



The Post-illumination Pupil Response (PIPR) Is Associated With Cognitive Function in an Epidemiologic Cohort Study

Yanjun Chen^{1*}, Alex A. Pinto¹, Adam J. Paulsen¹, Carla R. Schubert¹, Laura M. Hancock², Barbara E. Klein¹, Ron Klein¹ and Karen J. Cruickshanks^{1,3}

¹ Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Madison, WI, United States, ² Department of Neurology, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Madison, WI, United States, ³ Department of Population Health Sciences, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Madison, WI, United States

We conducted a cross-sectional study on 403 participants in the 10-year follow-up

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

John Jing-Wei Chen, Mayo Clinic, United States

Reviewed by:

Victoria Susan Pelak, University of Colorado Denver, United States Chiara La Morgia, IRCCS Istituto Delle Scienze Neurologiche di Bologna (ISNB), Italy

*Correspondence:

Yanjun Chen ychen344@wisc.edu

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Neuro-Ophthalmology, a section of the journal Frontiers in Neurology

Received: 01 February 2019 Accepted: 11 June 2019 Published: 26 June 2019

Citation:

Chen Y, Pinto AA, Paulsen AJ, Schubert CR, Hancock LM, Klein BE, Klein R and Cruickshanks KJ (2019) The Post-illumination Pupil Response (PIPR) Is Associated With Cognitive Function in an Epidemiologic Cohort Study. Front. Neurol. 10:682. doi: 10.3389/fneur.2019.00682 examination of the Beaver Dam Offspring Study. The participants included 172 male and 231 female, with age ranging from 33 to 81 years (mean \pm SD, 60.7 \pm 9.3). The post-illumination pupil response (PIPR) was recorded using binocular infrared pupillometer (Neur-Optics, Inc., Irvine, CA). Cognitive testing consisted of Trail Making Test (TMT) Parts A and B, Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test (AVLT), Digit Symbol Substitution Test (DSST), and Verbal Fluency Test (VFT) (F, A, and S). Principal component analysis (PCA) was used to calculate an overall cognitive function score. There was a significant reduction in the mean baseline pupil diameter by 0.21 mm for every 5-year increase in age (95% CI: -0.25, -0.17). There was also a significant increase in the PCA cognitive score by 0.20 (linear regression, 95% CI: 0.08, 0.32) for every 0.1 unit increase in the PIPR. The association remained significant after adjusting for age, sex, education, medications, systemic and ocular disease, and short form-12 physical and mental component score. The results of this study demonstrated a modest association between the PIPR and cognitive function, warranting longitudinal studies to evaluate the role of the PIPR in predicting cognitive function in the middle-aged and older adults.

Keywords: pupillography, retinal ganglion cells, melanopsin, cognition, aging

INTRODUCTION

Whereas visual impairment has been associated with increased morbidity and mortality in a variety of age-related ocular diseases, studies have also shown that age-related ocular diseases are associated with declines in quality-of-life measures independent of vision (1, 2). However, how the visual system—from the eyes to the brain—works to influence behavior and quality of life remains unclear. The recent discovery of the intrinsically photosensitive retinal ganglion cells (ipRGCs), a group of novel, melanopsin-containing photoreceptors in the inner retina that connect the eye to the brain, provides us a unique opportunity to understand how the eye's modulation of external ambient light impacts brain activity (3, 4).

The eye serves two crucial physiological functions. In addition to its well-known functionality of producing vision (image-forming function), the eye also plays a critical role in conducting a

1

collection of vital, non-visual physiologic activities including circadian rhythm, pineal melatonin suppression, rest-activity, body temperature, and hormonal secretion (5). The non-imageforming function of the eye relies on the direct connection between the ipRGCs and the suprachiasmatic nucleus of the hypothalamus, the master biological clock that synchronizes the majority of biological and physiological activities in living organisms with the external 24-h light-dark cycle (6, 7). When experimental animals were deprived of ipRGCs, they demonstrated a disorganized biological behavior such as sleep and rest-activity (4).

Degeneration of the retinal ganglion cells (RGCs) and their axons, the retinal nerve fiber layer (RNFL), in the inner retina has been noted in histopathologic studies in the autopsy of Alzheimer's disease. In addition, *in vivo* study of retinal structure using Optical Coherence Tomography (OCT) demonstrated RGC/RNFL loss in not only patients with Alzheimer's disease but also individuals with mild cognitive impairment (MCI) (8–15), and RGC/RNFL thickness was negatively correlated with cognition measured by neuropsychological testing (16–18). Furthermore, intra- and extra-cellular amyloid deposition in the ipRGCs in addition to ipRGC loss were found in postmortem retina in patients with Alzheimer's disease (19).

The ipRGCs are connected to the pretectal olivary nuclei, the pupil regulatory center located in the rostral midbrain (20). The post-illumination pupil response (PIPR), elicited by tailored light stimuli in humans, has been identified as a robust biomarker for ipRGC activity (21, 22). The PIPR correlation with cognition has not been studied. Based on widespread evidence linking RGC loss and central nervous system (CNS) neurodegeneration, we postulate that there could be a potential association between the PIPR and cognitive measures.

Here, we present the first attempt to investigate the association between the PIPR and cognition, one of the most eloquent brain functions, among participants in an established, large epidemiologic cohort.

METHOD

Overview

The study was an ancillary substudy added during the 10year follow-up Beaver Dam Offspring Study (BOSS), a large longitudinal epidemiologic, multi-sensory study of aging (23, 24). The BOSS used standardized protocols to determine the 10year incidence of hearing, vision, and olfactory impairments and sensory declines, cognitive function, and the associations of potential risk factors with declines in sensory and cognitive function. The 10-year follow-up BOSS consisted of communitydwelling individuals with age ranging from 27 to 93 years (n = 2,466). The majority of the cohort are Caucasians (99.5%), reflecting the demographic characteristics of the parents who were residents of Beaver Dam, WI in 1987-88. In the present study, we invited a convenience sample of 403 BOSS participants to complete pupil recording. The study was approved by the University of Wisconsin Madison Health Sciences Institutional Review Board. Written informed consent was obtained from participants prior to the examination.

