

Axonal stimulation affects the linear summation of single-point perception in three Argus II users

Yuchen Hou^{1,2}, Devyani Nanduri^{3,4}, Jacob Granley¹, James D. Weiland⁴, and Michael Beyeler^{1,2}

¹Department of Computer Science, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA

²Department of Psychological & Brain Sciences, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA

³Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA

⁴Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

E-mail: yuchenhou@ucsb.edu

Abstract. *Purpose.* Retinal implants use electrical stimulation to elicit perceived flashes of light (“phosphenes”). Single-electrode phosphene shape has been shown to vary systematically with stimulus parameters and the retinal location of the stimulating electrode, due to incidental activation of passing nerve fiber bundles. However, this knowledge has yet to be extended to paired-electrode stimulation. *Methods.* We retrospectively analyzed 3548 phosphene drawings made by three blind participants implanted with an Argus II Retinal Prosthesis. Phosphene shape (characterized by area, perimeter, major and minor axis length) and number of perceived phosphenes were averaged across trials and correlated with the corresponding single-electrode parameters. In addition, the number of phosphenes was correlated with stimulus amplitude and neuroanatomical parameters: electrode-retina and electrode-fovea distance as well as the electrode-electrode distance to (“between-axon”) and along axon bundles (“along-axon”). Statistical analyses were conducted using linear regression and partial correlation analysis. *Results.* Simple regression revealed that each paired-electrode shape descriptor could be predicted by the sum of the two corresponding single-electrode shape descriptors ($p < .001$). Multiple regression revealed that paired-electrode phosphene shape was primarily predicted by stimulus amplitude and electrode-fovea distance ($p < .05$). Interestingly, the number of elicited phosphenes tended to increase with between-axon distance ($p < .05$), but not with along-axon distance, in two out of three participants. *Conclusions.* The shape of phosphenes elicited by paired-electrode stimulation was well predicted by the shape of their corresponding single-electrode phosphenes, suggesting that two-point perception can be expressed as the linear summation of single-point perception. The notable impact of the between-axon distance on the perceived number of phosphenes provides further evidence in support of the axon map model for epiretinal stimulation. These findings contribute to the growing literature on phosphene perception and have important implications for the design of future retinal prostheses.

Keywords: Retinal prosthesis, phosphene shape, pattern vision

40 1. Introduction

41 Retinitis pigmentosa (RP) is an inherited degenerative disease of the eye that is
42 estimated to affect one in 4,000 individuals worldwide (Hamel, 2006). Although recent
43 advances in gene and stem cell therapies (e.g., Russell et al., 2017, da Cruz et al., 2018;
44 for a recent review see McGregor, 2019) as well as retinal sheet transplants (e.g., Foik et
45 al., 2018, Gasparini et al., 2019; for a recent commentary see Beyeler, 2019) are showing
46 great promise as near-future treatments for early-stage RP, electronic retinal prostheses
47 continue to be a pertinent option for later stages of the disease (Beyeler et al., 2017b).

48 Retinal prostheses typically acquire visual input via an external camera, which
49 is then translated into electrical pulses sent to a microstimulator implanted in the
50 eye (Weiland et al., 2016). The stimulator receives the information, decodes it,
51 and stimulates the surviving retinal neurons with electrical current, thus evoking the
52 perception of flashes of light (“phosphenes”). The most widely adopted retinal implant
53 thus far is the Argus II Retinal Prosthesis System (Vivani Medical, Inc; formerly Second
54 Sight Medical Products, Inc.), which was the first retinal implant to obtain regulatory
55 approval in the US and Europe, and has been implanted in roughly 500 individuals
56 worldwide (Luo and da Cruz, 2016).

57 A series of papers demonstrated that phosphenes elicited by stimulating a single
58 Argus II electrode have a distinctive shape that is relatively consistent over time
59 (Nanduri et al., 2008; Luo et al., 2016; Beyeler et al., 2019b). Phosphene shape has
60 been shown to depend strongly on the retinal location of the stimulating electrode,
61 predominantly elongated along the trajectory of the underlying nerve fiber bundle
62 (Rizzo et al., 2003; Beyeler et al., 2019b). In addition, phosphene appearance varies
63 systematically with stimulus amplitude and frequency (Horsager et al., 2009; Nanduri
64 et al., 2012; Sinclair et al., 2016) to the extent that a simple computational model
65 can predict phosphene shape across a wide range of stimulus parameters (Granley and
66 Beyeler, 2021).

67 However, less is known about how phosphenes combine when multiple electrodes
68 are stimulated. Early research suggested that repeated paired stimulation resulted
69 in reproducible phosphenes as participants perceived “similar” phosphenes on 66% of
70 trials (Rizzo et al., 2003). But more recent studies indicated that phosphenes tend to
71 merge in nontrivial ways. For instance, Wilke et al. (2011b) highlighted the importance
72 of electric crosstalk between electrodes in determining the response to simultaneous
73 stimulation of multiple electrodes. Horsager et al. (2011) found that elicited percepts
74 were affected by other stimulating electrodes (even after temporally staggering pulses to
75 remove electric field interactions) and demonstrated a linear combination of threshold
76 currents for simultaneous stimulation. Using a suprachoroidal prosthesis, Sinclair et al.
77 (2016) found that bipolar electrode configurations produced percepts that were similar
78 in appearance to the summation of the phosphenes that were elicited from the two
79 individual electrodes using a monopolar configuration. Most recently, Yücel et al.
80 (2022) identified several factors that might limit the spatial resolution of prosthetic

81 vision, which included retinal damage, electrode-retina distance, and the inadvertent
82 stimulation of nerve fiber bundles. To avoid electric crosstalk and aid the perceptual
83 merging of multi-electrode phosphenes, some researchers (Beauchamp et al., 2020;
84 Oswalt et al., 2021; Christie et al., 2022) considered sequential stimulation paradigms.
85 However, sequential stimulation does not always lead to perceptually intelligible forms
86 or objects; often participants are only able to trace an outline of the perceived shape,
87 and their interpretation of the shape relies heavily on this basic outline (Christie et al.,
88 2022). Therefore, understanding how multi-electrode stimulation can be leveraged to
89 produce form vision (that is, a fundamental aspect of visual perception that enables
90 humans to recognize spatial patterns and objects) remains an open challenge for the
91 field of visual prosthetics.

92 Here we aim to study the consistency and predictability of the (presumably
93 fundamental) building blocks of form vision: the percepts elicited by single- and paired-
94 electrode stimulation. While single-electrode stimulation is relatively well understood
95 (Nanduri et al., 2008; Sinclair et al., 2016; Luo et al., 2016; Beyeler et al., 2019b;
96 Granley and Beyeler, 2021), it remains to be demonstrated whether this knowledge can
97 be extended to predict phosphene appearance elicited by paired-electrode stimulation.
98 Specifically, the axon map model (Beyeler et al., 2019b; Granley and Beyeler, 2021)
99 predicts that the probability of seeing two phosphenes should increase with increasing
100 distance between their axon bundles (as opposed to distance on the retinal surface), but
101 no empirical studies have validated this hypothesis. Moreover, recent computational
102 models of prosthetic vision assume linear summation of phosphenes (Spencer et al.,
103 2019; de Ruyter van Steveninck et al., 2022), but this has yet to be demonstrated
104 empirically. Therefore, to assess whether phosphenes sum linearly and to determine
105 which neuroanatomical and stimulus parameters may be predictive of paired-phosphene
106 appearance, we retrospectively analyzed an extensive psychophysical dataset collected
107 with the help of three Argus II users.

108 2. Methods

109 2.1. Participants

110 This study involved three blind participants (one female and two male) with severe
111 RP, ranging from 41 to 70 years in age at implantation (Table 1). Participants
112 were chronically implanted with the Argus II Retinal Prosthesis System as part of
113 an interventional feasibility trial (clinicaltrials.gov NCT00407602; completed).
114 All psychophysical experiments were carried out at least six months after device
115 implantation. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at
116 each participant’s clinical site and was conducted under the tenets of the Declaration
117 of Helsinki. Informed consent was obtained from the participants after explanation of
118 the nature and possible consequences of the study.

119 Due to their geographic location, the participants were not directly examined by
120 the authors of this study. Instead, initial experimental procedures were sent to the
121 clinical site, and trained field clinical engineers performed the experiments as specified.
122 Raw collected data was then sent to the authors for subsequent analysis.

Participant ID	Sex	Pre-op VA	Age range at surgery	Years blind
1	M	NLP	61-70	?
2	F	NLP	41-50	11-20
3	M	BLP	41-50	21-30

Table 1: Participant details: sex (M: male, F: female), preoperative visual acuity (VA) categorized as either bare light perception (BLP) or no light perception (NLP), the age range at implantation, and the number of years that participants had been blind prior to implant surgery (self-reported). Years blind for Participant 1 was unknown due to gradual loss of vision.

123 2.2. Stimuli

124 Argus II consists of a 6×10 grid of platinum disc electrodes, each 200 μm in
125 diameter, subtending 0.7° of visual angle (Luo and da Cruz, 2016). Electrodes were
126 spaced 575 μm apart. In day-to-day use, an external component is worn by the user,
127 consisting of a small camera and transmitter mounted on a pair of glasses. The camera
128 captures video and sends the information to the visual processing unit (VPU), which
129 converts it into pulse trains using pre-specific image processing techniques (*camera*
130 *mode*).

131 All stimuli described in this study were presented in *direct stimulation* mode, where
132 stimuli were sent from the VPU directly to each electrode, without involving the external
133 camera. Stimuli were charge-balanced, cathodic-first, square-wave pulse trains with
134 0.45 ms phase duration and 250 ms total stimulus duration. Stimulus amplitudes,
135 frequencies, and the number of stimulated electrodes varied based on the design of each

136 experiment. Stimuli were programmed in Matlab 7 (Mathworks, Inc.) using custom
137 software, and pulse train parameters (i.e., the electrode(s) to be stimulated, current
138 amplitude, pulse width, inter-pulse interval, and overall stimulus duration) were sent
139 directly to the VPU, which then sent the stimulus commands to the internal portion
140 of the implant using an inductive coil link. The implanted receiver wirelessly received
141 these data and sent the signals to the electrode array via a small cable.

142 *2.3. Perceptual thresholds*

143 Perceptual thresholds for individual electrodes were measured using an adaptive
144 yes/no procedure. Custom software was utilized to measure perceptual thresholds on
145 each electrode through a hybrid method combining an adaptive staircase and constant
146 stimuli approach, using charge-balanced, biphasic 20 Hz pulse trains (de Balthasar et al.,
147 2008). The experiment involved five sessions, where each electrode was tested 12 times,
148 interspersed with 32 catch trials across sessions to assess the false alarm rate, with
149 stimulus amplitudes adjusted based on a Weibull function fit to current data. Data
150 from sessions where the false alarm rate exceeded 20% were deemed unreliable and
151 excluded from the analysis. See Appendix A for a more detailed description of the
152 procedure.

