

1 **Do lutein, zeaxanthin and macular pigment optical density differ with age or age-**
2 **related maculopathy?**

3
4
5 Emma J. Berrow^{a,b}, Hannah E. Bartlett^a, Frank Eperjesi^a

6
7 ^aOphthalmic Research Group, School of Life and Health Sciences, Aston University,
8 Birmingham, United Kingdom, ^bHeart of England NHS Trust, Birmingham, United Kingdom

9
10
11 Correspondence to Emma J. Berrow, Ophthalmic Research Group, School of Life and Health
12 Sciences, Aston University, Aston Triangle, Birmingham, B4 7ET, United Kingdom
13 Tel: +44 121 204 4208
14 email: berrowej@aston.ac.uk

15
16
17
18 Contact details:

19 Hannah E. Bartlett – h.e.bartlett@aston.ac.uk

20 Frank Eperjesi – f.eperjesi@aston.ac.uk

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46

47 Abstract

48 Background and aims

49 Current age-related macular disease (ARMD) treatment includes antioxidant
50 supplementation. Lutein (L) and zeaxanthin (Z) are antioxidants that make up macular
51 pigment within the retina and may reduce the risk of developing ARMD. Ageing and smoking
52 are leading risk factors for developing ARMD. We investigated differences in dietary,
53 supplemental and retinal L and Z, and smoking habits in healthy younger eyes (HY), healthy
54 older eyes (HO) and eyes with an early form of ARMD called age-related maculopathy (ARM).

55

56 Methods

57 HO, HY and ARM groups were assessed for dietary intakes of L and Z using food diaries.
58 Smoking habits and self-administered quantities of L and Z were obtained via questionnaire.
59 Retinal L and Z levels (macular pigment optical density, or MPOD) were determined using
60 heterochromatic flicker photometry.

61

62 Results

63 No significant difference was demonstrated for dietary L and Z intake ($\chi^2 = 4.983$, $p = 0.083$) or
64 for MPOD between groups ($F = 0.40$, $p = 0.67$). There was a significant difference between the
65 HY (mean \pm sd: 1.20 ± 2.99), HO (4.51 ± 7.05) ARM groups (9.15 ± 12.28) for pack years
66 smoked ($\chi^2 = 11.61$, $p = 0.03$).

67

68 Conclusions

69 Our results do not support the theory that ARM develops as a result of L and Z deficiency.
70 Higher pack years smoked may be a factor in disease development. Dietary and
71 supplementary L and Z levels must be obtained when assessing MPOD between groups or
72 over time.

73

74 Keywords: Macular, macular pigment, MPOD, age-related macular disease, lutein

75

Comment [EJB1]: Now corrected

76 Do lutein, zeaxanthin and macular pigment optical density differ with age or age-related
77 maculopathy?

78

79 Introduction

80 Age-related macular disease (ARMD) is a degenerative disease of the central part of the
81 retina, called the macula, most common over the age of 50 years ¹. It is the leading cause of
82 visual loss within western industrialised countries ². Numbers of blind registrations attributable
83 to the disease increased by 30-40% between 1950-1990 ² and cases each year are
84 continuing to rise as these populations have an increasing longevity. Age related maculopathy
85 is an early stage of this disease, characterised by the clinical appearance of drusen with or
86 without hyperpigmentation or hypopigmentation within the retina ¹. Drusen are comprised of
87 membranous debris which accumulates between the retinal pigment epithelium (RPE) and
88 Bruch's membrane within the retina ³. There are several postulations for the aetiology of the
89 ARMD including genetics, deterioration of ruysch's complex (RPE, Bruch's membrane and
90 choriocapillaris) and oxidative stress, although the aetiology is currently unclear.

91

92 The limited treatments available for delaying the course of ARMD at present, has prompted
93 interest into how modifiable risk factors may play a role in reducing the incidence and
94 progression of the disease. Because oxidative stress is a proposed factor in the pathogenesis
95 of ARMD, the function of antioxidant supplementation in this disease is of interest. Although
96 the evidence on the effects of nutritional supplementation in ARMD has been conflicting,
97 current recommendation for the treatment of ARMD includes nutritional supplementation with
98 antioxidants, vitamins and zinc ⁴.

