

1 **Great expectations: Aligning visual prosthetic development with implantee needs**

2 Lucas Gil Nadolskis^{1,†,*}, Lily Marie Turkstra^{2,†}, Ebenezer Larnyo³, Michael Beyeler^{2,4}

3 ¹Interdepartmental Graduate Program in Dynamical Neuroscience, University of California, Santa

4 Barbara

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

6 ³Center for Black Studies Research, University of California, Santa Barbara

7 ⁴Department of Computer Science, University of California, Santa Barbara

8 [†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

9 *Corresponding author: lgilnadolskis@ucsb.edu

10

11 *Word count:* 5,081

12 *Funding information:* Research reported in this publication was partially supported by the National

13 Library Of Medicine of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number DP2LM014268. The

14 content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of

15 the National Institutes of Health.

16 *Commercial relationships:* None.

17 **Abstract**

18 *Purpose:* Visual prosthetics have emerged as a promising assistive technology for individuals with vision
19 loss, yet research often overlooks the human aspects of this technology. While previous studies have
20 concentrated on the perceptual experiences of implant recipients (implantees) or the attitudes of potential
21 implantees towards near-future implants, a systematic account of how current implants are being used in
22 everyday life is still lacking.

23 *Methods:* We interviewed six recipients of the most widely used visual implants (Argus II and Orion) and
24 six leading researchers in the field. Through thematic and statistical analyses, we explored the daily usage
25 of these implants by implantees and compared their responses to the expectations of researchers. We also
26 sought implantees' input on desired features for future versions, aiming to inform the development of the
27 next generation of implants.

28 *Results:* Although implants are designed to facilitate various daily activities, we found that implantees use
29 them less frequently than researchers expected. This discrepancy primarily stems from issues with
30 usability and reliability, with implantees finding alternative methods to accomplish tasks, reducing the
31 need to rely on the implant. For future implants, implantees emphasized the desire for improved vision,
32 smart integration, and increased independence.

33 *Conclusions:* Our study reveals a significant gap between researcher expectations and implantee
34 experiences with visual prostheses, underscoring the importance of focusing future research on usability
35 and real-world application.

36 *Translational relevance:* This work advocates for a better alignment between technology development
37 and implantee needs to enhance clinical relevance and practical utility of visual prosthetics.

38 **Introduction**

39 Visual neuroprostheses, such as retinal and cortical implants (colloquially referred to as “bionic eyes”),
40 have emerged as a promising assistive technology for individuals with blindness¹⁻⁷. Analogous to
41 cochlear implants, these devices electrically stimulate surviving neurons in the visual pathway to evoke
42 visual percepts (phosphenes)^{8,9}. Existing devices generally provide an improved ability to localize high-
43 contrast objects and perform basic orientation & mobility tasks^{4,10}. Notable examples include Argus II¹
44 (Second Sight Medical Products, Inc., Sylmar, CA), the first retinal implant to obtain FDA approval, and
45 its successor, Orion⁷ (Cortigent, Inc., Valencia, CA; formerly Second Sight), a cortical implant that is
46 currently in clinical trials (clinicaltrials.gov: NCT03344848). Whereas Argus II has been implanted in
47 388 Argus II recipients worldwide (157 female and 231 male; personal communication with Cortigent,
48 Inc, 2024.), Orion started its clinical trial in the US with six implant recipients (1 female and 5 male), of
49 which three remain implanted.

50 Deeply rooted in the field of ophthalmological restorative medicine, most current research in this field
51 adheres to the medical model of disability¹¹; that is, a perspective which sees blindness as a result of an
52 individual's physical impairment that can be “fixed” – in this case, with an invasive prosthesis. As pointed
53 out by Refs.¹²⁻¹⁴, the majority of research on visual prostheses (and more generally: low vision aids) has
54 primarily focused on technological and functional aspects of these implants (e.g., the ability to produce
55 phosphenes and the resulting Snellen acuity) and has rarely incorporated implant recipients (*implantees*)
56 in the decision-making and design process¹⁴. However, blindness is not just about one’s physical
57 impairment, but also about the individual’s subjective psychological experience and the societal contexts
58 in which they live^{15,16}. In the development and evaluation of assistive technologies for people who are
59 blind, it is crucial to focus not only on the technical aspects but also on the wants, needs, and lived
60 experiences of the end users, studying how they might utilize such devices within their daily lives. This
61 approach ensures that technology serves the user, enhancing their quality of life rather than solely aiming
62 to correct a physical condition.

