

1 Design and Validation of a Low-Cost, Open-Source, 3D-Printed 2 Otoscope.

3

4

5

6 Joshua Lowe^{1*}, Hamza Bagha², Hamza Inayat^{3¶}, Anas Eid^{3¶}, Frankie Talarico, Tiffany Ni⁴, Tarek

7 Loubani³

8

9

10 ¹ School of Medicine, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada.

11 ² Fleming School of Nursing, Trent University, Peterborough, Ontario, Canada.

12 ³ Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada.

13 ⁴Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

14

15

16

17 *Corresponding author

18 Email: 0jdl@queensu.ca (JL)

19

20

21 ¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

22

23 **Abstract**

24 The modern otoscope is an indispensable instrument utilized by primary care physicians
25 as the gold standard tool to diagnose an array of otologic diseases and conditions. At present,
26 commercially available, traditional otoscopes remain cost-prohibitive to many potential users
27 despite limited innovation since its invention in the early 19th century. In this publication, the
28 design and assembly of a low-cost, open-source, 3D-printed otoscope, the Glia Otoscope V1.0, is
29 outlined. Subsequently, we describe the benchtop evaluation conducted, which measured several
30 outcomes relevant to otoscopy performance against a traditional, gold standard otoscope, the
31 Welch Allyn Rechargeable V3.5 Halogen HPX Otoscope. Measured outcomes included
32 illuminance, correlated color temperature, color rendering index, spatial resolution, field of view,
33 weight, battery life, and cost. Overall, the Glia Otoscope V1.0 demonstrated comparable
34 performance across measured outcomes against the traditional otoscope. Further validation in the
35 clinical setting is warranted as the Glia Otoscope V1.0 and its future iterations hold tremendous
36 potential in improving access and alleviating the burden of otologic disease in lower and middle-
37 income countries. Finally, we present a novel tool, the Otoscope Assessment Tool, which
38 establishes a standard set of performance characteristics for benchtop evaluation of otoscope
39 performance.

40

41

42

43

44 **Introduction**

45 The otoscope is an indispensable instrument utilized by primary care physicians and
46 health care providers.(1,2) It allows for precise and direct visualization of the outer and middle
47 ear structures and tissues, serving as the gold standard tool for diagnosing numerous otologic
48 diseases and conditions, including otitis media, cerumen impaction, otosclerosis, tympanic
49 membrane perforations, infectious myringitis, and cholesteatomas.(2,3) It is most recognized for
50 its role in diagnosing and stratifying the severity of acute otitis media (AOM), which has a global
51 incidence rate of 709 million cases each year with 51% of cases occurring in children under 5
52 years of age.(4) In the United States, AOM is the most common reason for seeking medical
53 therapy and antibiotic prescription in children under the age of 5 years, resulting in an estimated
54 total annual health care expenditure of \$2.88 billion.(4,5)

55 Despite its significance, especially in primary care medicine, the otoscope has largely
56 eluded technological innovation. Its fundamental design has persisted since the late 19th century,
57 comprising a light source, magnifying lens, and cone-shaped specula.(1,2,5) Moreover,
58 commercially available, gold standard, traditional otoscopes (TOs), commonly used in clinical
59 settings, remain cost-prohibitive to many potential users.(6–9) The high cost represents a
60 significant barrier for healthcare systems and providers in low and middle-income countries
61 (LMICs) and other low-resource settings.(6,8,9) Thus, hospitals and healthcare providers in these
62 settings often rely on well-intentioned donations of TOs and other medical devices. However, it
63 has been widely reported that the vast majority of donated medical devices are never actually
64 used due to incompatibility with infrastructure or they quickly become inoperable and
65 accumulate in a medical device “graveyard drawer” due to insurmountable logistics issues with
66 maintenance.(10) The inadequacy of access to otoscopy in LMICs hinders healthcare providers’

67 abilities to effectively diagnose, classify, and treat AOM, which has resulted in a high incidence
68 and prevalence of chronic suppurative otitis media (CSOM).(3,6) The World Health
69 Organization (WHO) estimates that up to 330 million people globally suffer from CSOM, which
70 is responsible for 28,000 deaths and over 2 million disability-adjusted life years annually.(3) The
71 lack of adequate access to otoscopy has also led to the overtreatment of uncomplicated AOM and
72 is a contributing factor toward the global antibiotic resistance crisis.(11,12) Thus, the
73 overwhelming global burden of undiagnosed, underdiagnosed, and overtreated acute and chronic
74 ear disease warrants greater investment into the research and development of a more accessible,
75 low-cost otoscope that is non-inferior to gold standard devices.

76 Several organizations, including the WHO and Lancet have advocated for the
77 development of more affordable medical technologies to serve those in LMICs.(8,9) This call-to-
78 action has been heeded by various organizations around the world, including the Glia Project
79 (Glia). Glia is an organization that develops and distributes high-quality, open-source, 3D-
80 printed medical devices to those in LMICs, especially during periods of geopolitical instability
81 when supply-chains are compromised.(13) In 2018, Glia validated an open-source, 3D-printed
82 stethoscope, which cost US\$1.84 to US\$3.68 to produce, in a non-inferiority trial against the
83 industry standard Littman Cardiology III.(14) Currently, over 3,000 Glia Stethoscopes have been
84 manufactured in Canada and Gaza.(15) They are deployed in hospitals across Canada and Gaza
85 and distributed to medical students across Canada, Kenya, and Zambia.(13–16) Glia has since
86 developed several other open-source 3D-printed medical devices, including an otoscope called
87 the Glia Otoscope V1.0 (GO), which is produced using accessible materials and costs US\$5.00
88 to US\$15.00 to produce. The GO aims to deliver equivalent, if not superior performance,
89 compared to a gold standard TO.(17)

90 At present, only two other low-cost, open-source 3D-printed otoscope designs are
91 available online. The first was published in 2017 in response to the 2015 Nepalese
92 earthquake.(18) This design is a "remix" of a concept originally published on Appropedia and
93 was further refined based on feedback from medical professionals in Nepal and the UK.
94 However, it has not been evaluated in a clinical or research setting. The second was developed
95 by Capobussi and Moja, who drew inspiration from the aforementioned design and created their
96 own after refining several development elements.(19) It is the only 3D-printed otoscope design
97 that has been studied in comparison to a commercially available TO. In their study, they
98 compared their €5 3D-printed otoscope to a €100 Sigma F.O. LED, G.I.M.A. S.p.A. Otoscope.
99 They reported their prototype demonstrated a similar overall quality, including the quality of
100 vision and magnification factor, when compared to the commercially available otoscope.(19)

101 The main objectives of this study are threefold: (1) to describe the development and
102 assembly process of the GO, (2) to perform a comparative benchtop evaluation of the GO against
103 a commercially available, gold standard TO, specifically, the Welch Allyn 3.5V Rechargeable
104 Halogen HPX Otoscope across several outcomes relevant to otoscopy performance, and (3) to
105 present a novel tool that establishes a standard set of performance characteristics most relevant to
106 otoscopy performance.