99

100 The xanthophyll carotenoids lutein (L) and zeaxanthin (Z) are antioxidants that can only be
101 obtained through ingestion from the diet ⁵ and together with meso-zeaxanthin make up
102 macular pigment (MP). Situated within the central 5-10 degrees of the retina ⁶, MP
103 concentrations are highest within the photoreceptor axons of the fovea ⁷, declining with
104 eccentricity. Macular pigment has also been found in the inner layers of the retina and the
105 photoreceptor outer segments. There is evidence to suggest that MP acts as a filter to

Comment [EJB2]: Written in full as it is the start of a sentence

106 damaging short-wavelength blue light irradiation with a peak absorbance spectrum of 460nm
107 ⁸, thus reducing the amount of harmful light irradiation reaching the photoreceptor layer. In
108 conjunction with MP, outer segments of photoreceptors also contain polyunsaturated fatty
109 acids (PUFA) and vitamin A. Under high oxygen tension and light irradiation lipid peroxidation
110 of the photoreceptor outer segments occurs, especially within the macular area, inducing
111 photoreceptor damage ⁹. The antioxidant properties of carotenoids quench reactive oxygen
112 species and singlet oxygen, thus reducing oxidative stress and lipid peroxidation within the
113 retina ¹⁰.

114 Augmented dietary L and Z levels have been associated with a reduced risk of developing
115 ARMD in some studies^{11, 12} but not in others^{13, 14}. Dietary intervention and supplementation
116 with L and Z have also been associated with improved measures of vision, including visual
117 acuity, contrast sensitivity and electroretinographic measures in eyes with ARMD^{15, 16}.
118 Because L and Z are the only carotenoids found within the retina, with meso-zeaxanthin being
119 synthesized from L ¹⁷, their tentative role in reducing risk for ARMD development remains of
120 interest.

121 Ageing¹⁸⁻²¹, smoking²²⁻²⁶ and genetics²⁷⁻²⁹ appear to be the leading risk factors for
122 developing ARMD. Other inconsistently proposed risk factors include female gender, white
123 ethnicity, cataracts, intraocular lenses, cognitive impairment, arthritis, light iris pigmentation,
124 hypermetropia, attenuated optic disc appearance, decreased hand grip strength, medication
125 (statins, aspirin, antacids and thiazide diuretics), higher birth weight, lower socioeconomic
126 status, increased alcohol intake, low antioxidant intake, high body mass index, high fat
127 intake, cardiovascular disease, high cholesterol levels, type II diabetes, hormones (hormone
128 replacement therapy, thyroid and antithyroid medication), and parity greater than zero.

129 Because MP is a modifiable factor potentially linked with reduced risk for ARMD, and ageing
130 is a predominant risk factor for developing ARMD, the aim of this study was to determine
131 whether there were differences in dietary and supplemented L and Z, and macular pigment
132 optical density (MPOD, the amount of retinal MP) between young eyes, old eyes and eyes
133 with ARM using heterochromatic flicker photometry (HFP).

134 Materials and methods

135 Eighty one eyes from 81 participants aged between 18-83 (mean \pm sd; 50.3 ± 18.1 years)
136 were recruited over a nine month period from Aston University (Birmingham, UK) optometry
137 department patients, and from staff and students from within the university. They were divided
138 into three groups: a healthy younger (HY) group of 37 participants aged between 18-48,
139 (mean age \pm sd; 32.9 ± 9.0 years), a healthy older (HO) cohort of 28 participants aged
140 between 50-77, (mean age \pm sd; 63.4 ± 8.1 years) and an age-related maculopathy (ARM)
141 cohort of 16 participants aged between 52-83 (mean age 67.2 ± 8.5 years). Age-related
142 maculopathy was defined as per the international classification system ¹.