The study collected detailed ocular history, including refractive error (non-cycloplegic auto-refraction), self-reported refractive surgery, fundus photo-graded age-related macular degeneration (23) and diabetic retinopathy (25), doctordiagnosed glaucoma, digital image-graded cataract (26), and self-reported cataract surgery. Relevant history, in particular, blinding eye disease (age-related macular degeneration, glaucoma, and cataract/cataract surgery) and concurrent use of CNS-acting medications (benzodiazepine, antihistamine, and antidepressants), and beta-blockers that may affect pupil reactivity were also collected to use as covariates in the analysis.

Pupil Recording and Analysis

The binocular infrared pupillometer (DP2000 Human Laboratory Pupillometer, Neur-Optics, Inc., Irvine, CA) consisted of a multi-chromatic binocular/dual camera system that tracks both pupils and stimulates both eyes. The pupillometer recorded the horizontal diameter of the pupil at 30 Hz. The stimulus display presented central stimuli that subtended a visual angle of 50 by 35 degrees at a viewing distance of 39 mm. Participants were kept in a minimally lit exam room for 10 min while receiving instructions prior to pupil recording. The pupil recording commenced with 5 s of darkness. Stimulus protocol consisted of a pair of 1-s bright light stimuli with spectral bands of 640 \pm 10 nm (red light) and 467 \pm 17 nm (blue light) at a stimulus intensity of 2.0 log lux. Each stimulus presentation was followed by a period of darkness (30 and 60 s following the red and blue light stimulus, respectively) to allow the pupil to settle to baseline. The pupil recording of both eyes was collected when the two eyes were stimulated simultaneously. One trial of pupil recording consisted of two consecutive repeats of the red/blue stimulus pair. The total duration of a trial lasted for approximately 3 min. Two trials of pupil recording were collected for each individual with an interval of 10 min.

Pupil recordings were saved in software-specific raw data files. Using a customized computer software program, pupil metrics were harvested after removal of blinks and recording artifacts. The baseline pupil diameter (BPD) was defined as the mean diameter over the 5-s interval immediately before each stimulus onset. The PIPR was calculated as the difference of the percent pupil contraction amplitude relative to BPD between the blue and red light stimulation at 6 s after termination of the 1-s light stimulus (21, 27, 28) (**Figure 1**).

Evaluation of Cognition

Cognitive testing included Trail Making Test (TMT) Parts A and B, Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test (AVLT), Digit Symbol Substitution Test (DSST), and Verbal Fluency Test (VFT) (F, A, and S). A principal component analyses (PCA) score was created for each participant to summarize cognitive tests together to yield a more sensitive measure of aging changes. The cognitive testing were conducted either during the same visit as the pupil recording or in a separate visit, with the duration ranges from 0.0 to 2.2 years (mean 0.7 years). The BOSS also included co-morbidity data, including diabetes mellitus (doctor-diagnosed or HgA1C > 6.5), obesity [body mass index (BMI) \geq 30], hypertension (systolic pressure > 140 mmHg or



diastolic pressure > 90 mmHg, or doctor-diagnosed or current antihypertensive use), cerebrovascular disease (CVD), doctordiagnosed thyroid disease, headache/migraine (doctor-diagnosed migraine or experienced severe headaches or migraines over the past 3 months), tobacco and alcohol (any alcohol in the past year) use, and the short form (SF)-12 physical and mental component summary (PCS/MCS) score (29). These co-morbidity data were included as potential covariates for cognition, along with educational attainment.

Dementia was defined as participant report of memory loss affecting functionality and impairment in two or three cognitive domains (executive function: TMT, DSST; Memory: AVLT; Verbal: VFT), an MMSE score < 24, or report of doctor diagnosis of AD or dementia. MCI was defined as a participant report of memory difficulties and impairment in at least one of the four cognitive domains.

Since both pupil reactivity and cognitive tests can be affected by alertness and attention, participants were screened with a modified self-reported Morningness-Eveningness questionnaire (30) to control for the circadian phase in which pupil recording and cognitive tests were conducted (31).

Statistical Analysis

All analyses were conducted using SAS software, version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc.). Correlation across the pupil measurements was estimated via the Pearson correlation coefficient. Principal component analysis (PCA) with the Factor procedure (Method = Principal with Score option) was used to construct a composite measure (mean of zero and a standard deviation of 1) of the cognitive function (TMT A and B, VFT, AVLT, DSST) test data. The first component was retained, and a PCA score was



calculated for the participants as a linear combination of the standardized observed variables.

The diagnostic panel in the regression output from SAS allowed for assessment of any violations of linear regression using our data. Patterns in the plots of residuals vs. predicted values, *q-q* plots, and spread of the residuals were explored. After no violations regarding the assumptions of linear regression were found (**Figure 2**), the PCA score and individual cognitive function tests were modeled as continuous outcomes in assessing the association with the PIPR using linear regression. Both unadjusted and multivariable linear regression models including age, sex, and education, use of CNS-acting medications and betablockers, depression, headache/migraine, cardiovascular disease, ocular disease, SF-12 PCS/MCS, and Morningness-Eveningness status were evaluated.

RESULTS

A total of 403 BOSS participants (172 male and 231 female) participated in this sub-study with an age range of 33–81 years (mean \pm SD, 60.7 \pm 9.3). **Table 1** describes the demographic features of the participants. The pupil recordings from 377 participants (163 male and 214 female) were included in the analysis, resulting in a data retention rate of 93.5%. A total of 26 subjects were excluded due to excessive artifacts and incomplete pupil recording (due to discomfort from the bright light exposure, three individuals). The demographic features of the 377 included participants were similar to the overall sample (see **Supplementary Table 1**). The cognitive assessment identified MCI in 14 (3.7%) and dementia in 2 (0.5%) participants, with the rest of the 361 participants being normal (95.8%). The mean and median of the cognitive function tests (PCA score and categorized) were demonstrated in **Supplementary Table 2**.

