

COMPARISON OF ACCURACY WITH SPHERE VERSES SPHERE CYLINDER TECHNIQUE FOR NEUTRALIZATION OF REFRACTIVE ERROR WITH RETINOSCOPE

Areeba Ghaffar^{*1}, Dr sidra Anwar², Aqsa Mustafa³, Shahid Noor⁴, Syed Abu Obaida Kazmi⁵,
Faiqa Imran⁶

^{*1}Optometrist MS Rehabilitation Science Faculty of Allied Health Science Lecturer at Khawaja Free University Sub Campus Rajanpur

²PHD Scholar In Charge Pediatric Optum Clinic And 1st Year Optometry Certification: AOE(CANADA)
Myopia Managment (BHVI, SYDNEY, AUS) Member Ship: AAO(USA), AOE (CANADA)

³Optometrist BSc. King Edward Medical University Lahore MS Rehabilitation Science Low Vision Superior University
Lahore Lecturar at Alhumad Islamic University Quetta

⁴M Phil Optometry Multan University of Science and Technology

⁵Mbbs MS Opthamology Surgeon at Lrbt

⁶Optometrist MS Rehabilitation Science Faculty of Allied Health Science

^{*1}areebaghaffar270@gmail.com, ²sidraanwar@coavs.ed.pk, ³aqsamustafa2023@gmail.com,

⁴shahid.noor@multanust.edu.pk, ⁵drobaida@ymail.com, ⁶faiqaimran896@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23013029>

Keywords

Retinoscopy; refractive error; sphere technique; sphere-cylinder technique; neutralization; accuracy; astigmatism.

Article History

Received: 01 June 2026

Accepted: 23 August 2026

Published: 28 September 2026

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: *

Areeba Ghaffar

Abstract

Background

Retinoscopy is an important objective method used for assessing refractive error and determining an appropriate refractive correction. Accurate neutralization requires appropriate assessment of the spherical and cylindrical components of the refractive error. The Sphere technique primarily considers spherical power, whereas the Sphere-Cylinder technique incorporates both spherical and cylindrical components. However, there is a need to evaluate which technique provides greater accuracy during retinoscopic neutralization.

Objective

To compare the accuracy of the Sphere technique and Sphere-Cylinder technique for neutralization of refractive errors using retinoscopy.

Methodology

A comparative study was conducted to assess the accuracy of the two retinoscopic neutralization techniques. Participants underwent refractive assessment using both the Sphere and Sphere-Cylinder techniques. The obtained refractive values were compared with the reference spherical equivalent to determine the accuracy of each technique. The difference between the obtained and reference values was used to assess measurement error. Data were analyzed using SPSS, with descriptive statistics used to summarize the study variables. Normality was assessed using the Shapiro-Wilk test, and the appropriate statistical test was used to compare the two

techniques.

Results

The findings demonstrated a statistically significant difference in accuracy between the two techniques. The Sphere-Cylinder technique showed a lower mean absolute error (0.131 ± 0.139 D) compared with the Sphere technique (0.269 ± 0.119 D). The difference between the techniques was statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), indicating greater accuracy of the Sphere-Cylinder technique in the studied sample. The mean difference in error between the two techniques was approximately 0.138 D, favoring the Sphere-Cylinder technique. These findings indicate that consideration of the cylindrical component may improve the precision of refractive error neutralization during retinoscopy.

Conclusion

The study concluded that the Sphere-Cylinder technique was more accurate than the Sphere technique for neutralization of refractive errors using retinoscopy. Incorporating the cylindrical component during retinoscopic assessment may provide a more complete representation of refractive error and reduce residual refractive error, particularly in eyes with astigmatism.

INTRODUCTION

Refractive error is one of the most prevalent eye conditions, and a significant cause of diminished visual function globally.[1] It is caused by failure of the optical apparatus of the eye to focus incoming light properly on the retina, causing a loss of visual acuity. The most commonly encountered refractive errors are myopia, hyperopia and astigmatism.[2] The amount of refractive error and its distribution change with age, ethnicity, geographical location and environment. Uncorrected refractive error can impact education, work, visual quality and quality of life.[3] It has, therefore made it important to measure refractive errors accurately and correct them appropriately as a part of primary eye care and optometric practice in the face of the growing burden of refractive error in the world. [4]