107

108 **Methods**

109 **Design**

110 The GO was originally designed by a Canadian audiologist, Frankie Talarico, through his
111 organization, E4R Designs. He used a simplified Computer Aided Design (CAD) software
112 named TinkerCAD and based his otoscope design on current gold standard designs of otoscopes

113 from premium brands. The design was subsequently modified and recreated in FreeCAD, an
114 open-source software package, in collaboration with Glia and with feedback from users in the
115 field and public forums (Fig 1). The device is manufactured in Canada under a Health Canada
116 Medical Device Establishment License (License #6823) to produce Class I devices.

117

118 **Fig 1. Orientation of the Glia Otoscope's 3D-printed parts on a slicer build plate.**

119

120 The 3D-printed components comprising the head and handle of the otoscope are shown in
121 Fig 2. Additional materials required include: a AA battery holder, 10 Ohm resistor, 5mm LED
122 light, rocker switch, 3x magnification biconvex acrylic lens, shrink tubing, and extra wiring. The
123 GO is designed to be compatible with Welch Allyn disposable accessories, such as the specula,
124 but can also accommodate other disposables with minor adjustments. The open-source design is
125 freely available at <https://github.com/GliaX/otoscope>, [16] The fully assembled GO is displayed
126 in Fig 3A and 3B.

127

128 **Fig 2. Glia Otoscope's individual parts.** A. Handle B. Battery compartment C. Two head shells
129 D. Inner head shell E. Bottom button F. Top button G. Lens holder bottom H. Lens holder top I.
130 Handle coupler J. Neck K. Speculum holder L. Button lock M. Button protector N. Head lock O.
131 Name plate P. Two Name plate locks.

132

133 **Fig 3A. Fully assembled Glia Otoscope with Welch Allyn 4.25mm specula. Front three-**
134 **fourths view.**

135 **Fig 3B. Fully assembled Glia Oscope with Welch Allyn 4.25mm specula. Rear three-**
136 **fourths view.**

137

138 **3D Printing and Assembly**

139 All parts were printed with 1.75 mm diameter filament using a fused deposition
140 modelling (FDM) printer. The chosen material was Polylactic Acid (PLA), and the prints were
141 set at a 0.2mm layer height with 100% infill except for the handle, which was set at 20% infill.
142 Assembly instructions provided by Frankie Talarico were found at
143 <https://github.com/GliaX/Oscope> and strictly adhered to.(17) Each 3D-printed part was
144 initially dry fitted and then permanently assembled using cyanoacrylate glue.

145 Battery compartment: The nameplate was mounted to the back of the battery
146 compartment using the nameplate locks. On the AA battery holder, the black wire was cut to
147 80mm and the red wire to 44mm. The 10-ohm resistor was soldered to the end of the red wire
148 and an additional 130mm red wire to the other end of the resistor. The battery pack was fitted
149 into the battery holder with the wires passing through their respective slots. The handle coupler
150 piece was installed onto the battery holder then the bottom button piece was secured in place by
151 the button lock.

152 Head: The outer head half pieces were assembled with the inner head, neck, head lock,
153 and specula holder pieces. A 50mm red and black wire was soldered to the positive and negative
154 terminals of the LED light, respectively, before being fitted to the inner head piece with the wires
155 passing through their respective slots. The inner head piece was connected to the head shells, and
156 the neck piece was attached to the head with the wires running through it. The headlock piece

157 was glued into its slot, and lastly, the specula holder was affixed to the front of the head using
158 cyanoacrylate glue.

159 Middle: The switch was connected to two black 50mm wires through soldering. The
160 friction-fit plastic components of the switch were carefully trimmed and smoothed using a file.
161 Subsequently, the switch was properly positioned within the button holder piece.

162 Otoscope Assembly: The head, middle, and battery compartment assemblies were joined
163 together (Fig 4) while simultaneously connecting the necessary wires through soldering. The red
164 wires from the battery and head were soldered together, and each black wire from the switch was
165 soldered to a corresponding black wire from the battery and head. The top and bottom halves
166 were securely bonded using cyanoacrylate glue. Two AA alkaline batteries were then inserted
167 into the battery holder, and the handle was attached and locked into position without the use of
168 glue.

169

170 **Fig 4. Assembly of peripheral pieces and disposables with Glia Otoscope.**

171

172 Lens: The lens was sized to the lens top holder piece and cut to size with a band saw and
173 shaped with a belt sander. It was fitted with the top and bottom lens holder pieces and installed
174 into the otoscope assembly.

175 As delineated in Table 1, the cost was calculated by multiplying the weight of each 3D-
176 printed part, determined through the Slic3r, version 1.3.0-dev, by the prevailing market price of
177 PLA filament as of October 2022. Printer electricity expenditure was estimated using the Ontario
178 Energy Board's current mid-peak rates. Power usage was extrapolated over a four-hour printing
179 period, and the resulting cost was reported in US\$.

180 For non-3D-printed components, market prices were estimated based on our material
181 sources listed on the Glia's Otoscope GitHub, Bill of Materials.(17) The weight of each
182 component and their respective costs are outlined in Table 1. This includes the AA batteries, the
183 on/off switch, LED/resistor/wire/shrink tubing, battery holder, acrylic lens (cut to size), and the
184 disposable specula.

185

186 **Benchtop Evaluation**

187 The evaluation of performance characteristics was conducted by a member of the
188 research team (JL). A Glia team member (SP) assembled a GO in London, Ontario, Canada,
189 which was utilized for the study. A TO, specifically the Welch Allyn Rechargeable 3.5V
190 Halogen HPX Otoscope, was loaned to the research team by the Department of
191 Otolaryngology/Head & Neck Surgery at Queen's University. The otoscopes are displayed side-
192 by-side in Fig 5. All outcomes for the otoscopes were measured with a Welch Allyn KleenSpec
193 4.25 mm Disposable Ear Specula attached.