The PIPR was found to be highly correlated between the two eyes, the repeated runs within a trial, and the two trials by linear regression and Bland-Altman plot (see **Supplementary Table 3**).

TABLE 1 | Participant characteristics.

Age 60.7 9.3 BMI (kg/m²) 31.0 7.4 SF-12 PCS 47.9 9.3 SF-12 MCS 53.2 7.3 Characteristic N Percer Characteristic N Percer Sex	aracteristic ($n = 403$)	Mean	SD
BMI (kg/m²) 31.0 7.4 SF-12 PCS 47.9 9.4 SF-12 MCS 53.2 7.4 Characteristic N Percer Sex Female 231 57. Male 172 42. Education (years) 0 -12 127 31. 0-12 127 31. 16-4 112 27. Systemic comorbidity CVD 42 10. 16+ 112 27. Systemic comorbidity CVD 42 10. Diabetes 46 11. Hypertension 205 51. Headache 42 10. Migraine 60 14. Thyroid disease 80 19. Smoking status Never 204 51. Past 134 34. Alcohol use in the past year 345 86. 37. 17. Benzodiazepine 26 63. 17. 0cular comorbidity 7. Refractive error (right eye) Myopia 123	e	60.7	9.3
SF-12 PCS 47.9 9.4 SF-12 MCS 53.2 7.4 Characteristic N Percer Characteristic N Percer Sex 12 42. Female 231 57. Male 172 42. Education (years) 0 12 27. 0-12 127 31. 13-15 162 40. 16+ 112 27. 35. 164 111. 27. Systemic comorbidity CVD 42 10. 10. 27. Systemic comorbidity CVD 42 10. 10. 27. Systemic comorbidity CVD 42 10. 10. 11. 11. 11. 11. 11. 11. 12. 11. 11. 12. 11. 12. 11. 12. 11. 12. 11. 12. 11. 11. 12. 11. 12. 11. 12. 11. 11. 12. 11. 11. 12. 11. 12. 11.	11 (kg/m ²)	31.0	7.0
SF-12 MCS 53.2 7.3 Characteristic N Percer Sex Female 231 57. Male 172 42. Education (years) 0 127 31. 0-12 127 31. 13-15 162 40. 16+ 112 27. Systemic comorbidity 205 51. CVD 42 10. Diabetes 46 11. Hypertension 205 51. Headache 42 10. Migraine 60 14. Thyroid disease 80 19. Smoking status	-12 PCS	47.9	9.5
Characteristic N Percer Sex Female 231 57. Male 172 42. Education (years) 0–12 127 31. 0–12 127 31. 13-15 162 40. 16+ 112 27. Systemic comorbidity 205 51. CVD 42 10. Diabetes 46 11. Hypertension 205 51. Headache 42 10. Migraine 60 14. Thyroid disease 80 19. Smoking status Never 204 51. Past 134 34. Current 56 14. Alcohol use in the past year 345 86. Systemic medication 26 63. 17. Benzodiazepine 26 63. Beta-blockers 69 18. Antidepressants 66 17. Ocular comorbidity 23 30. 166 41. <td< td=""><td>-12 MCS</td><td>53.2</td><td>7.5</td></td<>	-12 MCS	53.2	7.5
Sex Female 231 57. Male 172 42. Education (years) 0–12 127 31. 0–12 127 31. 13-15 162 40. 16+ 112 27. Systemic comorbidity 27. Systemic matches 80 11. Headache 42 100. Migraine 60 14. Thyroid disease 80 19. Smoking status 19. Smoking status 19. Smoking status 19. Systemic medication 41. Alcohol use in the past year 345 86. Systemic medication 17. Benzodiazepine 26. 63. 17.	aracteristic	N	Percent (%)
Female 231 57. Male 172 42. Education (years) 127 31. 0-12 127 31. 13-15 162 40. 16+ 112 27. Systemic comorbidity 2 10. CVD 42 10. Diabetes 46 11. Hypertension 205 51. Headache 42 10. Migraine 60 14. Thyroid disease 80 19. Smoking status	x		
Male 172 42. Education (years) 127 31. 0-12 127 31. 13-15 162 40. 16+ 112 27. Systemic comorbidity 27. Systemic comorbidity 27. CVD 42 10. Diabetes 46 11. Hypertension 205 51. Headache 42 10. Migraine 60 14. Thyroid disease 80 19. Smoking status Never 204 51. Past 134 34. Current 56 14. Alcohol use in the past year 345 86. Systemic medication 26 63. 17. Benzodiazepine 26 63. Beta-blockers 69 18. Antidepressants 66 17. Ocular comorbidity Xerrative error (right eye) 123 30. 27. Myopia 123 30. 31. 37.	Female	231	57.3
Education (years) 127 31. 0-12 127 31. 13-15 162 40. 16+ 112 27. Systemic comorbidity 27. Systemic comorbidity 27. CVD 42 10. Diabetes 46 11. Hypertension 205 51. Headache 42 10. Migraine 60 14. Thyroid disease 80 19. Smoking status 80 19. Smoking status 12. 13.4 34. Never 204 51. Past 134 34. 34. 34. Current 56 14. Alcohol use in the past year 345 86. 35. Systemic medication 7. 66 17. 66. 17. Ocular comorbidity 86 12.3 30. 18. Antidepressants 66 17. 66. 17. Ocular comorbidity 7. 7. 7. 7. Refractive error (right eye) 166 41. <td< td=""><td>Male</td><td>172</td><td>42.7</td></td<>	Male	172	42.7
0-12 127 31. 13-15 162 40. 16+ 112 27. Systemic comorbidity 27. Systemic comorbidity 27. CVD 42 10. Diabetes 46 11. Hypertension 205 51. Headache 42 10. Migraine 60 14. Thyroid disease 80 19. Smoking status Never 204 51. Past 134 34. Current 56 14. Alcohol use in the past year 345 86. Systemic medication 26 6.9 18. Antihistamine 67 17. Benzodiazepine 26 6.9 18. Antidepressants 66 17. Ocular comorbidity Refractive error (right eye) Myopia 123 30. Emmetropia 166 41. 14. 27. Glaucoma 11 27.	ucation (years)		
13–15 162 40. 16+ 112 27. Systemic comorbidity 42 10. Diabetes 46 11. Hypertension 205 51. Headache 42 10. Migraine 60 14. Thyroid disease 80 19. Smoking status)–12	127	31.7
16+ 112 27. Systemic comorbidity 42 10. CVD 42 10. Diabetes 46 11. Hypertension 205 51. Headache 42 10. Migraine 60 14. Thyroid disease 80 19. Smoking status 80 19. Never 204 51. Past 134 34. Current 56 14. Alcohol use in the past year 345 86. Systemic medication 67 17. Benzodiazepine 26 6.3 Beta-blockers 69 18. Antidepressants 66 17. Ocular comorbidity 7. 7. Refractive error (right eye) 123 30. Myopia 123 30. Emmetropia 166 41. Hyperopia 110 27. Glaucoma 11 2.5	13–15	162	40.4
Systemic comorbidity 42 10. CVD 42 10. Diabetes 46 11. Hypertension 205 51. Headache 42 10. Migraine 60 14. Thyroid disease 80 19. Smoking status 80 19. Smoking status 134 34. Current 56 14. Alcohol use in the past year 345 86. Systemic medication 77. 8enzodiazepine 26 6.3. Antihistamine 67 17. 8enzodiazepine 26 6.3. Beta-blockers 69 18. Antidepressants 66 17. Ocular comorbidity 78. 79. 70. 70. Refractive error (right eye) 123 30. 70. Myopia 123 30. 71. Hyperopia 110 27. 71. Glaucoma 11 2.	16+	112	27.9