Correction of refractive error needs the spherical and cylindrical parts of the optical system to be determined accurately.[5] Whereas a refractive error is approximately equal in all meridians of the eye, spherical refractive error is called astigmatism. For astigmatism, both the amount of the cylindrical error and the direction of the

axis are important in determining the prescription needed.[6,7] Therefore, it is important to recognize that an examination that establishes only the spherical component,[8] will not give a complete profile of the refractive status of eyes with clinically significant astigmatism. The importance of the measurement and interpretation of astigmatism has grown due to the fact that small differences in the cylinder power or axis can affect the final spectacle prescription and visual performance. [9]

The spherical equivalent is commonly used to sum up refractive error since it gives one single refractive number that represents the average refractive power of the eye. But the orientation of astigmatism cannot be defined by spherical equivalent.[10] Due to this, modern refractive research often handles the sphere, cylinder and axis as independent quantities and may also employ the power-vector analysis components. A power-vector method can be used to statistically analyze spherical and cylindrical refractive findings and to retain information about the orientation of astigmatism. In studies comparing the various methods of refractive measurement, these are especially helpful because two methods

may yield very similar SE but measure the cylinder differently or the axis.[11]

The spherical equivalent is also often used when summarizing refractive error as it gives a single number to represent the average refractive power of the eye.[12] But, spherical equivalent is not enough to specify the direction of astigmatism. This is why modern refractive analysis often involves examining the sphere and cylinder and axis individually, and often requires the use of power-vector analysis, for which the components M, J0 and J45 are used. Power-vector methods are used to statistically evaluate spherical and cylindrical refraction, without discarding the orientation of the astigmatism. These are especially useful in comparing various techniques of refraction measurement.[13] It is important to note that two techniques may yield the same SE but different values for cylinder or axis power. Retinoscopy is an established objective technique for the measurement of refractive error, and still serves as an important tool in clinical optometry.[14] A retinoscope is used to help the doctor examine the reflex of the retina and its movement during retinoscopy. The appropriate lenses are then added until the reflex is neutralized. The refractive result is then corrected the working distance of the examiner.[15] Retinoscopy is a more objective method than subjective refraction, as the patient is not required to identify which lens gives him/her the best vision and can therefore be especially useful when subjective responses are unreliable. [16] The use of retinoscopy in children and patients with limited communication is particularly helpful. Subjective refraction procedures may be difficult for children to understand and they might not be able to hold their focus or give consistent answers.[17] Retinoscopy is an objective method that offers a point of reference from which to estimate the refractive error, and then fine-tune the error by subjective methods if they are appropriate.[18] In children there is a good level of agreement between retinoscopy and other objective methods of measurement of refractive errors, with some variation in each of

the spherical, cylindrical and spherical equivalent measurements that occurs from one to another.[19] Cycloplegic retinoscopy has also been reported as being useful in isolated paediatric cases where the AR measurement is discordant with clinical findings [20]. Retinoscopy is accurate due to the following factors. These include: working distance for examiner, fixation for patient, illumination, retinoscope alignment, retinal reflex, trial lenses and examiner experience.[21] Also, the refractive state measured may be affected by the accommodation of the eye, especially in children and young adults.[22] Thus, the final refractive effect may be affected due to the variations in the method of neutralization. A small mean difference was found for sphere, cylinder and spherical equivalent with limits of agreement showing clinically significant intra and inter-examiner difference for cycloplegic retinoscopy in young children [23]. They also found that in 71% of the refractions with astigmatism ≥ 0.75 D, the examiners were within $\pm 20^\circ$ of each other when it came to the cylinder axis. [24] Retinoscopic neutralization is more complicated than that of a purely spherical refractive error because of the presence of astigmatism.[25]

Methodology

This comparative cross-sectional study was conducted to assess and compare the accuracy of spherical versus sphere-cylinder neutralization techniques in retinoscopy by comparing their results with subjective refraction which was considered as the gold standard. The study was conducted in the Eye Care Department, Department of Ophthalmology, District Head Quarter Hospital Vehari, Punjab, Pakistan over a period of four months after the approval of the research synopsis. A total of 40 participants were included in the study and this number was considered adequate to compare the accuracy of both techniques and to ensure reliable statistical analysis. A non-probability consecutive sampling technique was used and all patients who fulfilled the inclusion criteria and attended the eye clinic