153 *2.4. Phosphene drawings*

154 Participants were asked to perform a drawing task upon electrical stimulation of the
155 retina. Participants were comfortably seated in front of a touchscreen monitor whose
156 center was horizontally aligned with the participant's head. The distance between the
157 participant's eyes and the monitor was 83.8 cm for Participant 1, 76.2 cm for Participant
158 2, and 77.5 cm for Participant 3.

159 Each stimulus was presented in 5–10 trials randomly amongst other stimuli with
160 different frequency and/or amplitude levels. The stimulus frequency ranged from 6 Hz
161 to 120 Hz, and the amplitude was between 1.25 times threshold to 7.5 times threshold.
162 Within each trial, either one or two electrodes were randomly selected and stimulated;
163 if two electrodes were selected, they were stimulated simultaneously. After delivering
164 each stimulus and before moving to the subsequent trial, participants were asked to
165 trace the perceived shape on the touchscreen monitor. The drawing data was recorded
166 and converted into a binary shape data file using Matlab, and stored for future analysis.
167 All psychophysical experiments were carried out by local field clinical engineers at each
168 participating site, and the results were forwarded to the authors.

169 This yielded 3587 phosphene drawings across three participants. To make the
170 collected phosphene drawings amenable to automated image analysis, we manually
171 inspected all drawings (see Appendix B for details) to make sure that:

- 172 • all drawn contour lines were closed (e.g., when drawing a circle, the starting point
173 of the drawing must touch the endpoint);

Linear summation of single-point perception in three Argus II users

174 • small specs (i.e., phosphene with size smaller than 10 pixels) that appeared in
 175 less than 50% of trials for a particular electrode were not counted as additional
 176 phosphenes.

177 As part of this procedure, 13 drawings were removed. The remaining 3574 drawings
 178 (2717 single-electrode drawings and 857 paired-electrode drawings; see Table 2) were
 179 prepared for statistical analysis (explained in Section 2.8).

Participant	Amp (\times Th)	Single-Electrode							
		Freq (Hz)							
		6	20	24	30	40	60	120	
1	1.5	40	325	-	-	-	20	20	
2	1.5	40	62	-	-	20	20	20	
3	1.5	40	101	-	-	-	-	-	
3	1.25	56	80	17	20	20	74	40	

Participant	Freq (Hz)	Single-Electrode							Paired-Electrode			
		Amp (\times Th)							Amp (\times Th)			
		1.25	1.5	2	3	4	5	7.5	1.25	1.5	2	4
1	20	131	325	374	20	-	60	20	60	78	110	-
2	20	-	62	485	20	109	20	20	-	-	304	80
3	20	80	101	343	20	-	40	20	-	98	127	-

Table 2: The number of drawings for each participant under single and paired-electrode stimulation, categorized by different amplitude levels (upper) or frequency levels (lower).

180 Since the validity and reliability of the experiment relied on the ability of our
 181 participants to accurately draw the perceived phosphenes, a control task was conducted
 182 where participants were asked to feel six different tactile shapes made of felt with a
 183 cardboard background, and then draw them on a touchscreen (Beyeler et al., 2019b).
 184 As the shape of these tactile targets was known and we asked participants to repeat
 185 each drawing five times, we were able to determine each participant’s drawing error and
 186 bias. A detailed description of this task can be found in the Appendix S2 of Beyeler
 187 et al. (2019b). In short, this control established baseline drawing variability for each
 188 participant, against which we could compare electrically elicited phosphene drawing
 189 variability to determine the stability of phosphene appearance.

190 *2.5. Phosphene shape descriptors*

We used the `measure` module of `scikit-image` (version 0.18.3, <https://scikit-image.org>) to automatically extract phosphenes (connected regions) and their corresponding centroids from each drawing. Phosphene shape was quantified using four parameter-free shape descriptors commonly used in image processing: area, perimeter, major axis length, and minor axis length (Nanduri et al., 2008). An example is shown in Fig. 1. These descriptors are based on a set of statistical quantities known as *image*




Figure 1: An example of a phosphene drawing and five shape properties of the phosphene. A) Phosphene described by major axis length (red) and minor axis length (blue). B) Phosphene described by area (white), perimeter (red), and the number of distinct regions (green).

moments (Hu, 1962). For an $M \times N$ pixel grayscale image, $I(x, y)$, where $x \in [1, M]$ and $y \in [1, N]$, the raw image moments M_{ij} were calculated as:

$$M_{ij} = \sum_x \sum_y x^i y^j I(x, y). \quad (1)$$

191 Raw image moments were used to compute area ($A = M_{00}$) and the center of mass
 192 $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = (M_{10}/M_{00}, M_{01}/M_{00})$ of each phosphene.

Phosphene major/minor axis lengths were calculated from the covariance matrix of the phosphene drawing:

$$\text{cov}[I(x, y)] = \begin{bmatrix} \mu'_{20} & \mu'_{11} \\ \mu'_{11} & \mu'_{02} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

193 where $\mu'_{20} = M_{20}/M_{00} - \bar{x}^2$, $\mu'_{11} = M_{11}/M_{00} - \bar{x}\bar{y}$, and $\mu'_{02} = M_{02}/M_{00} - \bar{y}^2$. The
 194 eigenvectors of this matrix corresponded to the major and minor axes of the image
 195 intensity.

196 Phosphene perimeter was calculated using an algorithm described in Benkrid et al.
 197 (2000), which approximates the length of each phosphene's contour as a line running
 198 through the centers of connected border pixels.

199 The distribution of raw shape descriptors for all participants is given in Appendix
 200 C. Phosphene orientation was previously shown to depend mostly on the retinal location
 201 of the stimulating electrode (Beyeler et al., 2019b) and was thus excluded from the main
 202 analysis. However, the interested reader is referred to Appendix D for the supplemental
 203 analysis.

204 2.6. Estimation of electrode-fovea distance and inter-electrode distance

205 Electrode-fovea distances and inter-electrode distances were estimated using the
 206 *pulse2percept* software (Beyeler et al., 2017a). Following Beyeler et al. (2019b), each

207 participant's implant location was estimated based on the fundus images taken before
208 and after surgery by extracting and analyzing retinal landmarks (e.g., foveal region and
209 optic disc). Image pixels were converted into retinal distances using Argus II inter-
210 electrode spacing information. The implant image was then rotated and transformed
211 such that the raphe fell on the horizontal axis and the fovea was the origin of the
212 new coordination system. The stimulated implant was placed on a simulated map of
213 axonal nerve fiber bundles (Fig. 2), which was modeled based on ophthalmic fundus
214 photographs of 55 sighted participants (Jansonius et al., 2009). Since the fovea is the
215 origin in the stimulated implant's coordinates, the electrode-fovea distance was measured
216 as the distance between an electrode and the origin.

217 Inter-electrode distance measurements were adapted from Yücel et al. (2022) to
218 investigate the effect of axonal stimulation on perceived phosphene shapes, in which the
219 distance between two electrodes was divided into two, nearly orthogonal components:

- 220 • *between-axon* distance (green lines in Fig. 3): the shortest distance between the
221 center of the more nasal electrode to the closest axon of the more temporal electrode;
- 222 • *along-axon* distance (blue curves in Fig. 3): the distance from the center of the
223 temporal electrode, along the nasal electrode's closest axon, up to the point where
224 the nasal electrode's between-axon line reached the temporal electrode's axon.

225 2.7. Estimation of electrode-retina distance

226 Electrode-retina distances were estimated from post-surgical optical coherence
227 tomography (OCT) images collected with either Cirrus HD-OCT (Carl Zeiss Inc) or
228 Topcon 3D-OCT 1000 (Topcon Inc). The SD-OCT scans were obtained 6 months after
229 implantation of Participants 1 and 2, and 13 months after implantation of Participant
230 3.

231 When performing OCT scanning, the opaque metal electrodes prevent image




Figure 2: A) Participant 2's fundus image with Argus II implant placed over the retinal surface. B) Participant 2's simulated implant placed on the simulated axonal map.




Figure 3: Axonal distances (adapted from Yücel et al., 2022). A) The between-axon distance (green line) and the along-axon distance (blue curve) when two electrodes are on the same side of the raphe, B) and when two electrodes are on different sides.

232 acquisition directly underneath the corresponding electrode. However, based on the
233 length of the shadow between the electrode and the retinal surface, it is possible to
234 estimate the electrode-retina distance of that electrode (Ahuja et al., 2013). A single
235 grader manually measured the electrode-retina distance by counting the number of pixels
236 from the center of the shadow on the retinal pigment epithelium to the implant (Fig. 4).
237 These pixel counts were then converted to microns, using the known electrode diameter
238 as a reference to calibrate the pixel-to-micron ratio based on the width of each electrode
239 shadow's gap in the OCT images. Distances of poorly imaged electrodes were excluded
240 from the dataset.

241 Details about each participant's estimated electrode-fovea distances and electrode-
242 retina distances are given in Table 3. Welch's t -test was used to compare differences in
243 stimulus and neuroanatomical parameters across participants. There was no statistical
244 difference between the averaged electrode-fovea distance across different participants (for
245 Participants 1 and 2: $t(29) = 1.529$, $p > .05$; for Participants 2 and 3: $t(29) = 0.114$,
246 $p > .05$; for Participants 1 and 3: $t(29) = -1.247$, $p > .05$). In terms of electrode-retina
247 distance, Participant 1 had significantly larger values than the other two participants
248 ($t(29) = 5.776$, $p < .001$ and $t(29) = 5.776$, $p < .001$) whose implant was closely
249 attached to the retina.

Participant	Number of included electrodes	Electrode-fovea distance (μm)	Electrode-retina distance (μm)
1	30	2561.0 ± 217.5	150.9 ± 25.5
2	30	2136.2 ± 173.1	0.0
3	30	2168.8 ± 227.4	0.0

Table 3: Each participant's number of sampled electrodes, electrode-fovea distance (mean \pm SEM), and electrode-retina distance (mean \pm SEM).




Figure 4: A) Participant 1's retinal implant fundus image. The cyan arrow marked the current scanning area, and the green electrode array was superimposed onto the original image for better electrode visualization. B) Participant 1's OCT b-scan. Each electrode-retina distance (vertical blue line) was represented by the length between the center of the shadow on the retinal surface (horizontal blue line) and the implant (white line).

250 2.8. Statistical analysis

251 Data entry and statistical analyses were performed in Python (version 3.8.12,
252 Python Software Foundation). Python package scikit-image (version 0.18.3, <https://scikit-image.org>)
253 was used for calculating different phosphene shape properties, matplotlib (version 3.5.0, <https://matplotlib.org>)
254 was used for presenting phosphene drawings and analysis plots, and statsmodels (version 0.13.2, <https://statsmodels.org>)
255 was used for regression models.