CVD 42 10. Diabetes 46 11. Hypertension 205 51. Headache 42 10. Migraine 60 14. Thyroid disease 80 19. Smoking status 80 19. Smoking status 56 14. Never 204 51. Past 134 34. Current 56 14. Alcohol use in the past year 345 86. Systemic medication 77. Benzodiazepine 26 63. Antihistamine 67 17. Benzodiazepine 26 63. Beta-blockers 69 18. Antidepressants 66 17. Coular comorbidity 78. 79. 70. 70. Refractive error (right eye) 123 30. 70. Myopia 123 30. 71. Hyperopia 110 27. 71.	stemic comorbidity		
Diabetes 46 11. Hypertension 205 51. Headache 42 10. Migraine 60 14. Thyroid disease 80 19. Smoking status 80 19. Smoking status 204 51. Past 134 34. Current 56 14. Alcohol use in the past year 345 86. Systemic medication 7 17. Antihistamine 67 17. Benzodiazepine 26 6.3 Beta-blockers 69 18. Antidepressants 66 17. Ocular comorbidity 7 7 Refractive error (right eye) 123 30. Emmetropia 166 41. Hyperopia 110 27. Glaucoma 11 2.	CVD	42	10.6
Hypertension 205 51. Headache 42 10. Migraine 60 14. Thyroid disease 80 19. Smoking status 80 19. Smoking status 134 34. Qurrent 56 14. Alcohol use in the past year 345 86. Systemic medication 7 17. Antihistamine 67 17. Benzodiazepine 26 6.3 Beta-blockers 69 18. Antidepressants 66 17. Ocular comorbidity 7 7 Refractive error (right eye) 123 30. Emmetropia 166 41. Hyperopia 110 27. Glaucoma 11 2.	Diabetes	46	11.4
Headache 42 10. Migraine 60 14. Thyroid disease 80 19. Smoking status 80 19. Smoking status 204 51. Past 134 34. Current 56 14. Alcohol use in the past year 345 86. Systemic medication 77. 8enzodiazepine 26 6.5. Beta-blockers 69 18. Antidepressants 66 17. Ocular comorbidity 8efractive error (right eye) 74. 30. 123 30. Emmetropia 166 41. 41. 41. 27. Glaucoma 11 27.	Hypertension	205	51.0
Migraine6014.Thyroid disease8019.Smoking status8019.Smoking status20451.Past13434.Current5614.Alcohol use in the past year34586.Systemic medication6717.Benzodiazepine666.9Beta-blockers6918.Antidepressants6617.Ocular comorbidity7.Refractive error (right eye)16641.Hyperopia11027.Glaucoma112.	Headache	42	10.4
Thyroid disease8019.Smoking status20451.Never20451.Past13434.Current5614.Alcohol use in the past year34586.Systemic medication6717.Benzodiazepine6769Beta-blockers6918.Antidepressants6617.Ocular comorbidity12330.Emmetropia16641.Hyperopia11027.Glaucoma112.	Migraine	60	14.9
Smoking statusNever20451Past13434Current5614Alcohol use in the past year34586Systemic medication6717Antihistamine6717Benzodiazepine266.3Beta-blockers6918Antidepressants6617Ocular comorbidity7Refractive error (right eye)12330Myopia12330Emmetropia16641Hyperopia11027Glaucoma112.5	- Fhyroid disease	80	19.9
Never20451.Past13434.Current5614.Alcohol use in the past year34586.Systemic medication34586.Systemic medication6717.Benzodiazepine266.3Beta-blockers6918.Antidepressants6617.Ocular comorbidity7.Refractive error (right eye)16641.Hyperopia16641.Hyperopia112.5	noking status		
Past13434.Current5614.Alcohol use in the past year34586.Systemic medication6717.Benzodiazepine2663.Beta-blockers6918.Antidepressants6617.Ocular comorbidity76.30.Refractive error (right eye)12330.Emmetropia16641.Hyperopia11027.Glaucoma112.	Never	204	51.8
Current5614.Alcohol use in the past year34586.Systemic medication34586.Antihistamine6717.Benzodiazepine266.9Beta-blockers6918.Antidepressants6617.Ocular comorbidity70.Refractive error (right eye)12330.Emmetropia16641.Hyperopia11027.Glaucoma112.	Past	134	34.0
Alcohol use in the past year34586.Systemic medication6717.Antihistamine6717.Benzodiazepine266.9Beta-blockers6918.Antidepressants6617.Ocular comorbidity7.Refractive error (right eye)12330.Emmetropia16641.Hyperopia11027.Glaucoma112.	Current	56	14.2
Systemic medicationAntihistamine6717.Benzodiazepine266.Beta-blockers6918.Antidepressants6617.Ocular comorbidity6617.Refractive error (right eye)12330.Emmetropia16641.Hyperopia11027.Glaucoma112.	ohol use in the past year	345	86.3
Antihistamine6717.Benzodiazepine266.Beta-blockers6918.Antidepressants6617.Ocular comorbidity7.Refractive error (right eye)30.Myopia12330.Emmetropia16641.Hyperopia11027.Glaucoma112.	stemic medication		
Benzodiazepine266.9Beta-blockers6918Antidepressants6617Ocular comorbidity7Refractive error (right eye)300Myopia123300Emmetropia16641Hyperopia11027Glaucoma112.5	Antihistamine	67	17.8
Beta-blockers6918.Antidepressants6617.Ocular comorbidity8630.Refractive error (right eye)12330.Myopia12341.Hyperopia16641.Hyperopia11027.Glaucoma112.5	Benzodiazepine	26	6.9
Antidepressants6617.Ocular comorbidityRefractive error (right eye)30.Myopia12330.Emmetropia16641.Hyperopia11027.Glaucoma112.	Beta-blockers	69	18.3
Ocular comorbidityRefractive error (right eye)Myopia123Semmetropia166Hyperopia110Glaucoma11	Antidepressants	66	17.5
Refractive error (right eye)Myopia12330.Emmetropia16641.Hyperopia11027.Glaucoma112.	ular comorbidity		
Myopia 123 30. Emmetropia 166 41. Hyperopia 110 27. Glaucoma 11 2.1	Refractive error (right eye)		
Emmetropia 166 41. Hyperopia 110 27. Glaucoma 11 2.	Муоріа	123	30.8
Hyperopia 110 27. Glaucoma 11 2.	Emmetropia	166	41.6
Glaucoma 11 2.	Hyperopia	110	27.6
	Glaucoma	11	2.7
Cataract 39 12.	Cataract	39	12.4
Cataract surgery 32 7.5	Cataract surgery	32	7.9
ARMD 16 4.	ARMD	16	4.4
Diabetic retinopathy 15 4.1	Diabetic retinopathy	15	4.1
Morningness-eveningness type	rningness-eveningness type		
Morningness 253 63.	Norningness	253	63.0
Eveningness or neither 149 37.	Eveningness or neither	149	37.0