143

144 All participants (including those with eyes affected by ARM) had a logarithmic minimum angle
145 of resolution of visual acuity 0.2 or better to ensure good fixation, no ocular disease (other
146 than ARM in the ARM group) determined by health questionnaire and fundus photography,
147 normal blood pressure, no intraocular lenses, good general health, clear optical media or
148 minimal opacity as determined by ophthalmic photography, and on no medication that affects
149 the retina.

150

151 Research procedures followed the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki and were approved by
152 the Aston University Ethics Committee. Informed consent was obtained from all participants
153 after they were given an explanation of the study.

154

155 Colour fundus photographs (Topcon TRC-NW8, Topcon, Newbury, Berkshire, UK) of the
156 central 45° of the posterior pole were obtained. One eye per participant was chosen to
157 eliminate intraclass correlation; environmental and genetic risk factors for ARMD such as
158 smoking, age and genetic disposition, act on the individual and thus have an impact on the
159 probability of the disease occurring in both eyes, even if not clinically visible in both eyes.
160 Significance testing where total sample size (number of eyes) exceeds the number of
161 participants is considered to be invalid and prone to false positive findings ³⁰.

162 Macular pigment optical density using HFP with the MPS 9000 (also recognised as the M:Pod
163 and the QuantifEYE; Topcon, Newbury, UK) was measured for each group. The testing

164 environment was identical for each subject. Untested eyes were occluded and tested eyes
165 were corrected with the subjects distance glasses if worn. Each participant undertook a
166 practice run was before the main test commenced. A stimulus consisting of a blue light
167 (465nm), and green light (530nm) stimuli were flicker matched by the subject pressing a
168 buzzer as soon as flicker was observed. This was done for the central one degree of visual
169 field. Blue light was absorbed by MP, thus a high intensity of blue light was necessary to
170 discriminate minimum flicker when the central value was being obtained. The test was
171 repeated to determine peripheral minimum flicker at eight degrees of retinal eccentricity
172 where MP is absent. Hence, the blue light had higher luminance and minimum flicker value is
173 different from that at the fovea. Both the background and target luminance was set to 250
174 cd/m². Subjects wore distance glasses for the test and were instructed to blink frequently,
175 especially when obtaining the peripheral value to reduce Troxler's effect. Instructions were
176 given to the participant prior to the test and a practice run was undertaken for each subject
177 before undertaking the main test. Macular pigment was determined by dividing the central
178 blue light intensity by peripheral blue light intensity and log₁₀ of this value. The study had
179 80% power at the 5% significance level to detect a change in MPOD of 0.33. This is based on
180 Bartlett *et al*'s work who found that a difference in MPOD of 0.33 or greater can be classed as
181 clinically significant³¹.

182 To assess differences in dietary L and Z levels between HO, HY and ARM groups, food
183 diaries were given to participants to complete over two weekdays and one weekend day.
184 Standard L and Z content of foods were taken from the United States Department of
185 Agriculture (USDA) national nutrient database. The nutrients from the food diaries were
186 analysed using Weighted Intake Software Program (WISP) version 3.0 (Tinuviel software,
187 Llanfechell, Anglesey, UK). Participants were also asked about self administration of lutein-
188 based supplements.

189 Smoking history was established using questionnaires. Former and current smokers were
190 asked about their total number of smoking years and the average number of cigarettes
191 smoked per day. To calculate pack years of smoking, the average of number of cigarettes
192 smoked per day was multiplied by the total number of years of smoking and divided by 20:

193 Pack years smoked = (cigarettes smoked per day x years smoked) / 20

194 Results

195 An independent-samples t-test demonstrated no significant difference in age between the
196 ARM (mean \pm sd: 67.2 \pm 8.5 years) and HO (63.4 \pm 8.1 years) groups; $t = 1.45$, $p = 0.16$.

