secondary vascular attrition takes over”.¹ The statistical similarity in vessel density between severity-matched POAG and NTG groups across all stages appears consistent with this interpretation.

Building on this, we suggest that the absence of significant differences even in early disease might indicate that by the time glaucoma is clinically detectable, regardless of IOP phenotype, a common pathway of neurovascular degeneration may already be engaged. In this scenario, vessel density changes potentially represent consequences rather than primary causes of neuropathy in both subtypes. This interpretation would align with the parallel trends between RNFL thickness and vessel density that the authors observed.

If vessel density primarily reflects structural neuronal loss rather than independent vascular pathology, the findings of no significant difference between POAG and NTG when severity-matched would be expected and meaningful.

We thank Zehavi-Dorin et al for their valuable contribution of carefully severity-matched OCTA data to this important field. We offer these observations in the spirit of constructive scientific discourse and believe that future prospective studies incorporating treatment data, systemic hemodynamic profiling, and sectoral analysis would further advance our understanding of the vascular profile in NTG.

Disclosure

The authors report no conflicts of interest in this communication.

References

1. Zehavi-Dorin T, Kutzscher AE, Badr M, et al. A comparison of vessel density in primary open-angle glaucoma and normal-tension glaucoma patients using OCT angiography. *Clin Ophthalmol*. 2026;20:1–8. doi:10.2147/OPTH.S566473
2. Yu J, Gu R, Zong Y, et al. Relationship between retinal perfusion and retinal thickness in healthy subjects: an optical coherence tomography angiography study. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2016;57(9):OCT204–210. doi:10.1167/iops.15-18630
3. She X, Guo J, Liu X, et al. Reliability of vessel density measurements in the peripapillary retina and correlation with retinal nerve fiber layer thickness in healthy subjects using optical coherence tomography angiography. *Ophthalmologica*. 2018;240(4):183–190. doi:10.1159/000485957
4. Lin YH, Huang SM, Yeung L, et al. Correlation of visual field with peripapillary vessel density through optical coherence tomography angiography in normal-tension glaucoma. *Transl Vis Sci Technol*. 2020;9(13):1–8. doi:10.1159/000485957
5. Holló G. Influence of large intraocular pressure reduction on peripapillary OCT vessel density in ocular hypertensive and glaucoma eyes. *J Glaucoma*. 2017;26(1):e7–10. doi:10.1097/IJG.0000000000000527
6. Galassi F, Giambene B, Varriale R. Systemic vascular dysregulation and retrobulbar hemodynamics in normal-tension glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2011;52(7):4467–4471. doi:10.1167/iops.10-6710
7. Flammer J, Orgül S, Costa VP, et al. The impact of ocular blood flow in glaucoma. *Prog Retin Eye Res*. 2002;21(4):359–393. doi:10.1016/S1350-9462(02)00008-3
8. Lim HB, Lee MW, Park JH, Kim K, Jo YJ, Kim JY. Changes in ganglion cell-inner plexiform layer thickness and retinal microvasculature in hypertension: an optical coherence tomography angiography study. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2019;199:167–176. doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2018.11.016
9. Yu J, Xiao K, Huang J, Sun X, Jiang C. Reduced retinal vessel density in obstructive sleep apnea syndrome patients: an optical coherence tomography angiography study. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2017;58(9):3506–3512. doi:10.1167/iops.17-21414
10. Lahme L, Marchiori E, Panuccio G, et al. Changes in retinal flow density measured by optical coherence tomography angiography in patients with carotid artery stenosis after carotid endarterectomy. *Sci Rep*. 2018;8(1):17161. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-35556-4
11. Caprioli J, Sears M, Spaeth GL. Comparison of visual field defects in normal-tension glaucoma and high-tension glaucoma. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 1986;102(3):402–403. doi:10.1016/0002-9394(86)90028-0
12. Chen A, Liu L, Wang J, et al. Measuring glaucomatous focal perfusion loss in the peripapillary retina using OCT angiography. *Ophthalmology*. 2020;127(4):484–491. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2019.10.041
13. Hong KL, Burkemper B, Urrea AL, et al. Hemiretinal asymmetry in peripapillary vessel density in healthy, glaucoma suspect, and glaucoma eyes. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2021;230:156–165. doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2021.05.019

Dove Medical Press encourages responsible, free and frank academic debate. The content of the Clinical Ophthalmology 'letters to the editor' section does not necessarily represent the views of Dove Medical Press, its officers, agents, employees, related entities or the Clinical Ophthalmology editors. While all reasonable steps have been taken to confirm the content of each letter, Dove Medical Press accepts no liability in respect of the content of any letter, nor is it responsible for the content and accuracy of any letter to the editor.

Clinical Ophthalmology

Dovepress
Taylor & Francis Group

Publish your work in this journal

Clinical Ophthalmology is an international, peer-reviewed journal covering all subspecialties within ophthalmology. Key topics include: Optometry; Visual science; Pharmacology and drug therapy in eye diseases; Basic Sciences; Primary and Secondary eye care; Patient Safety and Quality of Care Improvements. This journal is indexed on PubMed Central and CAS, and is the official journal of The Society of Clinical Ophthalmology (SCO). The manuscript management system is completely online and includes a very quick and fair peer-review system, which is all easy to use. Visit <http://www.dovepress.com/testimonials.php> to read real quotes from published authors.

Submit your manuscript here: <https://www.dovepress.com/clinical-ophthalmology-journal>