194

195 **Fig 5. The Glia Otoscope and the Welch Allyn 3.5 V Halogen HPX Otoscope, pictured on**
196 **the left and right, respectively.**

197

198 At present, no standardized methodology exists to evaluate the efficacy of otoscopes.
199 Outcomes were selected based on performance characteristics commonly reported in the
200 literature from previously studied otoscopes, including the 3D-printed otoscope by Capobussi
201 and Moja(19), digital otoscopes(20), smartphone otoscopes(21,22), and the solar-powered
202 Arlight otoscope.(23) Additionally, the research team, by consensus, selected the most

203 clinically relevant performance characteristics reported by manufacturers of gold standard TOs
204 as outcomes.(24–26)

205 Illuminance, correlated color temperature (CCT), and International Commission on
206 Illumination (CIE) R_a value (more generally known and herein referred to as color rendering
207 index (CRI), were measured using the Opplé Light Master III (Opplé Lighting, 2022), a portable
208 spectrometry device developed by Opplé Lighting, a Dutch company with more than 23 years of
209 experience in the professional lighting industry, operating in over 70 countries. The Opplé Light
210 Master III utilizes the AS7262 Consumer Grade Smart 6-Channel VIS Sensor, an integrated
211 circuit (IC) that incorporates a 6-channel photodiode array.(27) This sensor samples visible
212 wavelengths in the range of approximately 430 nm to 670 nm, with a full-width half-max of
213 40 nm, through an integrated aperture that provides a $\pm 20^\circ$ field of view. The wavelength
214 accuracy of the CCD sensor is specified to be ± 5 nm. The Opplé Light Master III is highly
215 regarded among lighting professionals for its satisfactory and comparable performance when
216 tested against professional-grade spectrometers.(28–30) The device is capable of measuring
217 illuminance within a range of 0-50,000 lx and color temperature within a range of 2000-250,000
218 K. It operates within a temperature range of -10°C to 40°C . The sensor of the Opplé Light
219 Master III is cited to have a deviation of approximately 5% and a resolving power of 1 lx and 1
220 K.(31)

221 The Opplé Light Master III was mounted perpendicular to the surface, and a ruler was
222 used to ensure that the tip of the specula was positioned 12.5 mm away from the sensor of the
223 Opplé Light Master III. This distance approximates half the average length of the adult human
224 external auditory canal, an acceptable working distance for otoscopy.(32) All measurements
225 were conducted in a completely dark environment, void of any other light source, to prevent

226 contamination from ambient light sources. Each otoscope was powered-on to its highest
227 brightness setting and shone towards the center of the Oppl Light Master III's sensor. The
228 illuminance in lux (lx), correlated color temperature (CCT) in degrees of Kelvin (K), and color
229 rendering index (CRI) of the light emitted by each otoscope were measured and recorded three
230 times for each otoscope.

231 Spatial resolution was measured using the 1951 USAF resolution test chart, a widely
232 accepted method to evaluate the spatial resolution of imaging devices in optical engineering
233 laboratories.(33) The test chart was printed as instructed at proper scale using a Canon Pixma
234 MP980 printer at 9600 x 2400 dpi.(34) Each otoscope was mounted such that the tip of the
235 specula was 12.5 mm above the test chart, ensuring precise alignment. The approximate
236 resolution limit was determined by identifying the largest element on the chart without distinct
237 image contrast. The Group Number and Element was used to calculate the resolution with the
238 formula shown in the following equation:

239

$$240 \quad \text{Resolution} \left(\frac{lp}{mm} \right) = 2^{Group+(element-1)/6}$$

241

242 To measure the field of view (FOV), each otoscope was carefully positioned with the tip
243 of the specula positioned 12.5 mm above the surface. Following this, a ruler was aligned within
244 the central focus of the observed field through the otoscope, and the diameter of the field (mm)
245 was recorded.

246 The weight of each otoscope was determined by positioning them individually on a pre-
247 calibrated digital scale. Subsequently, the readings, documented in grams, were recorded. Two
248 new 1.5 V AA alkaline batteries were placed in the GO, and the TO's two rechargeable 3.5 V

249 Nickel-cadmium C batteries were charged to full capacity. Both otoscopes were powered on to
250 their maximum intensity, placed in view of a video camera, and left on. Battery life, measured in
251 hours, was determined by calculating the duration between the first timestamp, when the
252 otoscope was powered-on, to the second timestamp, when the otoscope failed to emit any light
253 perceptible to the researcher (JL) on the video recording.

254 The Bill of Materials for the GO was tabulated by a team member (HB) and reported in
255 Table 1. The cost of the TO was obtained from <https://www.stethoscope.ca> in October 2022, one
256 of Canada's largest authorized dealers for stethoscopes and medical equipment.(35)

257

258 **Table 1. Bill of Materials.**

3D-Printed Components			
	Dimensions (mm)	Weight (g)	PLA Filament Cost (US\$)
Battery Holder	18.0 X 129.5 X 18.5	12.3	\$0.27
Button Block	18.5 X 13.0 X 12.7	1	\$0.02
Button Holder	31.2 X 30.4 X 21.5	3.2	\$0.07
Button Holder Bottom	34.0 X 34.0 X 10.0	4.1	\$0.09
Button Lock	16.0 X 8.0 X 2.0	0.2	\$0.00
Handle Coupler	30.5 X 22.2 X 8.0	0.05	\$0.00
Handle Cover	33.0 X 33.0 X 125.5	30.3	\$0.67
Head Lock	19.4 X 14.3 X 8.0	1.2	\$0.03
Inner Head	34.0 X 30.8 X 13.7	2.1	\$0.05
Lens Holder Bottom	40.0 X 29.1 X 10.0	3	\$0.07

Lens Holder Top	23.7 X 36.6 X 6.0	1.1	\$0.02
Name Plate Locks	3.0 X 9.0 X 4.5	0.02	\$0.00
Name Plate	81.4 X 11.0 X 1.5	2.1	\$0.05
Neck	18.0 X 10.6 X 10.0	1.2	\$0.03
Outer Head Assembly	88.5 X 35.0 X 19.6	8.2	\$0.18
Specula Holder	25.0 X 24.5 X 4.0	1.1	\$0.02
Printer Electricity Usage (Ontario)	1.15 KWh Mid-Peak Usage	n/a	\$0.13
Total for 3D-Printed Components		71.17	\$1.69
Non-3D-Printed Components			
	Dimensions / Size (mm)	Weight (g)	Cost (US\$)
AA Batteries (2)	49.7 L, D: 13.5–14.5	47	\$1.57
On/Off Switch	10.0 X 10.0 X 15.0	2	\$0.55
5 mm LED / Resistor / Wire / Shrink Tubing	n/a	2	\$0.38
Battery Holder	107.8 X 16.2 X 13.7	7	\$1.47
Acrylic Lens (cut to size)	22.7 X 35.6 X 5.6	3	\$2.86
Disposable Specula	4.25	1	\$0.04

Total for Non-3D Printed Components		62.2	\$6.87
TOTAL		133.37 g	\$8.57

259

260 Independent, two-tailed t-tests were performed to compare mean Illuminance, CCT, and

261 CRI. The data were analyzed using RStudio (Version 2023.6.0.421).

262

263 **Results**

The measured outcomes for the GO and TO are reported in Table 2. The mean illuminance measured from the GO (M=853.33 lx, SD=109.44) was significantly lower compared to the TO (M=11486.33 lx, SD=1039.41), $t(4) = -17.62$, $p < 0.001$. The measured illuminances ranged from 734 lx to 949 lx for the GO and from 10473 lx to 12550 lx for the TO. Furthermore, the light from the GO's white LED exhibited a significantly higher mean CCT (M=9406 K, SD=853.32) compared to the TO's halogen bulb (M=3334 K, SD=199.09), $t(4) = 12.00$, $p < 0.001$. The measured CCT values ranged from 8424 K to 9964 K for the GO and from 3144 K to 3541 K for the TO. Additionally, the light from the GO produced a significantly lower mean CRI (M=72.87, SD=2.71) compared to the TO (M=97.10, SD=2.17), $t(4) = -12.11$,

p<0.001. The measured CRI values ranged from 69.9 to 75.2 for the GO and from 95.8 to 99.6 for the TO.