256
257 To control for individual drawing bias and variance (Beyeler et al., 2019b) as well
258 as facilitate statistical analysis, we transformed the data as follows:

- 259 • All independent variables (i.e., amplitude, frequency, electrode-retina distance,
260 electrode-fovea distance, between-axon distance, and along-axon distance) were
261 standardized across all participants.
- 262 • The dependent variables, which describe phosphene shape (i.e., area, perimeter,
263 major/minor axis lengths), were expressed as multiples of the shape descriptors
264 elicited by a “standard” pulse train (amplitude: $2\times$ threshold, frequency: 20
265 Hz). This procedure was performed separately for each participant, but considered
266 drawings from all recorded electrodes of that participant, in order to account for
267 drawing bias and variance. For instance, the area of an individual phosphene was
268 normalized by the phosphene area averaged across all drawings of a particular
269 participant when one of their electrodes was stimulated with the standard pulse.
- 270 • Shape descriptors were first extracted from each individual phosphene in each
271 drawing, before they were averaged across trials of the same electrode and stimulus
272 combination, in order to eliminate repeated measures of the same data point.
273 Averaging in this fashion across trials reduced the 3574 drawings to 379 data points

274 (278 single-electrode percepts, 101 paired-electrode percepts).

275 • Data points that fell more than 2.5 standard deviations away from the mean
276 were considered outliers and were removed from all further analyses. In total, 26
277 data points were removed from single-electrode analyses, and no data points were
278 removed from paired-electrode analyses. The remaining 353 data points (252 single-
279 electrode percepts, 101 paired-electrode percepts) were included in all analyses.

280 • Feature descriptors were transformed using a power of $1/n$ to keep the residuals
281 normally distributed. Specifically, we used $n = 3$ for area and $n = 2$ for perimeter,
282 major axis length, and minor axis lengths. All residuals were verified for normality
283 using Quantile-Quantile plots (see Appendix E).

284 Partial correlation plots for the shape descriptors are given in Appendix E, along
285 with their linear fits.

286 A series of multiple linear regression and partial correlation analyses were conducted
287 *within* participants (Hou et al., 2023), while linear mixed-effects analyses (with stimulus
288 and neuroanatomical parameters as fixed effects and participants as a random effect)
289 were performed *across* participants.

3. Results

3.1. Amplitude and frequency modulation affect single-point perception differently

Consistent with the literature on single-electrode phosphene drawings (Nanduri et al., 2008; Luo et al., 2016; Beyeler et al., 2019b), phosphene shape greatly varied across participants and electrodes, but was relatively consistent across trials of a single electrode. Single-electrode stimulation reliably elicited phosphenes in all three participants, who reported seeing a single phosphene on 86.8% of trials, two phosphenes on 13.0% of trials, and three or more phosphenes on the remaining trials.

Fig. 5 shows the mean images for each electrode, obtained by averaging the drawings for each electrode across trials obtained with a particular current amplitude (Fig. 5 rows; expressed as a multiple of the threshold current). Mean images were then centered over the corresponding electrode in a schematic of the participant's implant to reveal the




Figure 5: Single-electrode phosphene drawings as a function of stimulus amplitude (rows; expressed as multiples of the threshold current). Mean images were obtained by averaging drawings from individual trials aligned at their center of mass (Appendix F). Averaged drawings were then overlaid over the corresponding electrode in a schematic of each participant's implant (*pulse2percept* 0.8.0.dev0, Beyeler et al., 2017a). Pulse train frequency was 20 Hz for all participants. Squares (\square) indicate the estimated location of the fovea.

rich repertoire of elicited percepts across electrodes (see Appendix F).

Whereas Participant 1 mostly drew blobs and wedges, which grew larger as the stimulus amplitude was increased, Participant 2 reported seeing exclusively lines and arcs, which got longer with increasing amplitude. The effect of amplitude on phosphene shape was most apparent for Participant 3, where phosphenes that appeared as lines and arcs near threshold turned into blobs and wedges as amplitude was increased.

First reported by Nanduri et al. (2012), pulse frequency seemed to affect phosphene shape differently than amplitude (Fig. 6). Whereas phosphenes that were located close to the center of vision (denoted by \square in Fig. 6) did not noticeably change in shape, more eccentric phosphenes turned from blobs at 6 Hz to rectangles at 60 Hz (Participant 1), or from short streaks at 6 Hz to orders-of-magnitude longer arcs at 60 Hz (Participant 3).




Figure 6: Single-electrode phosphene drawings as a function of pulse train frequency. Mean images were obtained by averaging drawings from individual trials aligned at their center of mass (Appendix F). These averaged drawings were then overlaid over the corresponding electrode in a schematic of each participant's implant (*pulse2percept* 0.8.0dev; Beyeler et al., 2017a). Shown are only those electrodes for which drawings at all stimulus frequencies were available. Stimulus amplitude was 1.5 times threshold for Subjects 1 and 2, and 1.25 times threshold for Participant 3. Squares (\square) indicate the estimated location of the fovea.

314 *3.2. Factors affecting phosphene shape during single-electrode stimulation*

315 To more systematically investigate how different stimulus and anatomical
316 parameters affect phosphene shape in single-electrode stimulation, we considered
317 how the four shape descriptors (area, perimeter, major axis length, and minor axis
318 length; see Methods, Section 2.5) could be predicted by different stimulus parameters
319 (i.e., amplitude and frequency) and neuroanatomical parameters (i.e., electrode-retina
320 distance and electrode-fovea distance). To address this, shape descriptor values were
321 first averaged across trials and normalized per participant (see Methods, Section 2.8).

322 We first performed a multiple linear regression and partial correlation analysis for
323 each participant (top three sections in Table 4), corrected for multiple comparisons with
324 the Bonferroni method. Consistent with Nanduri et al. (2012), we found that stimulus
325 amplitude strongly affected phosphene area in two out of three participants ($p < .001$)
326 and minor axis length ($p < .001$), suggesting that phosphenes tended to get larger with
327 increasing amplitude. However, amplitude did not significantly modulate phosphenes
328 drawn by Participant 2 (also visually evident in Fig. 5). Stimulus frequency had no
329 significant effect on phosphene shape in Participants 1 and 2, but strongly ($\beta > .3$,
330 $r > .6$) and significantly ($p < .001$) modulated phosphene perimeter, major axis length,
331 and minor axis length in Participant 3.

332 In terms of neuroanatomical parameters, we considered an electrode's distance to
333 the fovea (i.e., retinal eccentricity) and distance to the retina (i.e., height). Electrode-
334 retina distances (labeled "ERD" in Table 4) were non-zero only in Participant 1,
335 where larger ERDs led to smaller phosphenes ($p < .05$). Interestingly, we found that
336 electrode-fovea distance (labeled "EFD" in Table 4) significantly modulated shape in
337 all three participants. For Participant 1, more eccentric phosphenes tended to be more
338 elongated ($p < .001$) but not necessarily larger. For Participants 2 and 3, more eccentric
339 phosphenes tended to be larger overall (affecting all shape descriptors with $p < .05$ or
340 smaller).

341 To determine which of these correlations were general trends that reached
342 significance across all three participants, we also fitted a linear mixed-effects to all
343 data (bottom section in Table 4), corrected for multiple comparisons (Bonferroni), with
344 "Participant" as a random effect. This analysis revealed that larger stimulus amplitudes
345 tended to elicit larger ($p < .001$) and "blobbier" phosphenes (by means of increased
346 minor axis length; $p < .001$). Perhaps driven by Participant 3's data, increased stimulus
347 frequencies tended to elicit slightly larger and more extended/less compact phosphenes,
348 by means of the overly increased perimeter ($\beta = .156$, $r = .617$) and major/minor axis
349 lengths ($\beta > .12$, $r > .4$; $p < .001$). Increasing retinal eccentricity (EFD) had a similar
350 effect, leading to slightly larger and more elongated phosphenes, by means of the overly
351 increased perimeter ($\beta = .107$, $r = .469$; $p < .001$) and major axis length ($\beta = .128$,
352 $r = .479$; $p < .001$). Partial correlation plots can be found in Appendix E.2.

Linear summation of single-point perception in three Argus II users

		Area		Perimeter		Major axis length		Minor axis length	
		β	r	β	r	β	r	β	r
Participant 1 ($N = 102$)	Amp	.117***	.437	.0333	.218	-.00904	-.0510	.132***	.530
	Freq	.107	.257	.0564	.221	.0584	.194	.0555	.156
	EFD	-.0325	-.131	.0443	.280	.0679***	.353	-.0425	-.194
	ERD	-.0871*	-.338	-.0166	-.110	-.00497	-.0279	-.0650	-.293
Participant 2 ($N = 64$)	Amp	.0184	.125	.0512	.242	.0522	.242	.0435	.241
	Freq	.0498	.209	.104	.304	.113	.323	.0789	.272
	EFD	.0874***	.634	.112***	.601	.116***	.608	.0701***	.482
Participant 3 ($N = 86$)	Amp	.255***	.678	.121**	.408	.0290	.0943	.298***	.575
	Freq	.0557	.207	.360***	.813	.438***	.833	.304***	.602
	EFD	.0586*	.321	.151***	.665	.186***	.698	.104**	.367
All Participants ($N = 252$)	Amp	.103***	.440	.0621***	.297	.0276	.118	.121***	.420
	Freq	.0400*	.190	.156***	.617	.186***	.624	.125***	.435
	EFD	.0426*	.190	.107***	.469	.128***	.479	.0581**	.209

Table 4: Single-electrode phosphene shape predicted by amplitude (Amp), frequency (Freq), electrode-fovea distance (EFD), and electrode-retina distance (ERD; only non-zero for Participant 1). Participant-specific analyses (top three sections) were conducted using a multiple linear regression (β : standardized regression coefficient) and partial correlation analysis (r : partial correlation coefficient). All-participant analysis (bottom section) was conducted using a linear mixed-effects model fit on all data, with “Participant” as a random factor. Intercepts (not shown) were included in the analysis. The variance inflation factor of all predictors was smaller than 2, suggesting minimal multicollinearity. N denotes the number of data points included in each analysis, where each data point represents the mean shape descriptor of the phosphenes elicited with a particular stimulus amplitude and frequency on a particular electrode, averaged across trials. *: $p < .05$, **: $p < .01$, ***: $p < .001$. Significant effects are marked in bold (corrected for multiple comparisons using the Bonferroni method).

353 *3.3. Predicting two-point perception from single-point perception*

354 When two electrodes were stimulated simultaneously, participants reported seeing
 355 a single phosphene on 53.1% of trials, two phosphenes on 43.4% of trials, and three
 356 or more phosphenes on the remaining trials. Three or more phosphenes were generally
 357 encountered when single-electrode stimulation itself produced more than one phosphene.
 358 Representative examples of phosphene drawings for different electrode pairs are shown
 359 in Fig. 7.