PCS, physical component summary; MCS, mental component summary; SD, standard deviation; BMI, body mass index; CVD, cardiovascular disease; ARMD, age-related macular degeneration.

The mean PIPRs across all available PIPRs for individual participants were used for subsequent analysis of the PIPR vs. cognitive relationship. A minimum of four PIPRs was required for each participant to be included in the analysis.

The BPD ranged from 2.5 to 7.7 mm (mean \pm SD: 5.3 \pm 0.9) (right eye, trial 1). The BPD appeared to be stable within a trial of

TABLE 2 | The full model with the adjustment for variables to assess the association between the PIPR and PCA summary score of the five cognitive measures (n = 377).

Variable	B coefficient (95% CI)	P-value
Age at pupillometry exam (in 5 year increments)	-0.15 (-0.21, -0.09)	<0.0001
Sex (male gender)	-0.72 (-0.93, -0.51)	<0.0001
BMI (kg/m ²)	-0.004 (-0.019, 0.011)	0.63
College education (16+ years)	0.49 (0.26, 0.72)	<0.0001
SF-12 PCS	0.0005 (-0.01, 0.01)	0.94
SF-12 MCS	0.007 (-0.01, 0.02)	0.41
Morning vs. evening/neither type	-0.005 (-0.22, 0.21)	0.96
Medication use		
Antihistamine	0.11 (-0.14, 0.37)	0.39
Benzodiazepine	0.27 (-0.15, 0.69)	0.21
Antidepressants	-0.06 (-0.32, 0.20)	0.66
Beta-blockers	-0.05 (-0.35, 0.24)	0.71
Cardiovascular disease	0.30 (-0.07, 0.67)	0.11
Depression	0.30 (-0.15, 0.75)	0.19
Headache/migraine	0.14 (-0.11, 0.40)	0.28
Glaucoma	-0.11 (-0.69, 0.48)	0.72
Any cataract, worse eye	-0.14 (-0.47, 0.18)	0.39
Ever had cataract operation	0.004 (-0.52, 0.52)	0.99
ARMD (worse eye)	-0.41 (-0.89, 0.06)	0.09
Average PIPR (in 0.10 unit increments)	0.13 (0.008, 0.25)	0.04

The bold values show statistically significant correlation.

recording (estimated bivariate correlations, Pearson Correlation Coefficients > 0.92). There was a significant reduction of the BPD by 0.21 mm for every 5-year increase in age (95% CI: -0.25, -0.17; p < 0.001). There also appeared to be an agerelated decrease in the mean PIPR by 0.01 for every 5-year increase in age (95% CI: -0.02, -0.01). However, the PIPR vs. age correlation was no longer significant after adjusting for the BPD.