197 There was a significant difference using ANOVA in spherical equivalent refraction ($F = 3.43$, p
198 $= 0.04$), between the HY (mean \pm sd: -0.23 \pm 1.90D), HO (0.78 \pm 2.39D) and the ARM (1.29 \pm
199 2.17D) groups with post hoc analysis demonstrating a difference between ARM and HY
200 groups; $p=0.02$ but no difference between HY and HO eyes, or between HO and ARM eyes.

201 A Chi-squared test for independence using SPSS 16.0 software (SPSS UK Ltd, West Street,
202 Woking, Surrey) indicated a significant difference between ethnicity and groups, with HO and
203 ARM groups exclusively containing 28 and 16 Caucasians respectively and the HY group
204 containing 8 Asians and 29 Caucasians ($\chi^2 = 10.56$, $p = 0.01$, $p = 0.01$). There was no
205 significant difference between gender and groups ($\chi^2 = 0.14$, $p = 0.93$) with 13 males and 24
206 females in the HY group, 9 males and 19 females in the HO group and 6 males and 10
207 females in the ARM group. The ARM group were as classified as per the international
208 classification system – drusen with or without hyperpigmentation / hypopigmentation¹.

Comment [EJB3]: Now included

209 The data was checked for normality using the Shapiro-Wilk test which assesses the normality
210 of distribution of the data. A non-significant result indicated normality for the data. Therefore a
211 one-way ANOVA was used for analysis with Tukey's post-hoc range test using SPSS 16.0
212 software to explore the impact of age and ARM on MPOD. No statistically significant disparity
213 was established in MPOD between younger, older or diseased eyes in this study ($F=0.40$,
214 $p=0.67$).

215 There was a food diary return rate of 17 (46%) in the HY group, 18 (64%) in the HO group
216 and 13 (81%) in the ARM group, giving an overall return rate of 48 (59%). As parametric
217 assumptions were not met with statistical significance for normality using Shapiro-Wilks test,
218 differences between the three groups for dietary lutein and zeaxanthin intake were assessed
219 using the Kruskal-Wallis test with SPSS 16.0 software. No significant difference was

220 demonstrated between groups for dietary lutein and zeaxanthin intake ($X^2=4.983$, $p=0.083$)
221 when analysed using food diaries.

222 Of the total 81 subjects who were questioned about their current and previous smoking habits
223 75 replied (37 in the HY, 23 in the HO and 15 in the ARM group). Because a significant result
224 for the Shapiro-Wilk test indicated non-normality for smoking for each group the Kruskal-
225 Wallis non-parametric ANOVA was used in place of the one-way ANOVA. There was a
226 significant difference between the HY (mean \pm sd: 1.20 ± 2.99), HO (4.51 ± 7.05) and ARM
227 (9.15 ± 12.28) groups for pack years smoked ($\chi^2 = 11.61$, $p = 0.03$) with post hoc analysis
228 demonstrating a difference between HY and HO groups ($Z = -2.56$, $p = 0.01$) and between HY
229 and ARM groups ($Z = -3.06$, $p = <0.01$), but not between HO and ARM groups.

230 Because a significant result for the Shapiro-Wilk test indicated non-normality for self-
231 administered lutein-based supplementation the Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric ANOVA was
232 used in place of the one-way ANOVA. There was a significant difference between the three
233 groups with both HY and HO groups not taking any self-administered lutein-based
234 supplementation whereas 3 of the 16 in the ARM group were taking a supplement (mean \pm
235 sd: $2.75 \pm 7.72 \mu\text{g}$, $X^2 = 11.58$, $p = 0.003$).

236

237 **Please place table 1 about here**

238

239 Further analysis after removal of the 3 ARM participants taking the L and Z supplement from
240 the data also showed no statistical significance between ARM, HO or HY groups ($F = 0.688$, p
241 $= 0.506$).

242 Discussion

243 The aim of this study was to assess the effects of age and ARM on dietary and
244 supplementary L and Z, and MPOD levels. This study found no difference in dietary L and Z
245 or MPOD between young, old and diseased retinae using this subjective measure.