360 When paired-electrode stimulation produced two distinct phosphenes (Fig. 7, left),
 361 their shape resembled the linear summation of the phosphenes reported during single-
 362 electrode stimulation. For instance, as shown in Row 1 of the left panel in Fig. 7,
 363 Participant 1 perceived a long arc when electrode E1 was stimulated and an oval when
 364 electrode A10 was stimulated. When both E1 and A10 were stimulated concurrently,
 365 the resulting phosphene appeared as an arc alongside an oval. Similarly, in Row 9 of
 366 the left panel, Participant 3 perceived a tilted line for electrode E6 and a small triangle
 367 for electrode D7. Then during the simultaneous stimulation of electrodes E6 and D7,




Figure 7: *Left:* Representative examples of single phosphenes combining linearly without overlap during paired-electrode stimulation. *Right:* Representative examples of phosphenes merging and overlapping during paired-electrode stimulation. Mean images were obtained by averaging drawings from individual trials, each phosphene aligned at its trial-averaged center of mass (Appendix F).

368 the resulting shape preserved the original form of the individual phosphene shapes.
 369 A colored version of this figure that superimposes the outline of the single-electrode
 370 phosphenes on the paired-electrode phosphenes is given in Appendix G.

371 When paired-electrode stimulation produced a single phosphene (Fig. 7, *right*),
 372 the phosphenes reported during single-electrode stimulation appeared to merge into a
 373 unified shape. For instance, as shown in Row 2 of the right panel in Fig. 7, Participant 1
 374 perceived a blob for electrode C7 and a right-leaning straight line for electrode D7. When
 375 both C7 and D7 were stimulated simultaneously, the participant saw a larger blob tilted
 376 rightward. Similarly, in Row 6, electrode B4 elicited a small dot, and electrode F4
 377 elicited a long arc; and simultaneous stimulation yielded an arc-shaped phosphene,
 378 appearing as a cohesive shape formed by connecting the two individual shapes.

Linear summation of single-point perception in three Argus II users

		Area		Perimeter		Major axis length		Minor axis length	
		β	r	β	r	β	r	β	r
Participant 1 ($N = 47$)	Amp	.0841	.356	.0332	.330	.0104	.102	.0934*	.454
	EFD	-.0949	-.248	.0393	.240	.0693	.378	-.0895	-.280
	ERD	.0446	.120	.0232	.144	.00886	.0522	.0417	.135
Participant 2 ($N = 22$)	Amp	.0110	.0987	.0112	.0754	.0123	.0827	-.000242	-.00188
	EFD	.0833*	.599	.115*	.613	.117*	.619	.0690	.472
Participant 3 ($N = 32$)	Amp	.123	.375	.0184	.156	-.0271	-.223	.166	.446
	EFD	.0786	.250	.0527	.412	.0652*	.483	.0171	.0514
All Participants ($N = 101$)	Amp	.0421	.149	.00592	.0643	-.00954	-.0314	.0941	.169
	EFD	.0579	.165	.0649***	.418	.0727***	.459	.0331	.0496

Table 5: Paired-electrode phosphene shape predicted by amplitude (Amp), electrode-fovea distance (EFD), and electrode-retina distance (ERD; only non-zero for Participant 1). Participant-specific analyses (top three sections) were conducted using a multiple linear regression (β : standardized regression coefficient) and partial correlation analysis (r : partial correlation coefficient). All-participant analysis (bottom section) was conducted using a linear mixed-effects model fit on all data, with “Participant” as a random factor. Intercepts (not shown) were included in the analysis. The variance inflation factor of all predictors was smaller than 3, suggesting minimal multicollinearity. N denotes the number of data points included in each analysis, where each data point represents the mean shape descriptor of the phosphenes elicited with a particular stimulus amplitude on a particular electrode pair, averaged across trials. *: $p < .05$, **: $p < .01$, ***: $p < .001$. Significant effects are marked in bold (corrected for multiple comparisons using the Bonferroni method).

379 *3.4. Factors affecting phosphene shape during paired-electrode stimulation*

380 We wondered whether these stimulus and neuroanatomical parameters could also
 381 explain the shape of phosphenes elicited by paired-electrode stimulation. As participants
 382 would frequently draw multiple phosphenes during paired-electrode stimulation (Fig. 7),
 383 we extracted each shape descriptor for each individual phosphene. Then, we summed all
 384 phosphenes’ corresponding shape descriptor within each drawing in order to account for
 385 the variable number of perceived phosphenes. Finally, we averaged each shape descriptor
 386 of each drawing across trials (see Methods, Section 2.8).

387 The results are shown in Table 5, and partial correlation plots can be found in
 388 Appendix E.2. Similar to the single-point results (Table 4), electrode-fovea distance
 389 affected phosphene shape in two out of three participants ($p < .001$), generally increasing
 390 the perimeter and major axis length of more eccentric phosphenes. However, in
 391 contrast to the single-point results, amplitude (i.e., the average amplitude across the two
 392 stimulated electrodes) had a less definitive effect on phosphene shape, only increasing
 393 the minor axis length ($p < .05$) for Participant 1. Unfortunately, all paired-electrode
 394 drawings were collected at 20 Hz, thus stimulus frequency could not be included in the
 395 analysis.

396 Naturally, we asked to what extent the phosphene shape elicited by paired-electrode

Linear summation of single-point perception in three Argus II users

	Area		Perimeter		Major axis length		Minor axis length	
	β	r	β	r	β	r	β	r
Participant 1 ($N = 47$)	.686***	.155	.593***	.469	.549***	.670	.726***	.560
Participant 2 ($N = 22$)	.725***	.883	.726***	.884	.726***	.883	.640***	.607
Participant 3 ($N = 32$)	.578***	.570	.558***	.445	.512***	.396	.589***	.506
All Participants ($N = 101$)	.653***	.483	.619***	.649	.592***	.652	.692***	.707

Table 6: Paired-electrode phosphene shape descriptors predicted by the sum of the corresponding single-electrode shape descriptors. Participant-specific analyses (top three rows) were conducted using a simple linear regression (β : standardized regression coefficient) and partial correlation analysis (r : partial correlation coefficient). All-participant analysis (bottom row) was conducted using a linear mixed-effects model fit on all data, with “Participant” as a random factor. Intercepts were not included in the analysis, because if the value of a predictor (sum of the single-electrode phosphene shapes) was zero, the corresponding value of the dependent variable (the paired-electrode phosphene shape) should also be zero. N denotes the number of data points included in each analysis, where each data point represents the mean shape descriptor of the phosphenes elicited on a particular electrode pair, averaged across trials. *: $p < .05$, **: $p < .01$, ***: $p < .001$. Significant effects are marked in bold (Bonferroni-corrected for multiple comparisons).

397 stimulation could be predicted by the phosphene shape elicited during single-electrode
 398 stimulation. To answer this question, we conducted a simple linear regression (Table 6)
 399 where each shape descriptor from a paired-electrode stimulation trial (e.g., the sum
 400 of phosphene areas when Electrodes A and B were simultaneously stimulated) was
 401 regressed on the same shape descriptor from a single-electrode stimulation trial (e.g.,
 402 phosphene area elicited by Electrode A plus phosphene area elicited by Electrode B).
 403 In short, we found that each paired-electrode shape descriptor could be predicted by
 404 the sum of the two corresponding single-electrode shape descriptors (Table 6; $p < .001$).
 405 Across all participants, shape descriptors tended to sum linearly, with the β values
 406 suggesting that phosphenes elicited by paired-electrode stimulation appeared larger than
 407 the average of their single-electrode counterparts, but smaller than their sum.

408 *3.5. Factors affecting the number of perceived phosphenes during paired-electrode*
 409 *stimulation*

410 Yücel et al. (2022) previously demonstrated that the probability of perceiving two
 411 distinct phosphenes increases with inter-electrode distance. However, the axon map
 412 model (Beyeler et al., 2019b) makes a more nuanced prediction: participants should be
 413 more likely to see two distinct phosphenes as the distance between two nerve fiber
 414 bundles increases (“between-axon” distance; as opposed to distance on the retinal
 415 surface; see Methods). Under this model, paired-electrode stimulation with a short
 416 between-axon distance should activate the same nerve fiber bundles and thus lead to a

	Participant 1 ($N = 45$)		Participant 2 ($N = 9$)		Participant 3 ($N = 31$)		All Participants ($N = 85$)	
	β	r	β	r	β	r	β	r
Amp	-.0432	-.125	-	-	.0606	.128	-.00979	-.0212
EFD	.130	.220	.327*	.875	-.0947	-.150	-.0489	-.0842
ERD	.156	.246	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between-Axon Dist.	.340**	.498	.374*	.879	.391	.399	.233*	.327
Along-Axon Dist.	.108	.207	.0771	.366	-.292	-.362	-.0149	-.0333

Table 7: Number of perceived phosphenes predicted by amplitude (Amp), electrode-fovea distance (EFD), electrode-retina distance (ERD), between-axon distance, and along-axon distance. Participant-specific analyses were conducted using multiple linear regression (β : standardized regression coefficient) and partial correlation analysis (r : partial correlation coefficient); all-participant analysis was conducted using a linear mixed-effects model fit on all data, with “Participant” as a random factor. Intercepts (not shown) were included in the analysis. The variance inflation factor of all predictors was smaller than 3.1, suggesting minimal multicollinearity. N denotes the number of data points included in each analysis, where each data point represents the mean number of perceived phosphenes elicited with a particular stimulus amplitude on a particular electrode pair, averaged across trials. *: $p < .05$, **: $p < .01$, ***: $p < .001$. Significant effects are marked in bold (Bonferroni-corrected for multiple comparisons).

417 single phosphene, even though the two electrodes may be far apart on the retina.

418 To test this hypothesis, we split retinal distance into two, almost orthogonal
 419 components: “between-axon” distance, which spreads the current radially from the
 420 more nasal electrode until it reaches the more temporal electrode’s closest axon, and
 421 “along-axon” distance, which walks along the axon from that point until it reaches the
 422 more temporal electrode (Fig. 3; this works even for pairs on opposite sides of the raphe).
 423 During the preliminary stage of this study, we experimented with a number of similar
 424 formulations of splitting these two components, and all of them gave similar results.

425 Consistent with the axon map model (Beyeler et al., 2019b), we found a significant
 426 correlation between the number of perceived phosphenes and the between-axon distance
 427 ($p < .05$, Table 7). Along-axon distance, on the other hand, was not significantly
 428 correlated with the number of perceived phosphenes ($p > .05$).

429 To further demonstrate the predictive power of the between-axon distance, we
 430 constructed two sets of models and compared their Akaike Information Criterion (AIC)
 431 and Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) scores:

- 432 • Model A: phosphene number = $f(\text{along-axon distance, additional factors})$
- 433 • Model B: phosphene number = $f(\text{between-axon distance, additional factors})$

434 where “additional factors” consisted of the stimulus parameters (e.g., amplitude) and
 435 neuroanatomical parameters (e.g., electrode-fovea distances). As is evident in Table 8,
 436 we found strong evidence that models relying on between-axon distance (Model B)
 437 significantly outperformed models relying on along-axon distance (Model A) in two out
 438 of three participants, as well as in the all-participant analysis.