63 Although tools and surveys have been developed to provide a subjective assessment to capture the
64 functional visual ability and well-being of an implantee^{10,17,18}, in practice these are often employed as an
65 external validation tool that constitutes the very last step of the design process^{44,17}. It is therefore perhaps
66 not surprising that none of the current devices have found broad adoption, and that several device
67 manufacturers had to close their doors because their device did not (such as in the case of Retina Implant
68 AG) lead to “the concrete benefit in everyday life of those affected”¹.

69 This lack of end-user involvement and limited adoption underscores the necessity for a deeper exploration
70 into how implants are actually used in daily life, contrasted with the initial expectations of their designers.
71 Despite numerous studies assessing functional vision^{4,6,17} and documenting the experiences of current
72 implantees^{10,13,19,20}, as well as discussions on ethical considerations in trial participant selection^{21,22} and
73 the attitudes of blind individuals toward implant technology²³, a comprehensive understanding of the real-
74 world application of these devices remains elusive.

75 This study aims to explore the perspectives, experiences, practices, and aspirations of individuals who
76 have received one of the most commonly available visual implants (Argus II or Orion). It also seeks to
77 contrast these user insights with the viewpoints of prominent researchers who are either involved in
78 developing these devices or who interact directly with the implantees. We also sought feedback from
79 implantees to identify current technology limitations and gather suggestions for future enhancements.
80 Through reconciling the viewpoints of both researchers and implantees as well as fostering cooperative
81 efforts in the design process, we hope that the next generation of visual prosthetic technology can have a
82 profound impact on the quality of life of millions of people worldwide.

83 **Methods**

84 We conducted semi-structured interviews with 12 participants (six researchers and six implantees) to
85 assess the actual frequency of implant usage among Argus II and Orion users, and compared the reported

¹ <https://web.archive.org/web/20200805082212/https://www.retina-implant.de/en>

86 usage to researcher expectations. This sample represents roughly 1% of the global Argus II population
87 and 67% of the individuals who still have the Orion implant, reflecting the rarity of these implants in both
88 commercial and clinical settings. We initially posed structured questions covering an extensive array of
89 instrumental activities of daily living²²⁻²⁵ (iADLs). We then engaged in open-ended discussions to delve
90 into which strategies and usage patterns that implantees and researchers deemed effective or ineffective,
91 and what the implantees hope to see in the next generation of implants.

92 Informed consent was obtained from all participants after confirmed understanding of the expectations of
93 the interview. The study was deemed exempt from review by the Institutional Review Board of the
94 University of California, Santa Barbara.

95 *Study participants*

96 Twelve participants (2 female and 10 male) were recruited via email and phone through a combination of
97 snowball sampling and connections with various research groups and previous collaborators (**Tables 1-2**).

98 To qualify for the study, implantees (I1-6) had to be current recipients of either the Argus II or Orion
99 implant. All implantees have had their implant for at least five years, remain currently implanted with
100 their respective devices, and none had reported medical complications with the device. Five out of six
101 implantees lived with either family or a spouse while one lived alone, and all were frequent users of
102 assistive technology both inside and outside of the home. In addition, four out of five reported to be users
103 of either a cane or a guide dog, while one reported using both and one preferred not to answer. All
104 participants resided in either the United States or the Netherlands.

105 The other six participants (R1-6) were researchers, either principal investigators or medical professionals,
106 who are currently working with Orion, or had previously worked with either Orion or Argus II within the
107 last five years. R2, R3, and R6 had experience with both Argus II and Orion. None of the researchers
108 reported having any visual impairment.

Subject	Implant	Gender	Age	Education	Employment status	Years blind	Years implanted	Residential area	Living arrangement	Mobility aid	Top accessibility aids
I1	Orion	male	25-44	High school	fully employed	11-20	1-5	city	with family	mobility cane	AI-based smartphone apps, Google maps, voiceover, JAWS
I2	Argus II	male	45-64	Master's degree	partially employed	20+	6-10	urban	with family	mobility cane	Voiceover, many different smartphone apps
I3	Orion	male	45-64	Bachelor's degree	not employed	11-20	1-5	urban	with sighted spouse	mobility cane	Screen reader
I4	Argus II	male	25-44	Associate's degree	fully employed	20+	6-10	urban	with sighted spouse	guide dog	iPhone with voiceover, navigation apps, social media
I5	Argus II	male	45-64	Bachelor's degree	not employed	20+	6-10	urban	with family	prefer not to say	Amazon Echo, Siri on phone
I6	Argus II	female	65+	Bachelor's degree	not employed	20+	6-10	city	alone	mobility cane, guide dog	iPhone, Android phone, computer with JAWS

110 **Table 1.** Participant demographics for each of our interviewed implantees (I1-6). “Education” indicates the highest education level completed.