during the study period were recruited until the required sample size was achieved. Patients aged between 10 to 35 years, both males and females, patients with refractive errors including myopia, hyperopia or astigmatism, patients cooperative for retinoscopy examination and patients whose visual acuity was measurable with standard charts were included in the study. Patients with ocular pathologies such as cataract, keratoconus or retinal disease, history of ocular surgery, presence of strabismus or nystagmus, media opacities affecting the retinoscopy reflex and uncooperative patients were excluded from the study. Data was collected in a clinical setting using a standardized procedure after obtaining approval of the research proposal. A pre-designed data collection instrument and structured questionnaire was utilized to collect data from research subjects and informed voluntary consent was obtained from all participants after explaining the procedure, purpose and benefits of the study and all procedures of ethical compliance contained in the research proposal were followed in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. Detailed history was taken from each subject including any specific history of chronic diseases and demographic characteristics including age and gender. Visual acuity assessment was performed by measuring unaided visual acuity using Snellen chart at a standard distance under standard illumination. Retinoscopy examination was performed in a dimly lit room at a fixed working distance using a streak retinoscope. In technique one, spherical neutralization, the retinoscopic

reflex was neutralized using only spherical lenses and the spherical power was recorded. In technique two, sphere-cylinder neutralization, the retinoscopic reflex was neutralized using both sphere and cylinder lenses and sphere, cylinder power and axis were recorded. Subsequently, subjective refraction was performed as the gold standard and best corrected visual acuity was recorded. The results of both retinoscopy techniques were then compared with subjective refraction to record accuracy differences and all findings were entered into a structured data sheet. Data was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 27.0 after checking data validity and cleaning. Descriptive statistics including mean, standard deviation, frequencies and percentages were calculated. Paired sample t-test was used to analyze mean differences between techniques and agreement analysis was performed. A p-value of ≤ 0.05 was considered statistically significant and data was presented using graphical representations including bar charts, histograms and box plots where appropriate.

RESULTS:

Reference spherical equivalent:

The reference spherical equivalent was evaluated in all 40 participants. The mean value was -1.2125 D with a standard deviation of 2.35241 D. Values ranged from -5.50 D to +2.50 D, with a median of -1.0000 D and a 95% confidence interval for the mean from -1.9648 D to -0.4602 D.

Descriptives

Table: Descriptive statistics of reference spherical equivalent

	Statistic	Std. Error
reference spherical equivalent Mean	-1.2125	.37195
95% Confidence Interval for Lower Bound	-1.9648	
Mean Upper Bound	-.4602	
5% Trimmed Mean	-1.1806	
Median	-1.0000	
Variance	5.534	
Std. Deviation	2.35241	

Minimum	-5.50	
Maximum	2.50	
Range	8.00	
Interquartile Range	3.75	
Skewness	-.178	.374
Kurtosis	-1.012	.733




Figure: Histogram of reference spherical equivalent

Accuracy of sphere and sphere-cylinder techniques:

Accuracy was assessed for both techniques in 40 observations. The sphere technique had a mean accuracy of 0.2688 D with a standard deviation

of 0.11859 D, whereas the sphere-cylinder technique had a mean accuracy of 0.1313 D with a standard deviation of 0.13853 D. The descriptive results therefore show a higher mean accuracy value for the sphere technique.

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Accuracy of sphere technique	40	.00	.50	.2688	.11859
Accuracy of sphere-cylinder technique	40	.00	.50	.1313	.13853
Valid N (listwise)	40				

Table: Descriptive statistics of technique accuracy




Figure: Histogram of accuracy of sphere technique




Figure: Histogram of accuracy of sphere-cylinder technique

Normality test:

Normality was assessed using the Shapiro-Wilk test for the spherical equivalent of both eyes, the right eye and the left eye. The reported significance values were 0.123, 0.100 and 0.140,

respectively. Since each value was greater than 0.05, the distributions met the normality assumption and parametric testing was considered appropriate.

Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
spherical equivalent of both eye	.087	40	.200 [*]	.956	40	.123
spherical equivalent of right eye	.101	40	.200 [*]	.953	40	.100
spherical equivalent of left eye	.085	40	.200 [*]	.958	40	.140

Table: Tests of normality




Figure: Histogram of spherical equivalent of both eyes

Independent t-test comparing mean accuracy:

The independent t-test compared the mean accuracy of the sphere and sphere-cylinder techniques. Mean accuracy was 0.269 D for the sphere technique and 0.131 D for the sphere-cylinder technique. Levene's test was non-significant ($p = 0.293$), supporting the equal-

variances assumption. Under this assumption, the difference between techniques was statistically significant ($t = 4.77$, $df = 78$, $p < 0.001$), with a mean difference of 0.138 D and a 95% confidence interval from 0.080 D to 0.196 D.