Linear summation of single-point perception in three Argus II users

	Model	Parameters	AIC ↓	BIC ↓
Participant 1	A	Amp + EFD + ERD + along-axon distance	53.345	62.378
	B	Amp + EFD + ERD + between-axon distance	43.954	52.988
Participant 2	A	EFD + along-axon distance	8.846	9.438
	B	EFD + between-axon distance	-3.220	-2.628
Participant 3	A	Amp + EFD + along-axon distance	53.388	59.124
	B	Amp + EFD + between-axon distance	52.345	58.081
All participants	A	Amp + EFD + ERD + along-axon distance	123.676	140.775
	B	Amp + EFD + ERD + between-axon distance	114.090	131.189

Table 8: Predicting the number of perceived phosphenes during paired-electrode stimulation based on the along-axon distance (Model A) and between-axon distance (Model B). Participant-specific analyses (top three sections) were conducted using a simple linear regression; all-participant analysis (bottom section) was conducted using a linear mixed-effects model fit on all data, with “Participant” as a random factor. Performance is measured using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) scores, where lower scores indicate better performance. A difference in AIC scores (ΔAIC) or BIC scores (ΔBIC) of less than 2 suggests that there is substantial support for both models (i.e., there is no clear preference for one over the other). $2 \leq \Delta AIC < 7$ or $2 \leq \Delta BIC < 6$ indicates some evidence against the model with the higher AIC. $\Delta AIC \geq 7$ or $\Delta BIC \geq 6$: strong evidence against the model with the higher AIC/BIC. In practical terms, the model with the lower AIC/BIC is significantly better in terms of the balance between goodness of fit and model simplicity (highlighted in bold). Amp: stimulus amplitude; EDR: electrode-fovea distance; ERD: electrode-retina distance.

439 4. Discussion

440 In this study, we set out to investigate the relationship between single-point and
441 two-point perception of Argus II users. Our results suggest that two-point perception
442 can be predicted by the linear summation of single-point perception, supporting the
443 notion of independent stimulation channels. We also found that the number of perceived
444 phosphenes increased with the between-axon distance of two stimulating electrodes, but
445 not the along-axon distance, thus providing further evidence in support of the axon
446 map model for epiretinal stimulation (Rizzo et al., 2003; Nanduri, 2011; Beyeler et al.,
447 2019b).

448 These findings contribute to the growing literature on phosphene perception and
449 have important implications for the design of future retinal prostheses, as they may
450 inform the optimal surgical placement of an epiretinal implant (Beyeler et al., 2019a;
451 Bruce and Beyeler, 2022) and constrain AI-based stimulus optimization algorithms
452 (Granley et al., 2022; de Ruyter van Steveninck et al., 2022; Relic et al., 2022).

453 4.1. Phosphene shape is well predicted by stimulus and neuroanatomical parameters

454 Although a link between neuroanatomical parameters such as electrode-retina
455 distance and perceptual thresholds has been well established in the literature
456 (Mahadevappa et al., 2005; de Balthasar et al., 2008; Ahuja et al., 2013; Pogoncheff
457 et al., 2023), research examining the effect of these parameters on the *shape* of elicited
458 phosphenes has been limited.

459 We found that phosphenes tended to appear larger and rounder as stimulus
460 amplitude increased (Table 4), which is consistent with previous considerations about
461 the current spread in the retina (de Balthasar et al., 2008; Granley and Beyeler, 2021;
462 Yücel et al., 2022). However, in contrast to Nanduri et al. (2012), we found that
463 stimulus frequency also affected phosphene size (Table 4 and Fig. 6). Perhaps driven
464 by Participant 3's data, increased stimulus frequencies tended to elicit slightly larger
465 and more extended/less compact phosphenes, by means of overly increased perimeter
466 and major axis length. This relationship between stimulus frequency and phosphene
467 size partially agrees with data from suprachoroidal prostheses, where phosphenes tend
468 to appear thicker or rounder as the stimulation rate increases (Sinclair et al., 2016).

469 In addition, we found that increased electrode-fovea distance (i.e., retinal
470 eccentricity) led to slightly larger and more elongated phosphenes (Table 4). While
471 more eccentric phosphenes may be elongated along the trajectory of the underlying
472 nerve fiber bundles (Beyeler et al., 2019b), the increased size may be a consequence of
473 ganglion cell receptive fields increasing with eccentricity (Curcio and Allen, 1990). This
474 would agree with psychophysical (Freeman and Simoncelli, 2011; Stingl et al., 2013)
475 and computational considerations (Song et al., 2022), but is an as-of-yet unpublished
476 finding about the appearance of phosphenes elicited by epiretinal implants. Indeed,
477 most phosphene models assume a constant scaling factor between retinal and visual
478 field coordinates (Horsager et al., 2009; Nanduri, 2011; Beyeler et al., 2019b).

479 *4.2. Two-point perception is the linear sum of single-point perception*

480 This study demonstrates that the shape of phosphenes elicited by paired-electrode
481 stimulation is well predicted by the linear summation of the shape of their corresponding
482 single-electrode phosphenes (Table 6), supporting the notion of independent channels for
483 phosphene perception. Specifically, β values in Table 6 suggest that phosphenes elicited
484 by paired-electrode stimulation were smaller than the sum of their single-electrode
485 counterparts. This finding is partially consistent with Christie et al. (2022), who showed
486 that the phosphene elicited by electrode “quads” was similar to phosphenes elicited by
487 individual electrodes that belonged to the quad, with Wilke et al. (2011a), who showed
488 that single-electrode phosphenes consisting of round dots and lines added up to more
489 complicated patterns when stimulated simultaneously, and with Barry et al. (2020), who
490 reported that multi-electrode percepts in the Orion cortical implant were perceived to
491 be smaller and simpler than the predicted combination of single-electrode phosphene
492 shapes.

493 The observed linear summation of single-electrode phosphenes provides valuable
494 empirical evidence for future computational model development. Many computational
495 models of prosthetic vision (Chen et al., 2009; Perez-Yus et al., 2017; Sanchez-Garcia
496 et al., 2019; Granley and Beyeler, 2021) assume a linear relationship between stimulus
497 parameters (e.g., amplitude) and phosphene appearance (e.g., brightness). The same
498 is true for the stimulus generation procedure that underlies “video mode” in Argus II.
499 Here we were able to provide empirical evidence for this assumption and detail the
500 factors that affect phosphene appearance during paired-electrode stimulation. These
501 results may thus inform recent AI-based stimulus optimization algorithms (Spencer
502 et al., 2019; de Ruyter van Steveninck et al., 2022; Relic et al., 2022; Granley et al.,
503 2022), which aim to select the optimal stimulation parameters on each electrode based
504 on their predicted effect on phosphene appearance. These insights may also benefit the
505 prediction of phosphene shape in multi-electrode stimulation scenarios (Zrenner et al.,
506 2010; Shivdasani et al., 2017), which aim to arrange individual phosphenes into more
507 complex patterns, with the ultimate goal of producing form vision to support activities
508 such as reading and recognizing objects.

509 However, it should be noted that multiple phosphene patterns may not
510 automatically group into perceptually intelligible objects (Stingl et al., 2015; Shivdasani
511 et al., 2017; Christie et al., 2022). This “binding problem” (Roelfsema, 2023) also
512 extends to cortical implants. Although a recent study with intracortical electrodes (Chen
513 et al., 2020) showed that macaques could successfully identify the intended shape of a
514 patterned electrical stimulus, human participants implanted with the same technology
515 could not always do that (Fernández et al., 2021). Indeed, human participants implanted
516 with cortical surface electrodes required a dynamic stimulation strategy to allow for
517 perceptual grouping (Beauchamp et al., 2020).

518 *4.3. The number of perceived phosphenes depends on the axonal distance in*
519 *paired-electrode stimulation*

520 While it is not surprising that two electrodes separated by a large retinal distance
521 might produce two distinct phosphenes (Yücel et al., 2022), here we were able to split
522 retinal distance into two (nearly orthogonal) components: between-axon distance, which
523 measures how far the electric current must spread *away from* an axon bundle until it
524 reaches another electrode, and along-axon distance, which measures how far the electric
525 current must spread *along* an axon bundle until it reaches another electrode. We found
526 that models relying on between-axon distance consistently outperformed models relying
527 on along-axon distance when predicting the number of perceived phosphenes (Table 8).
528 This result provides the first computational evidence that paired-electrode epiretinal
529 stimulation is more likely to elicit two distinct phosphenes as the distance between their
530 underlying axon bundles increases (as opposed to retinal distance alone), and provides
531 further evidence in support of the axon map model for epiretinal stimulation (Rizzo
532 et al., 2003; Nanduri, 2011; Beyeler et al., 2019b).

533 This result has important clinical implications. First, it suggests that a user's
534 axon map should be considered when deciding on an intraocular surgical placement
535 of the array (Beyeler et al., 2019a), as phosphenes tend to appear elongated in the
536 direction of the nerve fiber bundle that underlies the stimulating electrode (Beyeler
537 et al., 2019b). As the probability of seeing two phosphenes increases with between-axon
538 distance, the largest number of phosphenes should be produced by an implant whose
539 placement maximizes the sum of between-axon distances between all pairs of electrodes
540 in the array. In other words, electrodes that stimulate the same axon bundle (i.e., with
541 zero between-axon distance) are redundant and should therefore be avoided (Beyeler
542 et al., 2017b). Second, rather than arranging their electrodes on a rectangular grid in
543 an attempt to efficiently tile the retinal surface, future epiretinal implants should strive
544 to place every electrode on a different nerve fiber bundle in an attempt to efficiently
545 tile the axon map, which in turn efficiently tiles the visual field (Bruce and Beyeler,
546 2022). The same principle may be applied to cortical implants, where future devices
547 could arrange electrodes such that they efficiently tile the visual field rather than the
548 cortical surface.

549 *4.4. Limitations and future work*

550 Despite the ability of our work to highlight important factors that guide the
551 appearance of phosphenes elicited by retinal implants, it is important to note that
552 our linear analyses cannot identify nonlinear predictors of phosphene shape. Future
553 studies could thus focus on nonlinear (but still explainable) machine learning models
554 (Pogoncheff et al., 2023). In addition, due to data availability, our analyses are currently
555 limited to single- and paired-electrode stimulation in three participants. However, to
556 achieve form vision, it will be important to stimulate more than two electrodes at a
557 time for each participant. Therefore, future studies should investigate whether this

Linear summation of single-point perception in three Argus II users

24

558 linear summation can be extended to more than two electrodes across the Argus II and
559 the broader retinal implant population.

