Retinitis punctata albescens presenting with tunnel vision: Diagnostic dilemmas

Abstract—Tunnel vision is a classic sign among patients with advanced glaucoma. However, other conditions such as retinitis pigmentosa, optic neuritis and rod-cone dystrophy may be characterized by similar visual field defects. A 52-year-old lady with a family history of glaucoma presented with bilateral gradual loss of peripheral vision for two years. She claimed to have poor night vision about 20 years prior to this presentation. Her visual acuity was 6/7.5 in both eyes. The anterior chamber depth was moderate bilaterally, with Schaffer grading on gonioscopy of grade I to II. The intraocular pressure was 14 mmHg in both eyes. The optic discs appeared normal. Fundus examination showed scattered hypopigmented changes sparing the fovea. Humphrey visual field test revealed bilateral constricted visual fields. She was diagnosed with retinitis punctata albescens (RPA) based on her symptom of poor night vision, supported by the diffuse hypopigmented changes in her fundi. The management of this condition involves careful counselling regarding the genetic nature of the disease and its progressive course. We discuss this case to illustrate the importance of a thorough history taking and careful fundus examination in the workup of patients presenting with tunnel vision.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Tunnel vision, defined as constriction of the visual field resulting in loss of peripheral vision, is a sign which, although classically associated with advanced glaucoma, may be present in a variety of other conditions [1]. Some lesser known associations of tunnel vision are retinitis pigmentosa [2], brain tumors [3], optic neuropathy [4] and perchloroethylene toxicity [5]. We highlight the case of a lady with retinitis punctata albescens (RPA) who presented with symptoms mimicking end-stage glaucoma.

2 CASE REPORT

A 52-year-old lady presented with the complaint of bilateral gradual loss of peripheral vision for two years. Her vision worsened dramatically over the past one year, resulting in impairment of her daily activities. She had poor night vision since about twenty years prior to this presentation. Her elder sister was previously diagnosed with angle closure glaucoma, and had undergone both laser and glaucoma surgery. She denied any symptoms suggestive of high intraocular pressure such as eye pain or headache. She had no family history of night blindness or parental consanguinity.

Ocular examination revealed a best corrected visual acuity of 6/7.5 in both eyes. The anterior segment of both eyes were normal except for the anterior chamber depths, which were moderate based on Van Herick assessment. Schaffer grading on gonioscopy was grade I to II bilaterally. Intraocular pressure was 14 mmHg bilaterally. Fundoscopy revealed pink, non-glaucomatous optic discs, with a vertical cup-to-disc ratio of 0.3 bilaterally. There were scattered hypopigmented changes (white spots) in all 4 retinal quadrants, sparing the foveal area (Figure 1), with no retinal vessel attenuation. Humphrey visual field 10-2 analysis showed constricted visual fields bilaterally, sparing the central field (tunnel vision) (Figure 2).

A diagnosis of RPA was made based on her symptom of poor night vision, supported by the diffuse hypopigmented changes in her fundi. Presence of progressive peripheral visual field loss excludes the diagnosis of fundus albipunctatus. A pedigree chart of her family was
drawn and her family members were advised to undergo ocular genetics screening. She was counselled regarding the complications of the disease, including cataract, and advised to avoid ultraviolet radiation exposure by wearing sunglasses outdoors. She was given a follow up date for optical coherence tomography and electroretinogram (ERG), to look for reduction in scotopic and photopic responses. Unfortunately, she defaulted.

Figure 1 Fundus photos showing bilateral scattered hypopigmented changes in all 4 retinal quadrants with foveal sparing. (A) right eye, (B) left eye.

Figure 2 Humphrey visual field SITA-standard 10-2 analysis showing constricted visual fields bilaterally, also called tunnel vision. (A) right eye, (B) left eye.

3 DISCUSSION

RPA is a rare variant of retinitis pigmentosa characterised by glistening white spots in the fundus. It has been postulated to be linked to mutations in the gene encoding cellular retinaldehyde-binding protein 1, similar to retinitis pigmentosa [6, 7]. RPA is genetically heterogeneous, caused by defects in the retinal degeneration slow gene on chromosome 6p [8], in the rhodopsin gene on chromosome 3 [9] or in rd6 on chromosome 11q23 [10]. RPA and another condition, fundus albipunctatus, may have similar clinical presentation [11]; however, they may be differentiated based on various features as listed in Table I.

This case illustrates a patient with RPA who presented with clinical features mimicking glaucoma. Classic retinitis pigmentosa tends to be associated with tunnel vision in late stages, due to photoreceptor degeneration [2, 12, 13]. In glaucoma, although a similar visual field deficit may occur, the underlying cause is optic nerve damage, with loss of retinal ganglion cells [14-16]. Both these conditions may affect a similar age group; thus, clinical history alone could lead to a misdiagnosis [17].

In this case, a strong family history of angle-closure glaucoma and gonioscopy findings of a narrow angle made the diagnosis of glaucoma highly probable. Retinitis pigmentosa is usually associated with secondary open angle glaucoma; only in 1% of cases is retinitis pigmentosa associated with secondary angle closure glaucoma [18]. Fundus examination is essential to differentiate these conditions. Additional symptoms, such as presence of early-onset night blindness, also support the diagnosis of retinitis pigmentosa. It is essential to obtain a thorough drug history, as application of certain medications, such as pilocarpine, may induce symptoms of night-blindness [19].

As this genetic condition is irreversible and progressive, the visual prognosis is generally poor. In most cases, there is no treatment for this condition. However, specific disease subtypes have shown response to gene therapy and 9-cis-retinoids [20-23]. The clinician’s role is to impart realistic expectations to the patient regarding the natural history of the disease and to manage its complications, such as cataract and macular oedema. Genetic counselling is also required, and family members should be screened.

4 CONCLUSIONS

Bilateral tunnel vision and poor night vision in a patient with a hypopigmented fundus should prompt the clinician to consider retinitis pigmentosa. The management of this condition involves careful counselling regarding the genetic nature of the disease and its progressive course.
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Table I: Differentiating features of retinitis punctata albescens and fundus albipunctatus [11, 24].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differentiating Features</th>
<th>Retinitis punctata albescens</th>
<th>Fundus albipunctatus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genetic mutation</td>
<td>Mutations in retinaldehyde-binding protein 1.</td>
<td>Mutations in retinol dehydrogenase 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptoms</td>
<td>Night blindness begins at 3 to 4 years of age. Progressive loss of peripheral visual fields.</td>
<td>Congenital stationary night blindness. Non-progressive loss of peripheral visual field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>Scattered whitish-yellow spots, most numerous at the equator and usually sparing the macula. Optic nerve pallor, constriction of retinal vessels, pigment deposits or macular degeneration may be present.</td>
<td>Multiple subtle, tiny, symmetrical yellow–white spots at the posterior pole, sparing the fovea. Retinal blood vessels, optic disc, peripheral fields and visual acuity usually remain normal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electroretinogram (ERG)</td>
<td>ERG profiles show a reduced scotopic response and a slight reduction in the amplitude of the photopic responses. Elevated dark adaptation threshold occurs after 45 minutes of dark adaptation.</td>
<td>ERG is variably abnormal; both cones and rods may be affected. Scotopic ERG responses are reduced after a 30–40-min period of dark adaptation, but typically normalise after prolonged dark adaptation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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