The mean PCA cognitive score increased by 0.20 (95% CI: 0.08, 0.32) for every 0.1 unit increase in the mean PIPR (linear regression, p < 0.01); the association remained significant (adjusted estimates 0.13; 95% CI: 0.01, 0.25, p = 0.04) after adjusting for age, sex, BMI, education, medication (antihistamine, benzodiazepine, antidepressants, and beta-blockers), depression, headache/migraine, cardiovascular disease, ocular disease (glaucoma, cataract/cataract surgery, and age-related macular degeneration), SF12 PCS/MCS, and Morningness-Eveningness status (Table 2). When breaking down into individual cognitive measures, TMT A and B but not the other cognitive tests remained significantly associated with the mean PIPR.

DISCUSSION

In this cross-sectional study, we found a modest correlation between the PIPR and PCA summary score of four cognitive function tests among the participants in a subgroup of the BOSS cohort. The results suggest that longitudinal studies to investigate the PIPR as a potential predictor for cognition, one of the most important measures of brain aging, are warranted.

Our study was not designed to evaluate the causal relationship between the PIPR and cognition. The current evidence suggests a different trajectory of the PIPR and cognitive change during aging, with preservation of the PIPR up to age 70, whereas cognitive decline can take place decades earlier (32, 33). The ipRGCs connect to widespread brain areas besides the suprachiasmatic nuclei of the thalamus and pretectal olivary nuclei of the midbrain, including the lateral geniculate nucleus, ventral subparaventricular zone, the ventrolateral preoptic nucleus, and intergeniculate leaflet (34). However, these areas are not generally considered to be directly involved in cognitive function. A possible explanation of the observed association between the PIPR and cognition could be due to a unified CNS neurodegenerative process equally affecting the ipRGCs and brain networks involved in cognition, given that there has been ample evidence showing an overall retinal ganglion cell loss in Alzheimer's disease (18, 19, 35).

The individual cognitive tests used in this study measure different aspects of cognition, with the TMT A and B for visuomotor speed and set-shifting, AVLT for rote verbal learning and memory, DSST for processing speed, and VFT for language and executive functioning. When breaking down into individual cognitive tests, TMT A and B, but not the other cognitive measures show a significant correlation with the PIPR. Such a finding is not surprising as the TMT is a test of attention requiring quick visual scanning and object recognition, and both pupil reactivity and overall cognitive performance can be influenced by participants' attention (36, 37). Interestingly, the DSST also requires quick visual scanning and object recognition, but we did not find a direct relationship between it and PIPR. This suggests that a skill specific to TMT A and B may be driving this connection. In this study, we included the Morningness-Eveningness questionnaire to assess the impact of circadian phase on the outcome measures. The circadian phase during which cognitive testing is performed can impact cognition; a morning person will perform better in the morning when they are readily awake thus able to better concentrate and attend to the tests. In addition, the PIPR in humans has demonstrated a circadian variation over a 24-h cycle (31). In our study, the majority of the participants are morning type and adjusting for Morningness-Eveningness status did not change the outcomes. Further study including attention parameters may provide useful information in assessing whether the correlation between the PIPR and cognition demonstrated in our study indeed relates to attention.

Identifying biomarkers of brain neuronal activity has been an ongoing effort in the pursuit of a better understanding of brain aging. A few biomarkers have been found to link amyloid-beta, the hallmark of Alzheimer's disease, to early cognitive changes detected in cognitive tests. However, these biomarkers, including cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) and positron emission tomography (PET) amyloid imaging markers, functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), CSF tau, and MRI brain volume quantification (38–40), are either proxies of the brain neuronal activity as they do not directly test neuronal function or costly, thus limiting their widespread use. The PIPR offers a unique benchmark by quickly and directly measuring the physiologic function of the ipRGCs, the brain neurons involved in non-image-forming function. Results of this study suggest that the PIPR is related to cognition, although future studies are needed to better understand the nature of this relationship. The PIPR is less invasive and costly than the currently available proxy measurements and has the promise to serve as a screening tool for cognitive impairment. However, we should still be aware that the PIPR does not reflect the function of the brain neurons directly involved in cognition.

We acknowledge several limitations in the present study. First, our study used a convenience sample of the BOSS which could be subject to selection bias. Comparison of multiple variables between our sample and the overall BOSS cohort demonstrated demographic features (Supplementary Table 1), similar suggesting that our cohort is a fair representation of the community-dwelling middle-aged and older adult population of the upper Midwest. However, the predominance of non-Hispanic whites in this cohort may limit the generalizability of the study results to other racial groups. Second, the study results should be interpreted with caution given the crosssectional study design, where cognitive impairment can be confounded by cohort differences in education even after adjusting for age, sex, and education. Third, it is worthwhile to point out the heterogeneity within our cohort, especially where ocular comorbidity is concerned. The small proportion of the diseased eyes may have contributed to the variability of the PIPR and confounded the interpretation of PIPR vs. cogntion correlation. To address this concern, we did a sensitivity analysis excluding those who had ocular diseases (fundus photo-graded age-related macular degeneration and diabetic retinopathy, doctor-diagnosed glaucoma, digital image-graded cataract, and self-reported blinding eye disease). The analysis showed similar results. Incorporating additional structural and functional evaluation of RGCs in future studies would provide valuable information in clarifying the interrelation between the PIPR, age-related ocular disease, and cognition. Lastly, the present study did not allow us to evaluate the impact of the circadian phase on PIPR/cognition correlation. The experimental study of Munch et al. demonstrated a circadian oscillation of the PIPR in humans (31). The present study did not evaluate participants' circadian rhythm; in fact, evaluating circadian rhythm would be challenging in field study. We did perform an analysis where we incorporated the time of the pupil recordings in the model; the analysis showed no significant impact of the recording time on the results. Furthermore, the majority of our study cohort were morning type and all the pupil recordings were collected during the daytime (half from 8 to 11). Therefore, it would be unlikely that the time of the pupil recording would impose a significant impact on PIPR/cognition correlation in this study.