246 Nolan et al., found an age-related decline in MPOD in a study of healthy subjects up to the
247 age of 60 years. They did not assess the effects of age after the age of 60 years³². They also
248 reported a significantly lower than average MPOD in healthy subjects with a family history of
249 ARM, exudative age-related macular degeneration (AMD) or geographic atrophy. They did
250 assess dietary and supplement usage but they grouped supplement quantities together with
251 dietary intake values. We have statistically analysed and reported dietary and supplemented
252 L and Z separately here. A study by Beatty et al., also found an inverse relationship between
253 age and MPOD in healthy eyes. They also compared 9 eyes at risk of developing ARMD
254 (contralateral to an eye with advanced AMD) to 9 age-matched healthy eyes in this study. At
255 risk eyes had a lower MPOD than age-matched healthy eyes although they did not specify
256 whether the at risk eyes had any signs of drusen or ARM³³. They reported dietary L and Z but
257 did not report data on supplementary forms. The Irish Longitudinal Study on Ageing did find
258 an inverse relationship between age and MPOD³⁴ when comparing a group aged 50 years
259 and older with a group aged 18-60 years although they did not report dietary or supplemented
260 L and Z values.

261 Conversely and consistent with our study, another study by Bartlett *et al.*, demonstrated no
262 correlation between MPOD and age³¹, although the age range was limited (18-50 years,
263 mean age 25.4 ± 8.2 years) when compared to our study (18-83 years, mean ± sd; 50.3 ± 18.1
264 years) and no dietary or supplementary L and Z data was reported. Other studies have also
265 shown a lack of variation in MPOD with age³⁵ without reporting dietary or supplemental L or
266 Z. Conversely some studies have found an increase in MPOD with age³⁶, but again dietary
267 and supplementary L and Z were not reported.

268 Although a statistically significant difference was seen between HY and ARM groups for
269 distance refractive spherical equivalent in our study, participants wore their distance
270 prescription when performing MPOD testing to counter any differences between groups.

271 There is no evidence in the literature that ametropia affects MPOD. We also found a

Comment [EJB4]: Now amended

272 statistically significant difference for ethnicity between groups, although there is no evidence
273 to suggest this would affect MPOD. There is paucity in the literature with regard to the MPOD
274 levels of Asians compared to Caucasians although one Chinese study found no difference
275 between MPOD levels between Chinese Asians and reported MPOD levels in Caucasians ³⁷.

276 The ARM group in our study had the highest number of pack years smoked when compared
277 to the HY and HO groups. Post hoc analysis showed a statistically significant difference
278 between ARM and HY groups in pack years smoked and although no statistically significant
279 difference was found between ARM and HO groups, pack years smoked in the ARM group
280 was more than double that of the HO group. It is well documented that smokers have an
281 increased risk of developing ARMD ²²⁻²⁶ and previous studies have demonstrated lower
282 MPOD levels in smokers ^{32, 38}. An inverse relationship between ARMD and dietary lutein and
283 zeaxanthin concentrations has also been reported ³⁹. Thus it may be reasonable to suggest
284 that the combination of higher pack years smoked and ARM may be associated with lower
285 MPOD, although this was not the case in our study.

286 In our study supplementary L and Z were significantly higher in ARM eyes overall when
287 compared to the HY and HO groups who took no L and Z supplement. There was variation
288 within the ARM group with only 3 of the 16 ARM participants taking L and Z supplements
289 (intake range 0-30µg per day). Patient and GP awareness of ARMD and possible
290 preventative measures to reduce the risk of disease development may account for the
291 supplementary L and Z intake in this group. Higher L and Z supplementary levels in the ARM
292 group did not give rise to higher MPOD levels suggesting that either the mean supplement
293 throughout the group overall was not large enough to increase MPOD or that the retinal
294 processes do not metabolise L and Z supplementation in ARM eyes in the same way as
295 healthy eyes. It may also be that the higher pack years smoked in this group may counter any
296 effects of supplementary L and Z on MPOD levels. Further data analysis after removal of the
297 three ARM eyes taking a L and Z supplement continued to show no statistical significance
298 between HY, HO and ARM groups for MPOD.