560 **Acknowledgments**

561 This work was supported by the National Eye Institute of the National Institutes of
562 Health (R00-EY029329 to MB). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors
563 and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

564 **Author contributions**

565 JDW and MB designed the study. DN collected the data. YH and JG processed the
566 data. YH and MB analyzed the data and wrote the manuscript. All authors approved
567 the final version of the manuscript.

568 **Software and data availability**

569 The code to produce the figures and tables is publicly available at <https://github.com/bionicvisionlab/2023-ArgusPairs>. Data will be made publicly available via
570 Open Science Framework upon acceptance of this article.
571

REFERENCES

25

572 References

- 573 Ahuja, A. K., Yeoh, J., Dorn, J. D., Caspi, A., Wuyyuru, V., McMahon, M. J.,
574 Humayun, M. S., Greenberg, R. J., and Dacruz, L. (2013). Factors Affecting
575 Perceptual Threshold in Argus II Retinal Prosthesis Subjects. *Transl Vis Sci Technol*,
576 2(4):1.
- 577 Barry, M. P., Armenta Salas, M., Patel, U., Wuyyuru, V., Niketeghad, S., Bosking,
578 W. H., Yoshor, D., Dorn, J. D., and Pouratian, N. (2020). Video-mode percepts are
579 smaller than sums of single-electrode phosphenes with the Orion® visual cortical
580 prosthesis. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, 61(7):927.
- 581 Beauchamp, M. S., Oswalt, D., Sun, P., Foster, B. L., Magnotti, J. F., Niketeghad, S.,
582 Pouratian, N., Bosking, W. H., and Yoshor, D. (2020). Dynamic Stimulation of Visual
583 Cortex Produces Form Vision in Sighted and Blind Humans. *Cell*, 181(4):774–783.e5.
- 584 Benkrid, K., Crookes, D., and Benkrid, A. (2000). Design and FPGA implementation
585 of a perimeter estimator. In *Proceedings of the Irish Machine Vision and Image
586 Processing Conference*, pages 51–57.
- 587 Beyeler, M. (2019). Commentary: Detailed Visual Cortical Responses Generated by
588 Retinal Sheet Transplants in Rats With Severe Retinal Degeneration. *Frontiers in
589 Neuroscience*, 13.
- 590 Beyeler, M., Boynton, G., Fine, I., and Rokem, A. (2017a). pulse2percept: A Python-
591 based simulation framework for bionic vision. In *Proceedings of the 16th Python in
592 Science Conference*, pages 81–88, Austin, Texas. SciPy.
- 593 Beyeler, M., Boynton, G. M., Fine, I., and Rokem, A. (2019a). Model-Based
594 Recommendations for Optimal Surgical Placement of Epiretinal Implants. In Shen, D.,
595 Liu, T., Peters, T. M., Staib, L. H., Essert, C., Zhou, S., Yap, P.-T., and Khan, A.,
596 editors, *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI
597 2019*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 394–402. Springer International
598 Publishing.
- 599 Beyeler, M., Nanduri, D., Weiland, J. D., Rokem, A., Boynton, G. M., and Fine, I.
600 (2019b). A model of ganglion axon pathways accounts for percepts elicited by retinal
601 implants. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1):1–16.
- 602 Beyeler, M., Rokem, A., Boynton, G. M., and Fine, I. (2017b). Learning to see again:
603 biological constraints on cortical plasticity and the implications for sight restoration
604 technologies. *J Neural Eng*, 14(5):051003.
- 605 Bruce, A. and Beyeler, M. (2022). Greedy Optimization of Electrode Arrangement
606 for Epiretinal Prostheses. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted
607 Intervention – MICCAI 2022: 25th International Conference, Singapore, September
608 18–22, 2022, Proceedings, Part VII*, pages 594–603, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer-
609 Verlag.
- 610 Chen, S. C., Suaning, G. J., Morley, J. W., and Lovell, N. H. (2009). Simulating
611 prosthetic vision: I. Visual models of phosphenes. *Vision Research*, 49(12):1493–1506.

REFERENCES

26

- 612 Chen, X., Wang, F., Fernandez, E., and Roelfsema, P. R. (2020). Shape perception via a
613 high-channel-count neuroprosthesis in monkey visual cortex. *Science*, 370(6521):1191–
614 1196. Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science Section:
615 Research Article.
- 616 Christie, B., Sadeghi, R., Kartha, A., Caspi, A., Tenore, F. V., Klatzky, R. L.,
617 Dagnelie, G., and Billings, S. (2022). Sequential epiretinal stimulation improves
618 discrimination in simple shape discrimination tasks only. *Journal of Neural*
619 *Engineering*, 19(3):036033. Publisher: IOP Publishing.
- 620 Curcio, C. A. and Allen, K. A. (1990). Topography of ganglion cells in human retina.
621 *J Comp Neurol*, 300(1):5–25.
- 622 da Cruz, L., Fynes, K., Georgiadis, O., Kerby, J., Luo, Y. H., Ahmado, A., Vernon, A.,
623 Daniels, J. T., Nommiste, B., Hasan, S. M., Gooljar, S. B., Carr, A.-J. F., Vugler,
624 A., Ramsden, C. M., Bictash, M., Fenster, M., Steer, J., Harbinson, T., Wilbrey,
625 A., Tufail, A., Feng, G., Whitlock, M., Robson, A. G., Holder, G. E., Sagoo, M. S.,
626 Loudon, P. T., Whiting, P., and Coffey, P. J. (2018). Phase 1 clinical study of an
627 embryonic stem cell-derived retinal pigment epithelium patch in age-related macular
628 degeneration. *Nature Biotechnology*, 36(4):328–337.
- 629 de Balthasar, C., Patel, S., Roy, A., Freda, R., Greenwald, S., Horsager, A.,
630 Mahadevappa, M., Yanai, D., McMahan, M. J., Humayun, M. S., Greenberg, R. J.,
631 Weiland, J. D., and Fine, I. (2008). Factors Affecting Perceptual Thresholds in
632 Epiretinal Prostheses. *Investigative ophthalmology & visual science*, 49(6):2303–2314.
- 633 de Ruyter van Steveninck, J., Güçlü, U., van Wezel, R., and van Gerven, M. (2022).
634 End-to-end optimization of prosthetic vision. *Journal of Vision*, 22(2):20.
- 635 Fernández, E., Alfaro, A., Soto-Sánchez, C., Gonzalez-Lopez, P., Lozano, A. M., Peña,
636 S., Grima, M. D., Rodil, A., Gómez, B., Chen, X., Roelfsema, P. R., Rolston, J. D.,
637 Davis, T. S., and Normann, R. A. (2021). Visual percepts evoked with an intracortical
638 96-channel microelectrode array inserted in human occipital cortex. *The Journal of*
639 *Clinical Investigation*, 131(23). Publisher: American Society for Clinical Investigation.
- 640 Foik, A. T., Lean, G. A., Scholl, L. R., McLelland, B. T., Mathur, A., Aramant, R. B.,
641 Seiler, M. J., and Lyon, D. C. (2018). Detailed Visual Cortical Responses Generated
642 by Retinal Sheet Transplants in Rats with Severe Retinal Degeneration. *Journal*
643 *of Neuroscience*, 38(50):10709–10724. Publisher: Society for Neuroscience Section:
644 Research Articles.
- 645 Freeman, J. and Simoncelli, E. P. (2011). Metamers of the ventral stream. *Nat Neurosci*,
646 14(9):1195–1201.
- 647 Gasparini, S. J., Llonch, S., Borsch, O., and Ader, M. (2019). Transplantation of
648 photoreceptors into the degenerative retina: Current state and future perspectives.
649 *Progress in Retinal and Eye Research*, 69:1–37.
- 650 Granley, J. and Beyeler, M. (2021). A Computational Model of Phosphene Appearance
651 for Epiretinal Prostheses. In *2021 43rd Annual International Conference of the IEEE*
652 *Engineering in Medicine Biology Society (EMBC)*, pages 4477–4481. ISSN: 2694-0604.

REFERENCES

27

- 653 Granley, J., Relic, L., and Beyeler, M. (2022). Hybrid Neural Autoencoders for Stimulus
654 Encoding in Visual and Other Sensory Neuroprostheses. In *Advances in Neural*
655 *Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 22671–22685.
- 656 Hamel, C. (2006). Retinitis pigmentosa. *Orphanet Journal of Rare Diseases*, 1(1):40.
- 657 Horsager, A., Boynton, G. M., Greenberg, R. J., and Fine, I. (2011). Temporal
658 interactions during paired-electrode stimulation in two retinal prosthesis subjects.
659 *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*, 52(1):549–57.
- 660 Horsager, A., Greenwald, S. H., Weiland, J. D., Humayun, M. S., Greenberg, R. J.,
661 McMahan, M. J., Boynton, G. M., and Fine, I. (2009). Predicting Visual Sensitivity
662 in Retinal Prosthesis Patients. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*,
663 50(4):1483–1491.
- 664 Hou, Y., Nanduri, D., Granley, J., Weiland, J. D., and Beyeler, M. (2023). Phosphene
665 shape elicited by paired-electrode stimulation is well predicted by single-electrode
666 parameters for three Argus II users. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*,
667 64(8):4613.
- 668 Hu, M.-K. (1962). Visual pattern recognition by moment invariants. *IRE Transactions*
669 *on Information Theory*, 8(2).
- 670 Jansonius, N. M., Nevalainen, J., Selig, B., Zangwill, L. M., Sample, P. A., Budde,
671 W. M., Jonas, J. B., Lagrèze, W. A., Airaksinen, P. J., Vonthein, R., Levin, L. A.,
672 Paetzold, J., and Schiefer, U. (2009). A mathematical description of nerve fiber bundle
673 trajectories and their variability in the human retina. *Vision Research*, 49(17):2157–
674 2163.
- 675 Luo, Y. H.-L. and da Cruz, L. (2016). The Argus® II Retinal Prosthesis System.
676 *Progress in Retinal and Eye Research*, 50:89–107.
- 677 Luo, Y. H.-L., Zhong, J. J., Clemo, M., and da Cruz, L. (2016). Long-term Repeatability
678 and Reproducibility of Phosphene Characteristics in Chronically Implanted Argus II
679 Retinal Prosthesis Subjects. *American Journal of Ophthalmology*, 170:100–109.
- 680 Mahadevappa, M., Weiland, J., Yanai, D., Fine, I., Greenberg, R., and Humayun, M.
681 (2005). Perceptual thresholds and electrode impedance in three retinal prosthesis
682 subjects. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*,
683 13(2):201–206.
- 684 McGregor, J. E. (2019). Restoring vision at the fovea. *Current Opinion in Behavioral*
685 *Sciences*, 30:210–216.
- 686 Nanduri, D. (2011). *Prosthetic vision in blind human patients: Predicting the percepts*
687 *of epiretinal stimulation*. PhD thesis, University of Southern California, Los Angeles,
688 CA.
- 689 Nanduri, D., Fine, I., Horsager, A., Boynton, G. M., Humayun, M. S., Greenberg, R. J.,
690 and Weiland, J. D. (2012). Frequency and Amplitude Modulation Have Different
691 Effects on the Percepts Elicited by Retinal Stimulation. *Investigative Ophthalmology*
692 *& Visual Science*, 53(1):205–214.