CONCLUSIONS

In this cross-sectional study, we demonstrated the feasibility of collecting the PIPR in an epidemiologic cohort and found a

modest association between the PIPR and PCA summary score of four cognitive function tests. A longitudinal study is warranted to evaluate the role of the PIPR in predicting cognitive change among community-dwelling middle aged and older adults across all racial groups.

ETHICS STATEMENT

All subjects gave written informed consent in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. The protocol was approved by the University of Wisconsin Madison Health Sciences Institutional Review Board.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

YC and KC contributed to conception and design of the study. AAP organized the database and performed the statistical analysis. YC wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors

REFERENCES

- Broman AT, Munoz B, Rodriguez J, Sanchez R, Quigley HA, Klein R, et al. The impact of visual impairment and eye disease on vision-related quality of life in a Mexican-American population: proyecto VER. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2002) 43:3393–8.
- Knudtson MD, Klein BE, Klein R, Cruickshanks KJ, Lee KE. Age-related eye disease, quality of life, and functional activity. *Arch Ophthalmol.* (2005) 123:807–14. doi: 10.1001/archopht.123.6.807
- Lucas RJ, Freedman MS, Munoz M, Garcia-Fernandez JM, Foster RG. Regulation of the mammalian pineal by non-rod, non-cone, ocular photoreceptors. *Science*. (1999) 284:505–7. doi: 10.1126/science.284.5413.505
- Panda S, Provencio I, Tu DC, Pires SS, Rollag MD, Castrucci AM, et al. Melanopsin is required for non-image-forming photic responses in blind mice. *Science*. (2003) 301:525–7. doi: 10.1126/science.1086179
- Berson DM, Dunn FA, Takao M. Phototransduction by retinal ganglion cells that set the circadian clock. *Science*. (2002) 295:1070–3. doi: 10.1126/science.1067262
- Hannibal J, Hindersson P, Ostergaard J, Georg B, Heegaard S, Larsen PJ, et al. Melanopsin is expressed in PACAP-containing retinal ganglion cells of the human retinohypothalamic tract. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2004) 45:4202–9. doi: 10.1167/iovs.04-0313
- Berson DM, Castrucci AM, Provencio I. Morphology and mosaics of melanopsin-expressing retinal ganglion cell types in mice. J Comp Neurol. (2010) 518:2405–22. doi: 10.1002/cne.22381
- Parisi V, Restuccia R, Fattapposta F, Mina C, Bucci MG, Pierelli F. Morphological and functional retinal impairment in Alzheimer's disease patients. *Clin Neurophysiol.* (2001) 112:1860–7. doi: 10.1016/S1388-2457(01)00620-4
- Berisha F, Feke GT, Trempe CL, McMeel JW, Schepens CL. Retinal abnormalities in early Alzheimer's disease. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2007) 48:2285–9. doi: 10.1167/iovs.06-1029
- Paquet C, Boissonnot M, Roger F, Dighiero P, Gil R, Hugon J. Abnormal retinal thickness in patients with mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease. *Neurosci Lett.* (2007) 420:97–9. doi: 10.1016/j.neulet.2007.02.090
- Kesler A, Vakhapova V, Korczyn AD, Naftaliev E, Neudorfer M. Retinal thickness in patients with mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease. *Clin Neurol Neurosurg.* (2011) 113:523–6. doi: 10.1016/j.clineuro.2011.02.014
- Kirbas S, Turkyilmaz K, Anlar O, Tufekci A, Durmus M. Retinal nerve fiber layer thickness in patients with Alzheimer disease. *J Neuroophthalmol.* (2013) 33:58–61. doi: 10.1097/WNO.0b013e318267fd5f
- 13. Marziani E, Pomati S, Ramolfo P, Cigada M, Giani A, Mariani C, et al. Evaluation of retinal nerve fiber layer and ganglion cell layer thickness in

contributed to manuscript revision, read and approved the submitted version.

FUNDING

This work was supported by Award Number R01AG021917 (KC) from the National Institute on Aging, U10EY06594 (RK) from the National Eye Institute and an unrestricted grant from Research to Prevent Blindness (YC, AAP, AJP, CS, RK, BK, and KC). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fneur. 2019.00682/full#supplementary-material

Alzheimer's disease using spectral-domain optical coherence tomography. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. (2013) 54:5953–8. doi: 10.1167/iovs.13-12046

