

Supplementary Table 6

Similarities and differences (in bold italic) between the current study and the recently published randomized crossover trial⁷

	Current Study	Jayaramachandran et al ⁷
Study Type	Randomised <i>Control</i> Trial	Randomised <i>Crossover</i> Trial
Comparison	1. Baseline(plano CL + spectacles) 2. Fully corrective CL	1. Baseline (Spectacles) 2. Fully corrective SCL 3. Fully corrective RGP
Inclusion criteria	Adult subjects (aged >16 years); Diagnosis idiopathic IN ; Confirmation of INS waveform (with/without latent component)	Adult subjects (aged >16 years); Diagnosis IN (idiopathic or associated with albinism); No simultaneous involvement in other trials.
Exclusion Criteria	Periodic alternating nystagmus;Any corneal pathology; Unable to fit with contact lenses; Waveforms consistent with a diagnosis of fusion maldevelopment nystagmus syndrome; concurrent participation in other trials	Periodic alternating nystagmus; Corneal trauma; Previous complications associated with contact lens wear.; Waveforms consistent with a diagnosis of fusion maldevelopment nystagmus syndrome
Randomisation	Random permuted blocks of varying sizes in STATA statistical software. Participants and investigator not masked to randomization.	Computer generated stratified balanced (allocation ratio 1:1)randomization scheme with permuted block design. Participants and investigator not masked to randomization.
Duration of treatment	2 weeks (+/- 3 days)	2-3 weeks
Contact lens type	Proclear soft (Coopervision Ltd)	Proclear soft (Coopervision Ltd) or HydroCyl soft toric (Cantor and Nissel Ltd) & Quasar Aspheric RGPL (No & Contact Lens Ltd)
Eye Movement Recordings	Eyelink Eyetracker, 500Hz. Horizontal stimuli 5deg apart, +/-15 degrees	Eyelink Eyetracker, 250Hz Horizontal stimuli 3deg apart, +/-30 degrees
Eye Movements Analysis	Analysis of randomly allocated file names to minimize bias. Dominant eye only analysed. Calibration using best fit line to minimum mean position for primary and +/- 15 deg steps. Periodic waveform identified using period orbit analysis. All cycles within +/-12.5ms length selected. Parameters analysed: amplitude, foveation time, position (mean, min mean in 50/100ms window); velocity mean, min mean in 50/100ms window); NAFX	Analysis of randomly allocated file names to minimize bias. Dominant eye only analysed. Calibration using best fit line to mean position for each 3 deg step. Largest block of data without blinks (min 2 secs) analysed Parameters analysed:amplitude, frequency, intensity, NAFX, LFD (Longest Foveation Domain)
Visual Outcomes	LogMAR BCVA (EDTRS optotypes), reading VA	LogMAR BCVA (EDTRS optotypes), reading VA and critical print size

Number randomised	38	24
Number completed study	27 (71%)	20 (83%)
Primary Outcomes	Feasibility	Intensity
Secondary Outcomes	VA & Various waveform parameters	VA & Various waveform parameters, tolerability
Results	<p>High CL tolerability. Good CL fit.</p> <p>Trend toward mean improvements in VA (not significant) and some nystagmus parameters. Mean differences <1 LogMAR line</p> <p>No differences between plano/corrective groups</p> <p>?suggestive of proprioceptive effect</p>	<p>Tolerated well, but misalignment with time?</p> <p>No significant differences for any nystagmus characteristic between groups. BCVA, reading and critical print size significantly worse for SCL.</p> <p>Mean differences <1 LogMAR line.</p>