REFERENCES

28

- 693 Nanduri, D., Humayun, M. S., Greenberg, R. J., McMahon, M. J., and Weiland, J. D.
694 (2008). Retinal prosthesis phosphene shape analysis. *Conference proceedings: ...*
695 *Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology*
696 *Society. IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society. Annual Conference,*
697 2008:1785–1788.
- 698 Oswalt, D., Bosking, W., Sun, P., Sheth, S. A., Niketeghad, S., Salas, M. A., Patel,
699 U., Greenberg, R., Dorn, J., Pouratian, N., Beauchamp, M., and Yoshor, D.
700 (2021). Multi-electrode stimulation evokes consistent spatial patterns of phosphenes
701 and improves phosphene mapping in blind subjects. *Brain Stimulation: Basic,*
702 *Translational, and Clinical Research in Neuromodulation*, 14(5):1356–1372. Publisher:
703 Elsevier.
- 704 Perez-Yus, A., Bermudez-Cameo, J., Guerrero, J. J., and Lopez-Nicolas, G. (2017).
705 Depth and Motion Cues with Phosphene Patterns for Prosthetic Vision. In *2017*
706 *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision Workshops (ICCVW)*, pages
707 1516–1525. ISSN: 2473-9944.
- 708 Pogoncheff, G., Hu, Z., Rokem, A., and Beyeler, M. (2023). Explainable Machine
709 Learning Predictions of Perceptual Sensitivity for Retinal Prostheses. Pages:
710 2023.02.09.23285633.
- 711 Relic, L., Zhang, B., Tuan, Y.-L., and Beyeler, M. (2022). Deep Learning-
712 based Perceptual Stimulus Encoder for Bionic Vision. In *Augmented*
713 *Humans 2022*, AHS 2022, pages 323–325, New York, NY, USA. Association for Com-
714 puting Machinery.
- 715 Rizzo, J. F., Wyatt, J., Loewenstein, J., Kelly, S., and Shire, D. (2003). Perceptual
716 Efficacy of Electrical Stimulation of Human Retina with a Microelectrode Array
717 during Short-Term Surgical Trials. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*,
718 44(12):5362–5369. Publisher: The Association for Research in Vision and
719 Ophthalmology.
- 720 Roelfsema, P. R. (2023). Solving the binding problem: Assemblies form when neurons
721 enhance their firing rate—they don’t need to oscillate or synchronize. *Neuron*,
722 111(7):1003–1019. Publisher: Elsevier.
- 723 Russell, S., Bennett, J., Wellman, J. A., Chung, D. C., Yu, Z.-F., Tillman, A., Wittes,
724 J., Pappas, J., Elci, O., McCague, S., Cross, D., Marshall, K. A., Walshire, J., Kehoe,
725 T. L., Reichert, H., Davis, M., Raffini, L., George, L. A., Hudson, F. P., Dingfield,
726 L., Zhu, X., Haller, J. A., Sohn, E. H., Mahajan, V. B., Pfeifer, W., Weckmann, M.,
727 Johnson, C., Gewaily, D., Drack, A., Stone, E., Wachtel, K., Simonelli, F., Leroy,
728 B. P., Wright, J. F., High, K. A., and Maguire, A. M. (2017). Efficacy and safety of
729 voretigene neparvovec (AAV2-hRPE65v2) in patients with RPE65-mediated inherited
730 retinal dystrophy: a randomised, controlled, open-label, phase 3 trial. *The Lancet*,
731 390(10097):849–860. Publisher: Elsevier.
- 732 Sanchez-Garcia, M., Martinez-Cantin, R., and Guerrero, J. (2019). Indoor Scenes
733 Understanding for Visual Prosthesis with Fully Convolutional Networks:. In

REFERENCES

29

- 734 *Proceedings of the 14th International Joint Conference on Computer Vision, Imaging*
735 *and Computer Graphics Theory and Applications*, pages 218–225, Prague, Czech
736 Republic. SCITEPRESS - Science and Technology Publications.
- 737 Shivdasani, M. N., Sinclair, N. C., Gillespie, L. N., Petoe, M. A., Titchener, S. A., Fallon,
738 J. B., Perera, T., Pardinas-Diaz, D., Barnes, N. M., Blamey, P. J., and for the Bionic
739 Vision Australia Consortium (2017). Identification of Characters and Localization of
740 Images Using Direct Multiple-Electrode Stimulation With a Suprachoroidal Retinal
741 Prosthesis. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, 58(10):3962–3974.
- 742 Sinclair, N. C., Shivdasani, M. N., Perera, T., Gillespie, L. N., McDermott, H. J.,
743 Ayton, L. N., and Blamey, P. J. (2016). The Appearance of Phosphenes Elicited
744 Using a Suprachoroidal Retinal Prosthesis. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual*
745 *Science*, 57(11):4948–4961.
- 746 Song, X., Qiu, S., Shivdasani, M. N., Zhou, F., Liu, Z., Ma, S., Chai, X., Chen, Y., Cai,
747 X., Guo, T., and Li, L. (2022). An in-silico analysis of electrically-evoked responses
748 of midget and parasol retinal ganglion cells in different retinal regions. *Journal of*
749 *Neural Engineering*.
- 750 Spencer, M. J., Kameneva, T., Grayden, D. B., Meffin, H., and Burkitt, A. N. (2019).
751 Global activity shaping strategies for a retinal implant. *Journal of Neural Engineering*,
752 16(2):026008. Publisher: IOP Publishing.
- 753 Stingl, K., Bartz-Schmidt, K. U., Besch, D., Chee, C. K., Cottrill, C. L., Gekeler,
754 F., Groppe, M., Jackson, T. L., MacLaren, R. E., Koitschev, A., Kusnyerik, A.,
755 Neffendorf, J., Nemeth, J., Naeem, M. A. N., Peters, T., Ramsden, J. D., Sachs, H.,
756 Simpson, A., Singh, M. S., Wilhelm, B., Wong, D., and Zrenner, E. (2015). Subretinal
757 Visual Implant Alpha IMS – Clinical trial interim report. *Vision Research*, 111:149–
758 160.
- 759 Stingl, K., Bartz-Schmidt, K.-U., Gekeler, F., Kusnyerik, A., Sachs, H., and Zrenner,
760 E. (2013). Functional Outcome in Subretinal Electronic Implants Depends on Foveal
761 Eccentricity. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, 54(12):7658–7665.
- 762 Weiland, J. D., Walston, S. T., and Humayun, M. S. (2016). Electrical Stimulation of the
763 Retina to Produce Artificial Vision. *Annual Review of Vision Science*, 2(1):273–294.
- 764 Wilke, R., Gabel, V.-P., Sachs, H., Bartz Schmidt, K.-U., Gekeler, F., Besch, D.,
765 Szurman, P., Stett, A., Wilhelm, B., Peters, T., Harscher, A., Greppmaier, U., Kibbel,
766 S., Benav, H., Bruckmann, A., Stingl, K., Kusnyerik, A., and Zrenner, E. (2011a).
767 Spatial resolution and perception of patterns mediated by a subretinal 16-electrode
768 array in patients blinded by hereditary retinal dystrophies. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis*
769 *Sci*, 52(8):5995–6003.
- 770 Wilke, R. G. H., Moghadam, G. K., Lovell, N. H., Suaning, G. J., and Dokos, S.
771 (2011b). Electric crosstalk impairs spatial resolution of multi-electrode arrays in
772 retinal implants. *Journal of Neural Engineering*, 8(4):046016. Publisher: IOP
773 Publishing.

REFERENCES

30

- 774 Yücel, E. I., Sadeghi, R., Kartha, A., Montezuma, S. R., Dagnelie, G., Rokem, A.,
775 Boynton, G. M., Fine, I., and Beyeler, M. (2022). Factors affecting two-point
776 discrimination in Argus II patients. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 16.
- 777 Zrenner, E., Bartz-Schmidt, K. U., Benav, H., Besch, D., Bruckmann, A., Gabel, V.-P.,
778 Gekeler, F., Greppmaier, U., Harscher, A., Kibbel, S., Koch, J., Kusnyerik, A., Peters,
779 T., Stingl, K., Sachs, H., Stett, A., Szurman, P., Wilhelm, B., and Wilke, R. (2010).
780 Subretinal electronic chips allow blind patients to read letters and combine them to
781 words. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 278(1711):1489–1497.
782 Publisher: Royal Society.

783 **Appendix A. Perceptual threshold measurements**

784 Custom software was used to measure the perceptual thresholds on each electrode
785 using a yes-no procedure that was a hybrid between an adaptive staircase and a method
786 of constant stimuli (de Balthasar et al., 2008). Stimuli were charge-balanced, 0.45 ms
787 per phase, cathodic-first, biphasic 20 Hz pulse trains, 250 ms in duration.

788 The experiment consisted of five sessions, and each electrode was tested 12 times in
789 each session, in random order. 32 catch trials were also interspersed randomly over five
790 sessions to minimize the false alarm rate. Upon stimulation, participants had to report
791 whether they were able to see any phosphenes (detection task). Stimulus amplitudes
792 (for stimulus present trials) for the first block were predetermined (method of constant
793 stimuli). After the first block, a maximum likelihood algorithm fit of a Weibull function
794 to the current data determined the range of the next block of stimulation amplitude
795 values for each electrode. After each block, a confidence interval was acquired for each
796 electrode using a Monte-Carlo simulation based on responses to the previous trials. If the
797 confidence interval for an electrode fell below a pre-set level, trials for that electrode were
798 no longer presented, but trials on the other electrodes continued through a maximum
799 of five blocks.

800 Results were deemed unreliable if the false alarm rate, determined by the percentage
801 that the participant saw a stimulus during catch trials, was greater than 20%. Data
802 from runs with higher false alarm rates than 20% were removed from the analysis and
803 the runs were repeated.

804 **Appendix B. Image processing**

805 *Appendix B.1. Phosphene drawings with open contour lines*

806 It was sometimes challenging for our participants to draw fully closed circles,
807 triangles, or wedges. Although a common strategy is to place one finger at the starting
808 location while the other finger traces out the shape (thus simplifying the process of
809 “returning home” and closing the contour), some drawings ended up with open contour
810 lines (Fig. B1). These drawings were identified as follows:

- 811 • The drawing was either a hollow circle or triangle and either had a small gap
812 between two endpoints (Panels A and B) or a line that resembled the shape of a
813 circle or triangle (Panels C and D).
- 814 • The majority of drawings from the same electrode showed similarly shaped
815 phosphenes which were all filled.



Figure B1: Examples of phosphene drawings with open contour lines.