Table 1. Comparison of measured outcomes between the Glia Oscope and the Welch Allyn Rechargeable 3.5V Halogen HPX Oscope.

	Glia Oscope	Welch Allyn Oscope
Illuminance (lx)	853	11486
Correlated Color Temperature (K)	9406	3334
Color Rendering Index (Ra)	72.87	97.10
Spatial Resolution (lp/mm)	8.98	8.98
Field of View (mm)	11.0	11.0
Weight (g)	123	360
Battery Life (hours)	1344	0.93
Cost (US\$)	8.57	347.51

264

265 The resolution and FOV were identical for the GO and TO at 8.98 lp/mm and 11.0 mm at
266 a working distance of 12.5mm, respectively, with no variance between repeated physical
267 measurements. The GO and TO were measured to be 123 g and 360 g, 1344 hours and 0.93
268 hours, and US\$8.57 and US\$347.51 for weight, battery life, and cost, respectively. Measurement

269 of the GO's battery life was discontinued after 1344 hours (8 weeks) as the light emitted was
270 barely perceptible by the investigator (JL) and was determined to be of limited clinical utility at
271 this point.

272

273 **Discussion**

274 **Comparison to the gold standard, traditional otoscope**

275 This benchtop validation study demonstrated that the Glia Otoscope (GO) is comparable
276 to a traditional otoscope (TO), the Welch Allyn 3.5V Halogen HPX Rechargeable Otoscope,
277 across several outcomes relevant to otoscopy performance. The GO differed from the TO in
278 outcomes that are primarily influenced by the properties of the light source: illuminance, CCT,
279 and CRI. The GO's illuminance was significantly lower than the TO's, however, according to
280 Barriga et al.(36), who evaluated the optimal illuminance for otoscopy, its mean illuminance of
281 853 lx surpassed the thresholds to clearly appreciate the landmarks of the tympanic membrane
282 and distinguish the color of the tympanic membrane well, at 215 lx and 538 lx, respectively.
283 Additionally, it closely approached the threshold for optimal otoscopy, at 1076 lx, above which
284 they determined there was no appreciable benefit.(36)

285 Second, the GO's CCT, 9406 K, was characteristic of a cool white LED bulb producing
286 higher emissions in the blue spectrum compared to the TO's CCT, 3334 K, which was
287 characteristic of a halogen bulb yielding higher emissions in the red spectrum. At present, an
288 optimal CCT range for otoscopy has not been defined in the literature. Although CCT is a
289 commonly reported metric in consumer materials and industry standards, its utility in evaluating
290 otoscopy efficacy is limited, as it solely represents the color of the light emitted from the
291 otoscope and is not indicative of operator-perceived color rendering.

292 Color rendering or fidelity is better represented by other spectral characteristics, such as
293 CRI, which is a quantitative measure of the ability of an illuminant to reveal the colors of various
294 objects faithfully in comparison with an ideal or natural light source.(37) A minimum standard
295 CRI for otoscopy has not been defined in the literature, however, various Canadian government-
296 regulated sectors, including Food Inspection and Museology and Conservation, recommend a
297 minimum acceptable limit of 70, considered “fair”, for general lighting and applications, and the
298 GO would meet this threshold with a CRI of 72.87.(38,39) For healthcare and other industries
299 that perform intricate tasks where high color fidelity is critical, the minimum acceptable limit for
300 CRI ranges from 80 to 90, which is considered “good to excellent”, and the TO would meet this
301 threshold with a CRI of 97.10.(38,40) Yet, it is unclear whether this discrepancy in CRI values
302 would result in any clinically significant difference in diagnostic acuity. For example, erythema
303 of the tympanic membrane has been demonstrated to be nonspecific and less important than
304 position and mobility for diagnosing AOM.(41) It is conceivable the GO’s CRI would be
305 adequate for otoscopy and would yield equivalent clinical outcomes to the TO as the diagnosis of
306 otologic pathology factors-in a myriad of signs and symptoms, often with greater likelihood
307 ratios and predictive values than the subtleties of colors on otoscopy.(41) Notably, in recent
308 years, the CIE, the international authority for developing standards in the fields of light and
309 lighting, has expressed the necessity to update the CRI as a measure because LED light sources
310 have frequently demonstrated significant disagreement between CRI and overall perceived color
311 rendering.(42) Therefore, the measured CRI of the GO may not represent its color rendering
312 ability accurately. Several alternative standards have been proposed, including CIE-Rf, Color
313 Quality Scale, and Gamut Area Scale, however, they require further validation and have not yet
314 succeeded in replacing CRI as the standard for color rendering.(43–45)

315 In summary, the GO demonstrated exceptional performance for its cost across lighting
316 performance characteristics and it is likely capable of non-inferiority compared to the TO in the
317 clinical setting. Future iterations can be readily and inexpensively enhanced by improving the
318 light source, including sourcing a higher quality LED or increasing the number of LEDs to the
319 design. Future validation studies should exclude CCT as a primary outcome as its utility in
320 otoscopy performance is limited, and alternatives to CRI Ra, such as CIE-Rf, should be strongly
321 considered.

322 The GO and TO demonstrated equivalent performance in spatial resolution and FOV,
323 outcomes governed by their lens properties, indicating that their numerical apertures and
324 resolving capabilities were also equivalent. Consequently, the 3x magnification, injection-
325 molded acrylic bi-convex lens employed in the GO, sourced at US\$2.86 (Table 1), represents a
326 comparable, cost-effective solution.

327 Finally, the GO exhibited superior performance in outcomes determined by the materials
328 employed: weight, battery life, and cost. The GO weighed approximately one-third of the TO's
329 mass due to the lower density of the 3D printing filament used in the GO compared to the metal
330 and plastic used in the TO. This reduction in mass may afford its user enhanced control and
331 maneuverability during otoscopy, which would reduce the risk of irritation, injury, and
332 infection.⁽⁴⁶⁾ Next, the GO's battery life outperformed that of the TO by a considerable margin.
333 The disparity is multifactorial and is implicated by the intrinsic differences in efficiencies
334 between the LED and halogen light sources as well as the non-rechargeable and rechargeable
335 batteries. Moreover, the GO lacked a voltage regulator or power management circuit, and thus it
336 continued to operate at progressively lower voltages, gradually dimming until it was almost
337 indiscernible, whereas the TO likely incorporated a voltage regulator to ensure it only operated