- Ascaso FJ, Cruz N, Modrego PJ, Lopez-Anton R, Santabarbara J, Pascual LF, et al. Retinal alterations in mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease: an optical coherence tomography study. *J Neurol.* (2014) 261:1522–30. doi: 10.1007/s00415-014-7374-z
- Garcia-Martin E, Bambo MP, Marques ML, Satue M, Otin S, Larrosa JM, et al. Ganglion cell layer measurements correlate with disease severity in patients with Alzheimer's disease. *Acta Ophthalmol.* (2016) 94:e454–459. doi: 10.1111/aos.12977
- Iseri PK, Altinas O, Tokay T, Yuksel N. Relationship between cognitive impairment and retinal morphological and visual functional abnormalities in Alzheimer disease. J Neuroophthalmol. (2006) 26:18–24. doi: 10.1097/01.wno.0000204645.56873.26
- Moreno-Ramos T, Benito-Leon J, Villarejo A, Bermejo-Pareja F. Retinal nerve fiber layer thinning in dementia associated with Parkinson's disease, dementia with Lewy bodies, and Alzheimer's disease. *J Alzheimers Dis.* (2013) 34:659–64. doi: 10.3233/JAD-121975
- Oktem EO, Derle E, Kibaroglu S, Oktem C, Akkoyun I, Can U. The relationship between the degree of cognitive impairment and retinal nerve fiber layer thickness. *Neurol Sci.* (2015) 36:1141–6. doi: 10.1007/s10072-014-2055-3
- La Morgia C, Ross-Cisneros FN, Koronyo Y, Hannibal J, Gallassi R, Cantalupo G, et al. Melanopsin retinal ganglion cell loss in Alzheimer disease. *Ann Neurol.* (2016) 79:90–109. doi: 10.1002/ana.24548
- Lucas RJ, Hattar S, Takao M, Berson DM, Foster RG, Yau KW. Diminished pupillary light reflex at high irradiances in melanopsin-knockout mice. *Science*. (2003) 299:245–7. doi: 10.1126/science.1077293
- Park JC, Moura AL, Raza AS, Rhee DW, Kardon RH, Hood DC. Toward a clinical protocol for assessing rod, cone, and melanopsin contributions to the human pupil response. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2011) 52:6624–35. doi: 10.1167/iovs.11-7586
- Adhikari P, Zele AJ, Feigl B. The post-illumination pupil response (PIPR). Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. (2015) 56:3838–49. doi: 10.1167/iovs.14-16233
- Cruickshanks KJ, Tweed TS, Wiley TL, Klein BE, Klein R, Chappell R, et al. The 5-year incidence and progression of hearing loss: the epidemiology of hearing loss study. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* (2003) 129:1041–6. doi: 10.1001/archotol.129.10.1041
- Schubert CR, Cruickshanks KJ, Fischer ME, Huang GH, Klein BE, Klein R, et al. Olfactory impairment in an adult population: the Beaver Dam Offspring Study. *Chem Senses*. (2012) 37:325–34. doi: 10.1093/chemse/bjr102
- 25. Klein BE, Klein R, McBride PE, Cruickshanks KJ, Palta M, Knudtson MD, et al. Cardiovascular disease, mortality, and retinal microvascular characteristics in

type 1 diabetes: Wisconsin epidemiologic study of diabetic retinopathy. *Arch Intern Med.* (2004) 164:1917–24. doi: 10.1001/archinte.164.17.1917

- Klein BE, Klein R, Linton KL, Magli YL, Neider MW. Assessment of cataracts from photographs in the Beaver Dam Eye Study. *Ophthalmology*. (1990) 97:1428–33. doi: 10.1016/S0161-6420(90)32391-6
- Kankipati L, Girkin CA, Gamlin PD. Post-illumination pupil response in subjects without ocular disease. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2010) 51:2764–9. doi: 10.1167/iovs.09-4717
- Feigl B, Zele AJ, Fader SM, Howes AN, Hughes CE, Jones KA, et al. The post-illumination pupil response of melanopsin-expressing intrinsically photosensitive retinal ganglion cells in diabetes. *Acta Ophthalmol.* (2012) 90:e230–234. doi: 10.1111/j.1755-3768.2011.0 2226.x
- 29. Ware JE, New England Medical Center Health Institute. *SF-36 Physical and Mental Health Summary Scales: A User's Manual.* Boston, MA: Boston Health Assessment Lab, New England Medical Center (1994).
- Posey TB, Ford JA. The morningness-eveningness preference of college students as measured by the Horne and Ostberg questionnaire. *Int J Chronobiol.* (1981) 7:4.
- Munch M, Leon L, Crippa SV, Kawasaki A. Circadian and wake-dependent effects on the pupil light reflex in response to narrow-bandwidth light pulses. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2012) 53:4546–55. doi: 10.1167/iovs. 12-9494
- 32. Sperling RA, Aisen PS, Beckett LA, Bennett DA, Craft S, Fagan AM, et al. Toward defining the preclinical stages of Alzheimer's disease: recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimers Dement. (2011) 7:280–92. doi: 10.1016/j.jalz.2011.03.003
- Singh-Manoux A, Kivimaki M, Glymour MM, Elbaz A, Berr C, Ebmeier KP, et al. Timing of onset of cognitive decline: results from Whitehall II prospective cohort study. *BMJ*. (2012) 344:d7622. doi: 10.1136/bmj. d7622
- Gooley JJ, Lu J, Fischer D, Saper CB. A broad role for melanopsin in nonvisual photoreception. J Neurosci. (2003) 23:7093–106. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.23-18-07093.2003

- Coppola G, Di Renzo A, Ziccardi L, Martelli F, Fadda A, Manni G, et al. Optical coherence tomography in Alzheimer's disease: a meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE*. (2015) 10:e0134750. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0134750
- Kang OE, Huffer KE, Wheatley TP. Pupil dilation dynamics track attention to high-level information. *PLoS ONE*. (2014) 9:e102463. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0102463
- 37. Turnbull A, Wang HT, Schooler JW, Jefferies E, Margulies DS, Smallwood J. The ebb and flow of attention: between-subject variation in intrinsic connectivity and cognition associated with the dynamics of ongoing experience. *Neuroimage*. (2018) 185:286–99. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.09.069
- Jack CRJr, Lowe VJ, Senjem ML, Weigand SD, Kemp BJ, Shiung MM, et al. 11C PiB and structural MRI provide complementary information in imaging of Alzheimer's disease and amnestic mild cognitive impairment. *Brain.* (2008) 131(Pt 3):665–80. doi: 10.1093/brain/awm336
- Montine TJ, Peskind ER, Quinn JF, Wilson AM, Montine KS, Galasko D. Increased cerebrospinal fluid F2-isoprostanes are associated with aging and latent Alzheimer's disease as identified by biomarkers. *Neuromolecular Med.* (2011) 13:37–43. doi: 10.1007/s12017-010-8126-6
- 40. Luo X, Li K, Zeng Q, Huang P, Jiaerken Y, Qiu T, et al. Decreased bilateral FDG-PET uptake and inter-hemispheric connectivity in multidomain amnestic mild cognitive impairment patients: a preliminary study. *Front Aging Neurosci.* (2018) 10:161. doi: 10.3389/fnagi.2018.00161

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2019 Chen, Pinto, Paulsen, Schubert, Hancock, Klein, Klein and Cruickshanks. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.