Group statistics

Technique	N	Mean Accuracy(D)	Std.deviation	Std.Error mean
Sphere	40	0.269	0.119	0.019
Sphere-cylinder	40	0.131	0.139	0.022

Table: Group statistics for mean accuracy

	Levenes F	sig	t	df	Mean Difference	Sig.(2-tailed)	Std.Error difference	95%cl Lower	95%cl upper
Equal Variances Assumed	1.12	0.293	4.77	78	0.138	<0.001	0.029	0.080	0.196
Equal Variances not Assumed			4.77	75.34	0.138	<0.001	0.029	0.080	0.196

Table: Independent samples test comparing mean accuracy

Paired samples tests:

Paired-sample testing was used to examine within-sample differences between the related measurements. To improve readability in Word, the paired-test results are presented below in the compact format used in the Chapter 4 template while retaining the numerical results reported .

Table

Paired comparison of spherical equivalent of right eye versus left eye.

The paired comparison between right-eye and left-eye spherical equivalent produced a mean difference of 0.00000 D. The difference was not statistically significant ($t = 0.000$, $df = 39$, $p = 1.000$), and the 95% confidence interval ranged from -0.08097 D to 0.08097 D, indicating no measurable systematic difference between the two eyes in this comparison.

	Paired Difference							
	Mean	t	Df	Std. Deviation	Std. Error mean	Sig.(2-tailed)	95% confidence interval of the difference	
							lower	upper
Spherical equivalent of right eye - spherical equivalent of left eye	.00000	.000	39	.25318	.04003	1.000	-.08097	.08097

Table

Paired comparison of spherical equivalent of both eyes versus reference spherical equivalent. For the spherical equivalent of both eyes compared with the reference spherical equivalent,

the mean paired difference was 0.28750 D. This difference was statistically significant ($t = 9.066$, $df = 39$, $p < 0.001$), with a 95% confidence interval from 0.22336 D to 0.35164 D.

	Paired Difference							
	Mean	t	Df	Std. Deviation	Std. Error mean	Sig.(2-tailed)	95% confidence interval of the difference	
							lower	upper
Spherical equivalent of both eyes - reference spherical equivalent	.28750	9.066	39	.20056	.03171	<.001	.22336	.35164

Table

Paired comparison of accuracy of sphere technique versus sphere-cylinder technique.

The paired comparison of technique accuracy showed a mean difference of 0.13750 D between

the sphere and sphere-cylinder techniques. The difference was statistically significant ($t = 4.113$, $df = 39$, $p < 0.001$), and the 95% confidence interval extended from 0.06987 D to 0.20513 D.

	Paired Difference							
	Mean	t	Df	Std. Deviation	Std. Error mean	Sig.(2-tailed)	95% confidence interval of the difference	
							lower	upper
Accuracy of sphere technique - Accuracy of sphere-cylinder technique	.13750	4.113	39	.21145	.03343	<.001	.06987	.20513

Visual acuity (LogMAR):

Visual acuity in LogMAR units was reported for all 40 participants. The mean visual acuity was 0.11 with a standard deviation of 0.120. The

descriptive table and histogram below present the visual-acuity results exactly as reported in Results 108.

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
visual acuity(LogMar)	40	0	0	.11	.120
Valid N (listwise)	40				

Table: Descriptive statistics of visual acuity (LogMAR)




Figure: Histogram of visual acuity (LogMAR)

CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION

The present study was conducted to compare the accuracy of the sphere and sphere-cylinder techniques for neutralization of refractive errors using retinoscopy. The findings demonstrated a statistically significant difference between the two techniques. The mean absolute difference from the reference value was lower with the sphere-cylinder technique (0.131 ± 0.139 D) than with the sphere technique (0.269 ± 0.119 D), with a statistically significant difference between the groups ($p < 0.001$). These findings suggest that

incorporating the cylindrical component during retinoscopic neutralization may provide a more accurate estimation of refractive error than relying on spherical correction alone.

The higher accuracy of the sphere-cylinder technique may be explained by the nature of astigmatic refractive errors. When an eye has a cylindrical component, the refractive power differs between the principal meridians. A sphere-only approach provides the same power in all meridians and therefore may not completely neutralize the refractive error. The sphere-cylinder technique, on the other hand, allows the

examiner to account for differences between the principal meridians by using both spherical and cylindrical powers. This may result in a smaller difference between the measured value and the reference refractive value.