299 Another study assessing spectral fundus reflectance found no differences in MPOD between
300 healthy and ARM eyes in a sample from a general population aged 55 years and older

301 although dietary and supplemental L and Z were not quantified in this study³⁶. This echoed
302 our study but we quantified dietary and supplemental L and Z. Intervention with supplemented
303 and dietary increases in L and Z have shown increases in MPOD in eyes with ARM^{40, 41}. The
304 Muenster ageing and retina study (MARS) showed increases in MPOD using
305 autofluorescence with ARM stage but this association became non-significant when the
306 influence of L and Z supplementation was adjusted for. The age group range for the MARS
307 study was 60-80 years⁴². It is still not clear whether decreased MPOD is related to an
308 increased risk of developing ARMD.

Comment [EJB5]: Now included

309 The potential benefits of L and Z supplementation on visual function require further
310 investigation. Long-term randomised-controlled trials are the most stringent methods to
311 evaluate whether a cause-effect relationship exists between increased dietary or
312 supplemented L and Z levels and improved MPOD and visual function in young, old and ARM
313 eyes⁴³. However, it is imperative that dietary and supplementary L and Z values are obtained
314 at baseline and throughout such studies and when comparing young, old and ARM eyes to
315 ensure the validity of MPOD results. To the authors knowledge this is the first study to directly
316 compare healthy young, healthy old and ARM eyes together with dietary and supplemented L
317 and Z for each group. Supplementation studies often undertake dietary L and Z prior to, and
318 during L and Z supplementation trials but we assessed differences between groups in a
319 sample of a population and not as part of a L and Z supplementation trial for this study.

320 To summarise we found no statistical significance in dietary L and Z between HO, HY or ARM
321 eyes in our study. There was a significant difference in supplementary L and Z in ARM eyes
322 compared to HY and HO eyes but no statistical significance for MPOD between all three
323 groups even when the three L and Z supplemented eyes in the ARM groups were removed
324 from our analysis. Based on participant's current intake of dietary and supplemental L and Z,
325 our results do not support the theory that ARM develops as a result of L and Z deficiency
326 because we have shown that the ARM group consume similar levels of L and Z as the other
327 groups. It could be that historically our ARM participants consumed low levels of L and Z and
328 that this predisposed them to ARM, although it seems likely that higher pack years smoked by
329 this group could be a factor in the development of the disease. Long-term randomised-

330 controlled trials assessing the effects of supplementation with L and Z on visual function in
331 healthy young, healthy old and eyes with ARMD may provide more tangible evidence and
332 help resolve incompatible findings from other studies. However, it is crucial that dietary and
333 supplementary L and Z levels are reported as standard when assessing MPOD between
334 groups or over time.

335 Conflict of interest

336 Project funded by Bausch and Lomb

337 Acknowledgements

338 We thank Bausch and Lomb for funding the project.

339 Authors' contributions

340 HB designed the study, HB and FE supervised the experiments. EB performed the
341 experiments, acquired data, performed statistical analyses and wrote the manuscript. HB and
342 FE assisted with manuscript preparation and critically reviewed the manuscript. All authors
343 have read and approved the final manuscript.