338 above a certain voltage to maintain a specified illuminance. Thus, implementation of a voltage
339 regulator should be considered in future iterations of the GO and future validation studies should
340 plot a decay curve to better account for the decrease in illuminance with battery depletion and
341 degradation. Of note, the TO was not new and had been utilized in clinic for an unspecified
342 period, which suggests battery degradation was a factor; however, the measured battery life of
343 0.93 hours does not deviate substantially from the manufacturer's specified duration of 1
344 hour.(7) Regardless, the longevity of battery life demonstrated by the GO holds remarkable
345 promise that would be particularly advantageous in LMICs, where electrical infrastructure is
346 often unreliable and compromised.(8) Finally, the cost of the GO was over 40 times lower than
347 that of the TO. Of note, labor costs were not factored in for the cost of the GO as it is freely
348 accessible as an open-source project and individuals can personally assemble it if they so choose
349 to. Assembly time for individuals building their own GO was reported to be approximately 3
350 hours initially for the average user then gradually reduced to as low as 30 minutes with
351 subsequent builds as experience and familiarity were gained. Regardless, the wide cost disparity
352 highlights the tremendous potential for cost savings that can be realized by employing the GO
353 and other 3D-printed medical devices in LMICs. Overall, the GO demonstrated comparable
354 performance in parameters associated with the materials used compared to the TO.

355 In summary, this benchtop validation study demonstrates that the GO, at a cost of
356 US\$8.57, delivers comparable performance to the Welch Allyn 3.5 V Halogen HPX across
357 several outcomes relevant to otoscopy performance. Thus, it is a viable low-cost alternative for
358 healthcare workers in LMICs and low-resource settings who are unable to access or afford a
359 commercially available TO.

360

361 **Comparison to a previously studied open-source, 3D-printed**

362 **otoscope**

363 The GO and the open-source, 3D-printed otoscope developed by Capobussi and Moja
364 (19) share a few similarities. First, both otoscopes adhere to the conventional structure and
365 configuration of a TO, comprising of a cone-shaped head outfitted with a light source and lens
366 mounted on a handle housing the power source. Additionally, the quantity of 3D-printed
367 elements and non-3D-printed components needed for assembly is comparable. Specifically, the
368 GO requires 15 3D-printed parts and 9 non-3D-printed components (Table 1). In contrast,
369 Capobussi and Moja otoscope requires 9 3D-printed parts—with one prototype using FDM and
370 the second prototype using stereolithography (SLA)—and 11 non-3D-printed components. These
371 counts include batteries and specula as non-3D-printed parts. Second, the cost of the 3D printing
372 filament and the electricity used to operate the 3D printer were comparable at US\$1.67 for the
373 GO and US\$1.92 for Capobussi and Moja’s otoscope. Finally, the overall assembly time for
374 individuals is comparable with an estimated initial assembly time of 3 hours for the average user
375 with it significantly decreasing to as low as 30 minutes with increased experience and
376 familiarity.

377 There are also a few important differences between the GO and Capobussi and Moja’s
378 otoscope. First, the position and mounting of the LED lights are substantially different. The
379 GO’s LED is positioned in a custom mount within the head, which allows for unobstructed light
380 emission directly through the specula aperture, whereas the Capobussi and Moja otoscope
381 arranges 6 LEDs in a “ring shape around the visual pathway” and emits its light directly through
382 a translucent resin before the specula aperture.

383 Second, the type of lens incorporated in each otoscope is distinct despite both providing
384 3x magnification. The GO employs a bi-convex acrylic lens whereas the Capobussi and Moja
385 otoscope employs a Fresnel lens. The bi-convex acrylic lens confers a few important advantages
386 due to its intrinsic physical properties, including superior optical resolution and increased
387 durability (47); however, it is also more costly and difficult to process, which could limit its
388 accessibility in certain settings. An acrylic Fresnel lens was initially prototyped in the GO, and is
389 likely a reasonable substitute in resource-limited settings, however, there were concerns
390 regarding the degree of optical distortion and decreased durability, which could depreciate
391 performance to an substandard level.(47) Furthermore, incorporating the bi-convex acrylic lens
392 did not result in a substantial increase in the GO’s final cost, did not markedly affect processing
393 time, and it is a common commodity that can be accessed globally.

394 Finally, the otoscopes differed in reported outcomes: illuminance, CCT, and FOV. Of
395 note, it is not possible to draw any definitive conclusions due to variations in methodologies, and
396 therefore, only general comparisons can be made. The GO exhibited a higher illuminance of
397 853 lx, in contrast to the Capobussi and Moja otoscope, which reported 70 lx. This result was
398 unanticipated given the GO utilized a single 5 mm, 3.3 V LED bulb, while Capobussi and Moja
399 design incorporated six 5mm, 3.3 V LED bulbs. Capobussi and Moja did not specify the capacity
400 or type of AA batteries utilized nor the configuration of the circuit. It is possible their LEDs did
401 not operate at their full capacity if their voltage or current requirements were not met. In their
402 study, Capobussi and Moja stated they “...used a professional exposimeter (Bowens flash meter
403 III, Sekonic Electronics Inc, Japan) and converted in lux in order to account for the distance
404 between light source and target”. Since illuminance, expressed in lux units, is independent of
405 distance, it is plausible that they were conveying luminous intensity in units of candelas, which is

406 contingent upon the distance from the light source to the surface. It is also possible that their
407 working distance substantially exceeded the otoscopy standard or their design may not have
408 transmitted light as effectively given its transmission of light through the translucent resin of the
409 head. The GO's illuminance proved to be more akin to the values presented in the product sheets
410 of commercially available otoscopes, such as the Welch Allyn Pocket LED and Pocket Plus LED
411 Otoscope, which reported 1240 lx and 1540 lx, respectively, at a 50 mm working distance with a
412 4 mm specula (25). Moreover, the GO emitted a cooler light, 9406 K, compared to their
413 otoscope, 6700 K, however, as stated previously, CCT has limited utility in the evaluation of
414 otoscopy efficacy.

415 Finally, the FOV of the GO was noticeably larger than the FOV of Capobussi and Moja's
416 otoscope, with diameters of 11.0 mm and 4 mm, respectively. Their methodology was not
417 specified, however, it is conceivable they reported the aperture diameter of the specula or
418 otoscope head rather than the field diameter as viewed through the lens as 4 mm would be
419 suboptimal for otoscopy, given the average adult tympanic membrane approximates 8 mm to
420 10 mm in diameter.(48) Thus, there were key differences identified between the GO and
421 Capobussi and Moja's otoscope, including position of the LEDs, the type of lens, and certain
422 measured outcomes.