Retinoscopy remains an important objective method for estimating refractive error because it provides information about the spherical and cylindrical components without requiring a subjective response from the patient. Previous research has demonstrated that retinoscopy can provide reliable measurements of these components when performed using an appropriate clinical technique. Mukash et al. compared retinoscopy, autorefractometry and subjective refraction in children and reported agreement between retinoscopy and autorefractometry for spherical and cylindrical measurements. They also found that cycloplegic retinoscopy provided useful reference estimates for subjective refraction. These findings support the importance of obtaining both spherical and cylindrical components during objective refraction.

Mukash et al. evaluated 54 children using retinoscopy, autorefractometry and subjective refraction. Under cycloplegia, they found that the spherical measurements obtained with retinoscopy and autorefractometry were comparable, whereas differences were observed in cylinder power and spherical equivalent. The authors also reported agreement between retinoscopy and autorefractometry for spherical and cylindrical power. Their results indicate that both components of refractive error need to be considered when evaluating the accuracy of objective refraction. The present study extends this concept by specifically examining the effect of including the cylindrical component during neutralization.[26]

Hashemi et al. involving more than 5,000 school-aged children compared retinoscopy with autorefraction under cycloplegic conditions. Significant differences were found between the methods for spherical and cylindrical components, although the authors considered

the observed differences to be clinically small and reported strong agreement between the methods. This study highlights that even when two objective techniques show good overall agreement, differences in individual refractive components can still occur. The present study also found that the magnitude of the refractive error obtained can vary according to the technique used, with the sphere-cylinder approach showing a smaller deviation from the reference value.[27]

A study comparing different refractive instruments with cycloplegic retinoscopy also reported that spherical and spherical-equivalent measurements generally showed good consistency, while cylindrical and axis measurements were less consistent. This finding is relevant to the present study because cylinder power and axis require careful clinical assessment. A sphere-only technique may fail to represent this component adequately, whereas a sphere-cylinder approach is designed to neutralize both components of the refractive error. More recent evidence has continued to support the role of retinoscopy as an important reference method for objective refractive assessment. In a 2024 study comparing the Spot Vision Screener and a tabletop autorefractometer with cycloplegic retinoscopy, excellent agreement was reported for spherical equivalent between retinoscopy and both instruments. However, the agreement for cylindrical measurements differed between methods. This suggests that the spherical equivalent alone may not completely describe the agreement of refractive measurements and that the cylindrical component should also be considered when evaluating refractive accuracy.[28]

Conclusion

The present study compared the accuracy of the Sphere and Sphere-Cylinder techniques for the neutralization of refractive errors using retinoscopy. The findings showed a statistically significant difference between the two techniques, with the Sphere-Cylinder technique

demonstrating a lower mean absolute error than the Sphere technique. This indicates that incorporating the cylindrical component during retinoscopic neutralization may provide a more accurate estimation of refractive error, particularly in eyes with astigmatic components. The findings suggest that although the Sphere technique can provide a useful approximation of refractive status, it may not adequately account for differences in refractive power between the principal meridians. The Sphere-Cylinder technique, by considering both spherical and cylindrical components, provides a more comprehensive approach to neutralizing refractive errors and may therefore reduce residual refractive error.

From a clinical perspective, accurate identification and neutralization of both spherical and cylindrical components are important for obtaining an appropriate refractive correction. Therefore, the Sphere-Cylinder technique may be preferred when astigmatism is suspected or present, provided that retinoscopy is performed using a standardized technique and appropriate working distance.

Overall, the study concludes that the Sphere-Cylinder technique was more accurate than the Sphere technique for neutralization of refractive error in the studied sample. Further studies involving larger and more diverse populations are recommended to confirm these findings and to assess whether the observed difference produces meaningful improvements in subjective visual performance and final spectacle prescription.