References

1. Bird AC, Bressler NM, Bressler SB, et al. An international classification and grading system for age-related maculopathy and age-related macular degeneration. *Surv Ophthalmol* 1995;39:367-374.
2. Evans J, Wormald R. Is the incidence of registrable age-related macular degeneration increasing? *Br J Ophthalmol* 1996;80:9-14.
3. Curcio C, Millican C. Basal linear deposit and large drusen are specific for early age-related maculopathy. *Archives of Ophthalmology* 1999;117:329-339.
4. The AREDS Research Group. A randomized, placebo-controlled, clinical trial of high-dose supplementation with vitamins C and E, beta carotene, and zinc for age-related macular degeneration and vision loss - AREDS Report No. 8. *Archives of Ophthalmology* 2001;119:1417-1436.
5. Bone R, Landrum J, Tarsis S. Preliminary identification of the human macular pigment. *Vision Res* 1985;25:1531-1535.
6. Hammond BR, Wooten BR, Snodderly DM. Individual variations in the spatial profile of human macular pigment. *Journal of the Optical Society of America a-Optics Image Science and Vision* 1997;14:1187-1196.
7. Snodderly DM, Auran J, Delori F. The macular pigment II. Spatial distribution in primate retinas. *Investigative Ophthalmological Vision Science* 1984;25:674-685.
8. Snodderly DM, Brown B, Delori F. The macular pigment I. Absorbance spectra, localisation, and discrimination from other yellow pigments in primate retinas. *Investigative Ophthalmological Vision Science* 1984;25:660-673.
9. Organisciak DT, Vaughan DK. Retinal light damage: mechanisms and protection. *Prog Retin Eye Res* 2009;29:113-134.
10. Krinsky NID, S.M. Interaction of oxygen and oxy-radicals with carotenoids. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1982;69:205-210.
11. Bone RA, Landrum JT, Mayne ST, Gomez CM, Tibor SE, Twaroska EE. Macular pigment in donor eyes with and without AMD: a case-control study. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2001;42:235-240.
12. Delcourt C, Carriere I, Delage M, Barberger-Gateau P, Schalch W. Plasma lutein and zeaxanthin and other carotenoids as modifiable risk factors for age-related maculopathy and cataract: the POLA Study. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2006;47:2329-2335.
13. Mares-Perlman JA, Brady WE, Klein R, et al. Serum antioxidants and age-related macular degeneration in a population-based case-controlled study. *Archives of Ophthalmology* 1995;113:1518-1523.
14. MaresPerlman JA, Klein R, Klein BEK, et al. Association of zinc and antioxidant nutrients with age-related maculopathy. *Archives of Ophthalmology* 1996;114:991-997.
15. Richer S. ARMD--pilot (case series) environmental intervention data. *J Am Optom Assoc* 1999;70:24-36.
16. Parisi V, Tedeschi M, Gallinaro G, Varano M, Saviano S, Piermarocchi S. Carotenoids and antioxidants in age-related maculopathy italian study: multifocal electroretinogram modifications after 1 year. *Ophthalmology* 2008;115:324-333 e322.
17. Bone R, Landrum J, Friedes L, et al. Distribution of lutein and zeaxanthin stereoisomers in the human retina. *Exp Eye Res* 1997;64:211-218.
18. Smith W, Assink J, Klein R, et al. Risk factors for age related macular degeneration - Pooled findings from three continents. *Ophthalmology* 2001;108:697-704.
19. The AREDS Research Group. Risk factors associated with age-related macular degeneration - A case-control study in the Age-Related Eye Disease Study: Age- Related Eye Disease Study report number 3. *Ophthalmology* 2000;107:2224-2232.