423 In summary, several similarities and differences were identified between the open-source,
424 3D-printed otoscopes. Comparable performance between the otoscopes is plausible if they were
425 optimized and subject to the same methodology, considering their equivalence in power source
426 and magnification. Importantly, Capobussi and Moja highlighted the modularity of their design
427 and the ability of the consumer-maker community to rapidly iterate and improve their designs.
428 They substantiated this claim by rapidly designing and producing an otoscope with an UV light

429 source. Moreover, they proposed additional innovations, such as enhancing its magnification by
430 integrating a second Fresnel lens, as well as expanding its versatility by designing a handle
431 capable of accommodating interchangeable heads for otoscopy, dermoscopy, and
432 ophthalmoscopy.(19) The open-source design of both 3D-printed otoscopes affords significant
433 potential and fostering the consumer-maker community will help further accelerate innovation in
434 this field. Overall, both otoscopes demonstrate the opportunity for open-source, 3D-printed
435 medical devices to improve access and positively impact the health and well-being of patients
436 globally.

437

438 **Standardized outcomes for the benchtop evaluation of otoscope** 439 **performance**

440 The Oscope Assessment Tool (OAT) establishes a standardized set of outcomes most
441 relevant to otoscopy performance (S1). The tool evaluates a test otoscope against a traditional
442 under three categories of performance characteristics: light source, lens, and miscellaneous.
443 Working distance for light source and lens characteristics is set at 12.5mm. For the light source,
444 measured outcomes include illuminance (lx) and Colour Rendering Index (CIE-Rf). For the lens,
445 measured outcomes include spatial resolution (lp/mm), and field of view (mm). Finally,
446 Miscellaneous outcomes include weight (g), battery life (hours), and cost (\$USD).

447

448 **Limitations**

449 Several limitations were noted in the present study. One primary constraint was the
450 limited sample size. Initially, this was considered adequate for a preliminary benchtop study,

451 accompanied by basic statistical analysis. Logistical challenges and resource limitations during
452 the COVID-19 pandemic further justified this approach. Future studies requiring more complex
453 analyses could increase the sample size of each otoscope to account for intra-model variances.

454 Next, although the Ople Light Master III is highly regarded among lighting
455 professionals and enthusiasts as a cost-effective solution to spectrophotometry, it is not a true
456 spectrophotometer. It samples visible wavelengths through its 6-channel photodiode array then
457 transmits the signal to the IC, which uses an algorithm to compare the input against a set of
458 reference values. It approximates the true value with an accuracy cited to be within 5% and
459 resolving powers of 1 lx and 1 K. Thus, the level of accuracy and precision of the outcomes
460 measured with the Ople Light Master III, illuminance, CCT, and CRI, were likely diminished to
461 some degree compared to those potentially attained with a true spectrophotometer.

462 Finally, the GO's open-source design introduces variability depending on sourcing of
463 materials, printing, and assembly, which may result in variable performance of a device
464 assembled outside Glia when compared to our measured outcomes. Indeed, variability appears
465 inherent in the open-source 3D printing landscape and represents a potential limitation to the
466 external validity of the GO. Capobussi and Moja asserted that even a millimetric difference in
467 LED positioning for their device led to suboptimal performance.⁽¹⁹⁾ Glia's otoscope is designed
468 to be simple to assemble and test, thereby reducing this variability. In addition to the Bill of
469 Materials, Glia provides an assembly manual, lens creation guide, and assembly video. Since its
470 release in 2018, the Glia Otoscope V1.0 has been assembled by professional and amateur makers
471 with excellent results, so there is some evidence that consistency can be achieved with the
472 current design and instruction sets. Nevertheless, device construction by other groups and

473 individuals may result in differences, especially if those groups do not faithfully observe the Bill
474 of Materials and instructions.

475

476 **Future research**

477 As of May 2023, considerable progress has been made on the development of the GO
478 V2.0. Its design has been fully remodeled in FreeCAD, an open-source software, and simplified
479 so that it requires fewer 3D-printed parts and a minimal use of adhesives, facilitating easier
480 assembly and improved durability. The complete set of FreeCAD models for all Glia Otoscope
481 V2.0 components are freely available at <https://github.com/GliaX/Otoscope>. After the Glia
482 Otoscope V2.0's design and production are finalized, a benchtop non-inferiority trial is
483 warranted to evaluate its performance against the GO V1.0 and a TO using the standards
484 specified by the Performance of Otoscopy Evaluation Tool. If the GO V2.0 demonstrates non-
485 inferiority compared to the TO, a follow-up clinical study would be warranted, in which intra
486 and inter-rater reliability in the diagnosis of otologic pathology could be compared. An adjacent
487 qualitative evaluation could be conducted by administering a Likert-scale questionnaire that
488 surveys operator preferences and ease of use.

489 Another area of future research that warrants investigation is the GO's utility in medical
490 education. Otoscopy training has been identified as an area of deficiency in medical students
491 with low overall satisfaction and confidence regarding their exposure and ability to diagnose
492 pathology.(49) In clinical practice, otolaryngology-related disorders constitute 20-40% of all
493 family medicine encounters and greater than 50% of pediatric primary care patients present with
494 otolaryngology-related complaints.(50) Considering 49.44% of Canadian medical students
495 matched to either Family Medicine or Pediatrics in the 2023 Canadian residency match (51),

496 greater investment of resources towards improving competency in otoscopy is imperative. The
497 GO could be distributed to medical students, at relatively low-cost, which would improve access
498 and provide more opportunities to practice otoscopy. Subsequently, diagnostic acuity and
499 confidence in assessing otologic pathology could be evaluated.

500 Finally, multidisciplinary research is paramount to ensure proper implementation and
501 scale-up of the GO in LMICs and low-resource settings. Specifically, innovations in processes
502 will be critical to the real-world adoption of the GO. Best practices for establishing product
503 development partnerships, managing cultural barriers, and implementing international product
504 standards must be investigated further. Additionally, direct engagement and dialogue with
505 healthcare professionals and key stakeholders in LMICs and low-resource settings will be
506 essential for ensuring feasibility and comprehensive understanding of cost, wider economic
507 effects, challenges of distribution, human resources, and energy infrastructure. Ultimately,
508 innovations in processes will be required to ensure the GO is not just accessible but also
509 acceptable in meeting the unique needs of those across various LMICs and low-resource
510 settings.(8)

511

512 **Acknowledgements**

513 We would like to thank Carrie Wakem, Dr. Melanie Columbus, Jennifer Wilson, Steve Plimmer,
514 Dr. Hugh Kim, Dr. Mohammed Chamma, and the Department of Otolaryngology/Head & Neck
515 Surgery at Queen's University for their support of this project and its authors.

516

517 **References**

518 1. Kravetz RE. A look back. The Otoscope. Am J Gastroenterol. 2002 Feb;97(2):470–470.