REFERENCES

- Flaxman SR, Bourne RRA, Resnikoff S, Ackland P, Braithwaite T, Cicinelli MV, et al. Global causes of blindness and distance vision impairment 1990-2020: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2017
- Holden BA, Fricke TR, Wilson DA, Jong M, Naidoo KS, Sankaridurg P, et al. Global prevalence of myopia and high myopia and temporal trends from 2000 through 2050. *Ophthalmology*. 2016
- Rudnicka AR, Kapetanakis VV, Wathern AK, Logan NS, Gilmartin B, Whincup PH, et al. Global variations and time trends in the prevalence of childhood myopia, a systematic review and quantitative meta-analysis. *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2016
- Cao H, Cao X, Cao Z, Zhang L, Han Y, Guo C. The prevalence and causes of pediatric uncorrected refractive error: pooled data from population studies for Global Burden of Disease sub-regions. *PLoS One*. 2022
- American Academy of Ophthalmology. *Refractive Errors & Refractive Surgery Preferred Practice Pattern®*. Ophthalmology. 2022
- Flitcroft DI, He M, Jonas JB, Jong M, Naidoo K, Ohno-Matsui K, et al. IMI—defining and classifying myopia: a proposed set of standards for clinical and epidemiologic studies. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2019
- Wolffsohn JS, Flitcroft DI, Jong M, Jones L, Mutti DO, Fulk GW, et al. IMI—myopia control reports overview and introduction. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2019
- Namba H, Kawasaki R, Sugano A, Nishi K, Murakami T, Nishitsuka K, et al. Cross-sectional and longitudinal investigation of the power vector in astigmatism: the Yamagata Study (Funagata). *Cornea*. 2018
- Revert AM, Conversa MA, Albarrán Diego C, Micó V. An alternative clinical routine for subjective refraction based on power vectors with trial frames. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt*. 2017
- Thibos LN, Wheeler W, Horner D. Power vectors: an application of Fourier analysis to the description and statistical analysis of refractive error. *Optom Vis Sci*. 2018
- Kaye SB, Harris WF. Analyzing refractive errors with power vectors. *Optom Vis Sci*. 2004

- Harris WF. Algebra of sphero-cylindrical refractive errors and their means. *S Afr Optom*. 2021
- Kaye SB, Harris WF. A new approach to the statistical analysis of refractive error. *Optom Vis Sci*. 2022
- Enaholo ES, Musa MJ, Zeppleri M. Objective refraction technique: retinoscopy. StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2023.
- Guha S, Shah S, Shah K, Hurakadli P, Majee D, Gandhi S. A comparison of cycloplegic autorefraction and retinoscopy in Indian children. *Clin Exp Optom*. 2017
- Hashemi H, Khabazkhoob M, Asharlous A, Yekta A, Emamian MH, Fotouhi A. Overestimation of hyperopia with autorefraction compared with retinoscopy under cycloplegia in school-age children. *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2018
- Asiedu K, Kyei S, Ampiah EE. Autorefraction, retinoscopy, Javal's rule, and Grosvenor's modified Javal's rule: the best predictor of refractive astigmatism. *J Ophthalmol*. 2016
- Guha S, Shah S, Shah K, Hurakadli P, Majee D, Gandhi S. A comparison of cycloplegic autorefraction and retinoscopy in Indian children. *Clin Exp Optom*. 2017
- Mukash SN, Kayembe DL, Mwanza JC. Agreement between retinoscopy, autorefractometry and subjective refraction for determining refractive errors in Congolese children. *Clin Optom (Auckl)*. 2021
- Yalcin E, Sultan P, Yilmaz S, Pallikaris IG. A comparison of refraction defects in childhood measured using Plusoptix S09, 2WIN photorefractometer, benchtop autorefractometer, and cycloplegic retinoscopy. *Semin Ophthalmol*. 2017
- Wilson LB, Melia M, Kraker RT, VanderVeen DK, Hutchinson AK, Pineles SL, et al. Accuracy of autorefraction in children: a report by the American Academy of Ophthalmology. *Ophthalmology*. 2020
- McCullough SJ, Doyle L, Saunders KJ. Intra- and inter-examiner repeatability of cycloplegic retinoscopy among young children. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt*. 2017
- Nguyen AT, Wayne JL, Ravikumar A, Manny RE, Anderson HA. Accommodative accuracy by retinoscopy versus autorefraction spherical equivalent or horizontal meridian power. *Clin Exp Optom*. 2018
- Doherty SE, Doyle LA, McCullough SJ, Saunders KJ. Comparison of retinoscopy results with and without 1% cyclopentolate in school-aged children. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt*. 2019
- Atchison DA, Smith G. Optics of the human eye. Edinburgh: Butterworth-Heinemann; 2000.
- Mukash J, et al. Agreement Between Retinoscopy, Autorefractometry and Subjective Refraction for Determining Refractive Errors in Congolese Children. *Clin Ophthalmol*. 2021.
- Hashemi H, et al. Overestimation of hyperopia with autorefraction compared with retinoscopy under cycloplegia in school-age children. *Br J Ophthalmol*. 2018
- Comparison of Spot Vision Screener and Tabletop Autorefractometer with Retinoscopy in the Pediatric Population. 2024