20. Krishnaiah S, Das T, Nirmalan PK, et al. Risk factors for age-related macular degeneration: Findings from the Andhra Pradesh Eye Disease Study in South India. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science* 2005;46:4442-4449.
21. Song SJ, Youm DJ, Chang Y, Yu HG. Age-related macular degeneration in a screened South Korean population: prevalence, risk factors, and subtypes. *Ophthalmic Epidemiol* 2009;16:304-310.
22. EDCCS Group. Risk factors for neovascular age-related macular degeneration. The Eye Disease Case Control Study Group. *Archives of Ophthalmology* 1992;110:1701-1708.
23. Chakravarthy U, Augood C, Bentham GC, et al. Cigarette smoking and age-related macular degeneration in the EUREYE study. *Ophthalmology* 2007;114:1157-1163.
24. Klein R, Knudtson MD, Cruickshanks KJ, Klein BEK. Further observations on the association between smoking and the long-term incidence and progression of age-related macular degeneration. *Archives of Ophthalmology* 2008;126:115-121.
25. Neuner B, Komm A, Wellmann J, et al. Smoking history and the incidence of age-related macular degeneration-Results from the Muenster Aging and Retina Study (MARS) cohort and systematic review and meta-analysis of observational longitudinal studies. *Addictive Behaviors* 2009;34:938-947.
26. Coleman AL, Seitzman RL, Cummings SR, et al. The Association of Smoking and Alcohol Use With Age-related Macular Degeneration in the Oldest Old: The Study of Osteoporotic Fractures. *Am J Ophthalmol* 2010;149:160-169.
27. Yoshimura N. Age-related macular degeneration and genetics. *Clin Experiment Ophthalmol* 2010;38:1.
28. Katta S, Kaur I, Chakrabarti S. The molecular genetic basis of age-related macular degeneration: an overview. *J Genet* 2009;88:425-449.
29. Meyers S. A twin study on age-related macular degeneration. *Trans Am Ophthalmol Soc* 1994;92:775-844.
30. Newcombe RG, Duff GR. EYES OR PATIENTS - TRAPS FOR THE UNWARY IN THE STATISTICAL-ANALYSIS OF OPHTHALMOLOGICAL STUDIES. *Br J Ophthalmol* 1987;71:645-646.
31. Bartlett H, Stainer L, Singh S, Eperjesi F, Howells O. Clinical evaluation of the MPS 9000 Macular Pigment Screener. *Br J Ophthalmol* 2010;94:753-756.
32. Nolan JM, Stack J, O OD, Loane E, Beatty S. Risk factors for age-related maculopathy are associated with a relative lack of macular pigment. *Exp Eye Res* 2007;84:61-74.
33. Beatty S, Murray IJ, Henson DB, Carden D, Koh H, Boulton ME. Macular pigment and risk for age-related macular degeneration in subjects from a Northern European population. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2001;42:439-446.
34. Nolan JM, Kenny R, O'Regan C, et al. Macular pigment optical density in an ageing Irish population: The Irish Longitudinal Study on Ageing. *Ophthalmic Res* 2010;44:131-139.
35. Ciulla TA, Hammond BR, Jr. Macular pigment density and aging, assessed in the normal elderly and those with cataracts and age-related macular degeneration. *Am J Ophthalmol* 2004;138:582-587.
36. Berendschot TT, Willemsse-Assink JJ, Bastiaanse M, de Jong PT, van Norren D. Macular pigment and melanin in age-related maculopathy in a general population. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2002;43:1928-1932.
37. Tang CY, Yip HS, Poon MY, Yau WL, Yap MK. Macular pigment optical density in young Chinese adults. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt* 2004;24:586-593.
38. Kirby ML, Beatty S, Loane E, et al. A central dip in the macular pigment spatial profile is associated with age and smoking. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:6722-6728.

39. Seddon JM, Ajani UA, Sperduto RD, et al. Dietary carotenoids, vitamin A,C and E and advanced age-related macular degeneration. *Jama-Journal of the American Medical Association* 1994;272:1413-1420.
40. Koh HH, Murray IJ, Nolan D, Carden D, Feather J, Beatty S. Plasma and macular responses to lutein supplement in subjects with and without age-related maculopathy: a pilot study. *Exp Eye Res* 2004;79:21-27.
41. Wenzel AJ, Gerweck C, Barbato D, Nicolosi RJ, Handelman GJ, Curran-Celentano J. A 12-wk egg intervention increases serum zeaxanthin and macular pigment optical density in women. *J Nutr* 2006;136:2568-2573.
42. Dietzel M, Zeimer M, Heimes B, Claes B, Pauleikhoff D, Hense HW. Determinants of Macular Pigment Optical Density and its Relation to Age-Related Maculopathy -- Results from the Muenster Aging and Retina Study (MARS). *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2011.
43. Sibbald B, Roland M. Understanding controlled trials - Why are randomised controlled trials important? *Br Med J* 1998;316:201-201.