- 519 2. Mankowski NL, Raggio BS. Otoscope Exam. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL):
520 StatPearls Publishing; 2023 [cited 2023 May 23]. Available from:
521 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK553163/>
- 522 3. World Health Organization. Chronic suppurative otitis media : burden of illness and
523 management options [Internet]. World Health Organization; 2004 [cited 2023 Jun 6].
524 Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/42941>
- 525 4. Monasta L, Ronfani L, Marchetti F, Montico M, Brumatti LV, Bavcar A, et al. Burden of
526 Disease Caused by Otitis Media: Systematic Review and Global Estimates. PLOS ONE.
527 2012 Apr 30;7(4):e36226.
- 528 5. Ahmed S, Shapiro NL, Bhattacharyya N. Incremental health care utilization and costs for
529 acute otitis media in children. The Laryngoscope. 2014;124(1):301–5.
- 530 6. Blaikie A, Sandford-Smith J, Tuteja SY, Williams CD, O’Callaghan C. Arclight: a pocket
531 ophthalmoscope for the 21st century. BMJ. 2016 Dec 14;355:i6637.
- 532 7. stethoscopeco [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jun 7]. Welch Allyn 3.5 V Halogen HPX Otoscope Set
533 with MacroView Otoscope wit. Available from: <https://stethoscope.ca/products/welch-allyn-3-5-v-halogen-hpx-otoscope-set-with-macroview-otoscope-with-throat-illuminator>
534
- 535 8. Howitt P, Darzi A, Yang GZ, Ashrafian H, Atun R, Barlow J, et al. Technologies for global
536 health. The Lancet. 2012 Aug;380(9840):507–35.
- 537 9. World Health Organization. WHO compendium of innovative health technologies for low-
538 resource settings 2016-2017 [Internet]. 2018. Available from:
539 https://www.who.int/medical_devices/innovation/compendium/en/
- 540 10. Marks IH, Thomas H, Bakhet M, Fitzgerald E. Medical equipment donation in low-resource
541 settings: a review of the literature and guidelines for surgery and anaesthesia in low-income
542 and middle-income countries. BMJ Glob Health. 2019 Sep 29;4(5):e001785.
- 543 11. Choosing Wisely Canada [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jun 7]. Emergency Medicine. Available
544 from: <https://choosingwiselycanada.org/recommendation/emergency-medicine/>
- 545 12. Respiratory Tract Infections - Antibiotic Prescribing: Prescribing of Antibiotics for Self-
546 Limiting Respiratory Tract Infections in Adults and Children in Primary Care [Internet].
547 London: National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE); 2008 [cited 2023 May
548 29]. (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence: Guidelines). Available from:
549 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK53632/>
- 550 13. Researchers develop 3D-printed stethoscope for use in war zones, low-income areas | CTV
551 News [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jun 7]. Available from:
552 [https://www.ctvnews.ca/health/researchers-develop-3d-printed-stethoscope-for-use-in-war-
553 zones-low-income-areas-1.3842994](https://www.ctvnews.ca/health/researchers-develop-3d-printed-stethoscope-for-use-in-war-zones-low-income-areas-1.3842994)

- 554 14. Pavlosky A, Glauche J, Chambers S, Al-Alawi M, Yanev K, Loubani T. Validation of an
555 effective, low cost, Free/open access 3D-printed stethoscope. PLOS ONE. 2018 Mar
556 14;13(3):e0193087.
- 557 15. The Glia Project [@Glia_Intl]. 472 #3dprinted stethoscopes packaged up and ready to send
558 to first year #medstudents @SchulichMedDent, @uOttawaMed and @uoftmedicine! All
559 #opensource and all with #equalcare in mind. <https://t.co/JE9JIDyiFU> [Internet]. Twitter.
560 2022 [cited 2023 Jun 7]. Available from:
561 https://twitter.com/Glia_Intl/status/1494764289898561547
- 562 16. Glia [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jun 7]. The Glia Stethoscope Project. Available from:
563 <https://glia.org/pages/stethoscope>
- 564 17. Glia [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jun 7]. The Glia Otoscope Project. Available from:
565 <https://glia.org/pages/otoscope>
- 566 18. 3D printed otoscope - Appropedia [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jun 7]. Available from:
567 https://www.appropedia.org/3D_printed_otoscope
- 568 19. Capobussi M, Moja L. An open-access and inexpensive 3D printed otoscope for low-
569 resource settings and health crises. 3D Print Med. 2021 Nov 17;7(1):36.
- 570 20. Tötterman M, Jukarainen S, Sinkkonen ST, Klockars T. A Comparison of Four Digital
571 Oscopes in a Teleconsultation Setting. The Laryngoscope. 2020;130(6):1572–6.
- 572 21. Chan KN, Silverstein A, Bryan LN, McCracken CE, Little WK, Shane AL. Comparison of a
573 Smartphone Oscope and Conventional Oscope in the Diagnosis and Management of
574 Acute Otitis Media. Clin Pediatr (Phila). 2019 Mar 1;58(3):302–6.
- 575 22. Kravchychyn FDB, Meurer AT de O, Nogueira MHSDP, Balieiro FO, Balsalobre F de A,
576 Barauna Filho IS, et al. Smartphone-enabled otoscopy: method evaluation in clinical
577 practice. Braz J Otorhinolaryngol. 2023 Jan 1;89(1):122–7.
- 578 23. Hey SY, Buckley JC, Shahsavari S, Kousha O, Haddow KA, Blaikie A, et al. A mixed
579 methods comparative evaluation of a low cost otoscope (Arclight) with a traditional device
580 in twenty-one clinicians. Clin Otolaryngol. 2019 Nov;44(6):1101–4.
- 581 24. Dispomed [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jun 7]. Welch Allyn MacroView Oscope. Available
582 from: <https://www.dispomed.com/products/welch-allyn-macroview-otoscope/>
- 583 25. Welch Allyn Pocket PLUS LED Oscope 22880 (BLACK) with Soft carry case :
584 Amazon.in: Industrial & Scientific [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jun 7]. Available from:
585 <https://www.amazon.in/OTICA-Welch-Pocket-LED-Oscope/dp/B07YFLCP5N?th=1>
- 586 26. Axiom Medical Supplies [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jun 7]. Welch Allyn Oscope Diagnostic
587 Type 2.5 Volt LED Pocket - M-1010733-4466 | Each. Available from:
588 [https://axiommedicals.com/products/welch-allyn-otoscope-diagnostic-type-2-5-volt-led-](https://axiommedicals.com/products/welch-allyn-otoscope-diagnostic-type-2-5-volt-led-pocket-m-1010733-4466-each)
589 [pocket-m-1010733-4466-each](https://axiommedicals.com/products/welch-allyn-otoscope-diagnostic-type-2-5-volt-led-pocket-m-1010733-4466-each)