816 Based on these criteria, we identified 21 (out of 3587) drawings that needed to be
817 fixed. The data cleaning process involved three steps (Fig. B2):

- 818 (i) Identify the two endpoints of the drawing (Panel A).
- 819 (ii) Connect the two endpoints with a 1px-thick line (Panel B).
- 820 (iii) Fill the area with `scipy.ndimage.binary_fill_holes()` (Panel C).

821 Similarly, four phosphenes had small gaps in otherwise smooth contour lines (most
822 likely a tracking issue with the touchscreen). These small artifacts could potentially
823 have grave effects on our phosphene shape analysis, as a gap in the contour line would



Figure B2: Procedure for fixing phosphene drawings with open contour lines.

824 potentially be judged as two independent, connected regions by the image processing
825 software, thereby accidentally doubling the number of reported phosphenes and halving
826 their reported size.

827 Fortunately, we identified only twelve drawings with this issue. To fix them, we
828 manually identified four endpoints of the broken contour line (Fig. B3, Panel A) and
829 connected them (Panel B), then used `scipy.ndimage.binary_fill_holes()` to fill the
830 area (Panel C).




Figure B3: Procedure for fixing phosphene drawings with broken contour lines.

831 *Appendix B.2. Phosphene drawings with other artifacts*

832 Fourteen phosphene drawings had other artifacts, such as tiny specs (less than 10
833 pixels in size) that were not part of any other discernible shape, and were subsequently
834 removed (Fig. B4).




Figure B4: Example phosphene drawings with small specs (artifacts) that were removed from the dataset.

835 **Appendix C. Distribution of phosphene shape descriptors**

836 Fig. C1 shows the distribution of shape descriptors. Phosphene drawings were more
837 consistent within than across participants (for details, see Nanduri (2011); Beyeler et al.
838 (2019b)). In single-electrode stimulation, Participant 1 tended to draw simple dots, oval
839 and elongated lines varying in length and thickness (Fig. 5; *left column*). However, round
840 or oval shapes never appeared in Participant 2's drawings, as all phosphenes were curved
841 or straight lines (Fig. 5; *center column*), leading the average phosphene areas, minor axis
842 lengths, and perimeters to be much smaller than those of the other two participants.
843 This was also evident in the boxplots of each participant's phosphene shapes (Fig. C1;
844 *top row*), because Participant 2's median area, minor axis length, and perimeter were
845 even smaller than those of other participants' 25th quantile. The drawings of Participant
846 3 (which included curved lines, ovals, and triangles) varied dramatically in shape across
847 different electrodes.

848 Similar tendencies were observed in paired-electrode stimulation (Fig. C1, *bottom*
849 *row*).




Figure C1: Boxplot of different phosphene shape properties for single-electrode stimulation (top row) and paired-electrode stimulation (bottom row).

850 **Appendix D. Orientation analysis**

Phosphene orientation was also calculated from the covariance matrix of the phosphene drawing:

$$\text{cov}[I(x, y)] = \begin{bmatrix} \mu'_{20} & \mu'_{11} \\ \mu'_{11} & \mu'_{02} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{D.1})$$

where $m\mu'_{20} = M_{20}/M_{00} - \bar{x}^2$, $\mu'_{11} = M_{11}/M_{00} - \bar{x}\bar{y}$, and $\mu'_{02} = M_{02}/M_{00} - \bar{y}^2$. The eigenvectors of this matrix corresponded to the major and minor axes of the image intensity. Phosphene orientation could be extracted from the angle of the eigenvector associated with the largest eigenvalue towards the axis closest to this eigenvector:

$$\theta = \frac{1}{2} \arctan \left(\frac{2\mu'_{11}}{\mu'_{20} - \mu'_{02}} \right), \quad (\text{D.2})$$

851 which was valid as long as $\mu'_{20} \neq \mu'_{02}$, with $\theta \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$. To avoid division by zero,
852 we manually assigned an angle of $\theta = 0$ whenever μ'_{20} was equal to μ'_{02} .

853 Consistent with Beyeler et al. (2019b), we found a significant correlation between
854 the orientation of the nerve fiber bundle closest to the stimulating electrode and the
855 orientation of the perceived phosphene (Table D1). This was true for both single-
856 electrode and paired-electrode stimulation experiments except for one of the subjects
857 ($p < .05$; first two modules of Table D1). Moreover, the average of orientations in a
858 paired-electrode stimulus could be predicted by the average orientations of the individual
859 phosphenes measured during single-electrode stimulation ($p < .001$; last module of
860 Table D1), suggesting that the orientation of individual phosphenes did not change
861 much during simultaneous stimulation.

	Single-electrode elicited phosphene ATL		Paired-electrode elicited phosphene ATL		Paired-electrode elicited phosphene ATL				
	β	r	β	r	β	r			
Participant 1	Amp	.285	.231	Amp	.220	.245	Single-electrode elicited phosphene ATL	.766***	.766
	Freq	-.171	-.0855	Freq	-	-			
	EFD	.187	.143	EFD	.270	.177			
	ERD	.224	.183	ERD	.302	.201			
	ATL	.390***	.361	ATL	.380*	.349			
	$N = 102$		$N = 47$		$N = 47$				
Participant 2	Amp	-.170	-.170	Amp	.0947	.0815	Single-electrode elicited phosphene ATL	.766***	.707
	Freq	-.369	-.230	Freq	-	-			
	EFD	-.246	-.269	EFD	-.174	-.154			
	ATL	.590***	.569	ATL	.529	.430			
		$N = 64$		$N = 22$		$N = 22$			
Participant 3	Amp	.176	.102	Amp	.140	.138	Single-electrode elicited phosphene ATL	.615***	.568
	Freq	-.0809	-.0490	Freq	-	-			
	EFD	.0267	.0249	EFD	-.252	-.243			
	ATL	.487***	.444	ATL	.490*	.439			
		$N = 86$		$N = 32$		$N = 32$			
All Participants	Amp	.0699	.0700	Amp	.183	.183	Single-electrode elicited phosphene ATL	.727***	.687
	Freq	-.101	-.0921	Freq	-	-			
	EFD	-.0464	-.0365	EFD	-.0964	-.0811			
	ATL	.470***	.403	ATL	.426***	.376			
		$N = 252$		$N = 101$		$N = 101$			

Table D1: Phosphene numbers predicted by different stimuli and electrode-retina interface properties in single-electrode drawings and paired-electrode drawings, and phosphene numbers in paired-electrode drawings predicted by phosphene numbers in single-electrode drawings. The variance inflation factor of all predictors was smaller than 3. *Amp*: Amplitude. *Freq*: Frequency. *EFD*: Electrode-Fovea Distance. *ERD*: Electrode-Retina Distance. *ATL*: Axonal Tangential Line. *: $p < .05$, **: $p < .01$, ***: $p < .001$. Significant effects are marked in bold (corrected for multiple comparisons using the Bonferroni method).

862 **Appendix E. Statistical analysis**

863 *Appendix E.1. Q-Q plots*

864 We used Q-Q plots with residuals of the multiple linear regression models (per-
865 participant) and linear mixed-effects models (all-participants) to assess the normality
866 of the residuals.




Figure E1: The Q-Q plots of residuals for single-electrode stimulation.




Figure E2: The Q-Q plots of residuals for paired-electrode stimulation.

867 Appendix E.2. Partial correlation plots




Figure E3: Partial correlation plots of area, perimeter, major axis length, or minor axis length correlated with amplitude, frequency, electrode-fovea distance, and electrode-retina distance across all participants in single-electrode stimulation.

APPENDIX




Figure E4: Partial correlation plots of normalized phosphene shape elicited by paired-electrode stimulation, correlated with standardized stimulus amplitude and neuroanatomical parameters (arbitrary units).




Figure E5: Partial correlation plots of the number of distinct phosphene regions correlated with stimulus parameters and electrode-retina properties across all participants in paired-electrode stimulation.

868 **Appendix F. Visualizing average phosphenes**

869 To draw mean phosphene shapes for a particular electrode and stimulus (as shown
870 in, for instance, Fig. 5), phosphenes were first aligned by their centroid and averaged,
871 then aligned with the electrode location of the implant schematic (using `pulse2percept`
872 0.8.0.dev; Beyeler et al., 2017a). Note that our statistical analyses did not depend on
873 a phosphene’s centroid location, so the following description only serves to produce a
874 meaningful visualization of mean phosphenes.

875 If all five trial drawings showed exactly one phosphene (86.8% of trials during
876 single-electrode stimulation), alignment and averaging were straightforward. If all
877 five trial drawings showed exactly two phosphenes (43.4% of trials during paired-
878 electrode stimulation), phosphenes were assigned to electrodes by clustering their
879 centroid locations:

- 880 • In the drawing of Trial 1, the phosphene whose centroid had the smaller x coordinate
881 (if same x coordinate: smaller y) was labeled as Phosphene A, and the other as
882 Phosphene B.
- 883 • In the drawing of Trial 2, the centroid location for each phosphene was compared
884 to the centroids of Trial 1 and assigned to whichever centroid was closest.
- 885 • This process was repeated for every phosphene in all subsequent trials until every
886 phosphene was either grouped with Phosphene A or Phosphene B.

887 If the number of phosphenes varied across trials, a more sophisticated procedure was
888 necessary:

- 889 • Find the average centroid location of all single-phosphene drawings (Fig. F1, Panel
890 A). In the paired-phosphene drawings, identify the phosphene that is closest to the
891 average centroid location (“first phosphene centroid”).
- 892 • Find all phosphenes belonging to that centroid and average them (Fig. F1, Panel
893 B, “first averaged drawing”).
- 894 • Find all other phosphenes that have not been processed yet and average those
895 (Fig. F1, Panel C, “second averaged drawing”).




Figure F1: Procedure for stacking drawings when the number of phosphenes differed across trials. Note that this procedure only applies to the visualizations in Figures 5–7, as our statistical analysis did not require phosphene stacking.

896 **Appendix G. Phosphene superimposition**

897 To better visualize to which extent the phosphenes generated by paired-electrode
 898 simultaneous stimulation (Fig. 7) align with the linear combination of phosphenes
 899 produced by individual electrode stimulations, we overlaid the outlines of single-
 900 electrode phosphenes (first column in Fig. G1) onto the drawings of the phosphenes
 901 elicited by paired-electrode stimulation (second column in Fig. G1) for both “No
 902 Overlap” and “Overlap” panels.




Figure G1: Overlaying outlines of single-electrode stimulated phosphenes onto paired-electrode stimulated phosphenes. The “No Overlap” and “Overlap” panels are organized as follows: First column: mapping two single-electrode stimulated phosphenes onto the same plot where the distance between two electrodes’ phosphenes is the scaled electrode-electrode distance. The phosphene is color-coded to match the text color of the stimulating electrode. Second column: the corresponding paired-electrode stimulated phosphenes. Third column: superimposing the outlines of phosphenes from the first column onto the phosphenes from the second column.