- 590 27. ams [Internet]. [cited 2023 Apr 10]. AS7262 Spectral Sensing Engine. Available from:
591 <https://ams.com/en/as7262>
- 592 28. <https://www.facebook.com/1lumenflashlights>. <https://1lumen.com/>. 2022 [cited 2023 Jun 7].
593 Cheap device to measure color temperature of light / flashlights (Opplé Light Master 3 PRO
594). Available from: <https://1lumen.com/gear-review/opple-light-master-3-pro/>
- 595 29. Opplé Light Master III (G3) discussion thread (Cheap device for measuring Lux, CCT +
596 CRI) - Flashlight Modding and DIY Parts - BudgetLightForum.com [Internet]. [cited 2023
597 Apr 10]. Available from: [https://budgetlightforum.com/t/opple-light-master-iii-g3-](https://budgetlightforum.com/t/opple-light-master-iii-g3-discussion-thread-cheap-device-for-measuring-lux-cct-cri/67890/471)
598 [discussion-thread-cheap-device-for-measuring-lux-cct-cri/67890/471](https://budgetlightforum.com/t/opple-light-master-iii-g3-discussion-thread-cheap-device-for-measuring-lux-cct-cri/67890/471)
- 599 30. Opplé Light Master Pro 3 - Light at Speed [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Jun 7]. Available
600 from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=onara4C-hQc>
- 601 31. OPPLÉ Lighting | Light-master-III [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jun 7]. Available from:
602 <https://www.opple.eu/en/product/indoor/light-master/light-master-g3/light-master-iii>
- 603 32. Bedard N, Shope T, Hoberman A, Haralam MA, Shaikh N, Kovačević J, et al. Light field
604 otoscope design for 3D in vivo imaging of the middle ear. *Biomed Opt Express*. 2016 Dec
605 14;8(1):260–72.
- 606 33. Pfefer J, Agrawal A. A review of consensus test methods for established medical imaging
607 modalities and their implications for optical coherence tomography. In: *Design and Quality*
608 *for Biomedical Technologies V* [Internet]. SPIE; 2012 [cited 2023 May 30]. p. 65–74.
609 Available from: [https://www.spiedigitallibrary.org/conference-proceedings-of-](https://www.spiedigitallibrary.org/conference-proceedings-of-spie/8215/82150D/A-review-of-consensus-test-methods-for-established-medical-imaging/10.1117/12.912371.full)
610 [spie/8215/82150D/A-review-of-consensus-test-methods-for-established-medical-](https://www.spiedigitallibrary.org/conference-proceedings-of-spie/8215/82150D/A-review-of-consensus-test-methods-for-established-medical-imaging/10.1117/12.912371.full)
611 [imaging/10.1117/12.912371.full](https://www.spiedigitallibrary.org/conference-proceedings-of-spie/8215/82150D/A-review-of-consensus-test-methods-for-established-medical-imaging/10.1117/12.912371.full)
- 612 34. Lens Rating System Used in These Pages [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jun 7]. Available from:
613 http://www.takinami.com/yoshihiko/photo/lens_test/pdml-procedure_c.html
- 614 35. Stethoscope.ca (@stethoscope_ca) • Instagram photos and videos [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jun
615 7]. Available from: https://www.instagram.com/stethoscope_ca/
- 616 36. Barriga F, Schwartz RH, Hayden GF. Adequate Illumination for Otoscopy: Variations due to
617 Power Source, Bulb, and Head and Speculum Design. *Am J Dis Child*. 1986 Dec
618 1;140(12):1237–40.
- 619 37. color rendering index (CRI) (of a light source) - Illuminating Engineering Society [Internet].
620 [cited 2023 Jun 7]. Available from: [https://www.ies.org/definitions/color-rendering-index-](https://www.ies.org/definitions/color-rendering-index-cri-of-a-light-source/)
621 [cri-of-a-light-source/](https://www.ies.org/definitions/color-rendering-index-cri-of-a-light-source/)
- 622 38. Government of Canada CFIA. Lighting in an establishment [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2023 May
623 20]. Available from: [https://inspection.canada.ca/preventive-](https://inspection.canada.ca/preventive-controls/lighting/eng/1511197522669/1528205027203)
624 [controls/lighting/eng/1511197522669/1528205027203](https://inspection.canada.ca/preventive-controls/lighting/eng/1511197522669/1528205027203)

- 625 39. Institute CC. Light, ultraviolet and infrared [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2023 May 22]. Available
626 from: [https://www.canada.ca/en/conservation-institute/services/agents-](https://www.canada.ca/en/conservation-institute/services/agents-deterioration/light.html)
627 [deterioration/light.html](https://www.canada.ca/en/conservation-institute/services/agents-deterioration/light.html)
- 628 40. Soltic S, Chalmers A. Optimization of LED Lighting for Clinical Settings. *J Healthc Eng*.
629 2019 Aug 27;2019:5016013.
- 630 41. Rothman R, Owens T, Simel DL. Does This Child Have Acute Otitis Media? *JAMA*. 2003
631 Sep 24;290(12):1633–40.
- 632 42. Position Statement on CRI and Colour Quality Metrics (October 15, 2015) | CIE [Internet].
633 [cited 2023 May 22]. Available from: [https://cie.co.at/publications/position-statement-cri-](https://cie.co.at/publications/position-statement-cri-and-colour-quality-metrics-october-15-2015)
634 [and-colour-quality-metrics-october-15-2015](https://cie.co.at/publications/position-statement-cri-and-colour-quality-metrics-october-15-2015)
- 635 43. Jost S, Cauwerts C, Avouac P. CIE 2017 color fidelity index Rf: a better index to predict
636 perceived color difference? *J Opt Soc Am A Opt Image Sci Vis*. 2018 Apr 1;35(4):B202–13.
- 637 44. Davis W, Ohno Y. Color quality scale. *Opt Eng*. 2010 Mar;49(3):033602.
- 638 45. Lee S, Yoon HC. LED lighting system for better color rendition space: the effect of color
639 rendering index. *J Asian Archit Build Eng*. 2021 Sep 3;20(5):556–65.
- 640 46. Ear Examination | HealthLink BC [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jun 7]. Available from:
641 <https://www.healthlinkbc.ca/tests-treatments-medications/medical-tests/ear-examination>
- 642 47. Davis A, Kühnlenz F. Optical Design using Fresnel Lenses. *Opt Photonik*. 2007;2(4):52–5.
- 643 48. Jeught SV der, Dirckx JJJ. Real-time structured light-based otoscopy for quantitative
644 measurement of eardrum deformation. *J Biomed Opt*. 2017 Jan;22(1):016008.
- 645 49. Niermeyer WL, Philips RHW, Essig GF, Moberly AC. Diagnostic accuracy and confidence
646 for otoscopy: Are medical students receiving sufficient training? *The Laryngoscope*. 2019
647 Aug;129(8):1891–7.
- 648 50. Campisi P, Asaria J, Brown D. Undergraduate Otolaryngology Education in Canadian
649 Medical Schools. *The Laryngoscope*. 2008;118(11):1941–50.
- 650 51. CaRMS Forum Presentation is now live! - CaRMS [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jun 7]. Available
651 from: <https://www.carms.ca/news/carms-forum-presentation-is-now-live-3-2/>

652

653 **Supporting Information**

654 **S1 Fig. The Otoscope Assessment Tool (OAT) for the technical evaluation of clinically**
655 **relevant outcomes for 3D-printed otoscope.**




Figure 1




Figure 2



Figure 3A




Figure 4



Figure 3B




Figure 5