111 “Living Situation” provides a description of other individuals that our participants currently live with, if any.

112

Subject	Implant	Gender	Age	Education	Work sector	Focus area	Years in field
R1	Argus II	female	25-44	PhD	academia	implantee-centric	5-10
R2	Argus II, Orion	male	25-44	PhD	industry, academia	implantee-centric	15-20
R3	Argus II, Orion	male	45-64	PhD	industry	both device-centric and implantee-centric	15-20
R4	Argus II	male	45-64	Bachelor's Degree	industry, academia	implantee-centric	5-10 (with Argus, 35-40 with oph rehab)
R5	Orion	male	25-44	MD/PhD	academia	device-centric	1-5 (7th year resident, one of his projects was with Orion (trial started 2017))
R6	Argus II, Orion	male	45-64	PhD	industry	device-centric	10-15

114 **Table 2.** Participant demographics for each of our interviewed researchers (R1-6). “Education” indicates the highest education level completed.
115 “Academia/Industry” refers to the affiliation of their current work. Researchers were not asked about their living situation. None of the researchers
116 were blind.

117 *Interview procedure*

118 The interviews were conducted via Zoom by the two lead researchers of the study, one blind and one
119 sighted. Transcripts were generated using the Otter AI transcription software (Mountain View, CA) and
120 analyzed manually by the research team. Each interview lasted between 30 and 90 minutes.

121 Three probing interview questions were presented to implantees in order to further understand their
122 experience with their device:

- 123 ● Q1-I: How often do you use your implant for <iADL>? Choose from: daily, weekly, monthly,
124 yearly, never.
- 125 ● Q2-I: Please give some examples of how your implant supports <iADL>. What works? What
126 does not?
- 127 ● Q3-I: What do you wish your implant could do to support/facilitate <iADL>?

128 These questions were repeated for each of twelve iADLs, which we drew from previous literature²⁴⁻²⁷ to
129 ensure a broad spectrum of everyday tasks. These iADLs included essential activities such as meal
130 preparation, housekeeping, transportation, and socializing, chosen for their relevance to independence and
131 quality of life for blind individuals. For each of these iADLs, we formulated a series of questions aimed at
132 uncovering not only the frequency and extent of visual prosthetic use, but also the practical benefits and
133 limitations experienced by implantees.

134 In addition, we sought to understand the discrepancy between the expected and actual use of these
135 devices. Researchers were therefore presented with a similar set of questions, but were asked to reply
136 based on their perception of an implantee's device usage:

- 137 ● Q1-R: How often do you expect implantees to use the implant you currently work with for
138 <iADL>? Choose from: daily, weekly, monthly, yearly, never.
- 139 ● Q2-R: Please give some examples of how the implant you currently work with might support
140 <iADL>.

141 ***Data analysis***

142 To gain a quantitative understanding of device usage, we converted the answers to Q1-I and Q1-R to a
143 numerical five-point scale (0: never, 1: yearly, 2: monthly, 3: weekly, 4: daily), and used a linear mixed
144 model to test whether the answers of implantees and researchers were statistically different. This is a valid
145 transformation, since the original data is ordinal in nature (i.e., “daily” > “weekly”, “weekly” >
146 “monthly”) and our mapping to numerical values preserves this order. The linear mixed model used group
147 (“researcher” vs. “implantee”) as a fixed effect and random intercepts for each subject to account for
148 individual differences. The analysis included 144 observations across 12 unique subjects, with each
149 subject contributing 12 observations. The model was estimated using restricted maximum likelihood
150 (REML) via the `statsmodels` (v0.14.1) package in Python 3.10. We further performed pairwise
151 Tukey's Honest Significant Difference (HSD) tests for each iADL to test the hypothesis that implantees
152 used their device less frequently than researchers expected.

153 To get a qualitative understanding of the device usage for the different iADLs, we performed an inductive
154 thematic analysis²⁸ on Q2-I, Q-R, and Q3-I. Themes were individually identified from transcripts, with
155 new ones added for unclassified examples. This iterative process continued across all transcripts until no
156 new themes emerged, culminating in a consensus on 13 definitive themes. Both implantees' and
157 researchers' responses were categorized under these themes, with unique codes assigned to each for
158 systematic analysis.

Subject	Meal Prep	House-keeping	Laundry	Reading	Shopping	Transportation	Finances	Medication	Personal electronic devices	Socializing	Hobbies	Employment
I1	Never	Yearly	Monthly	Never	Yearly	Never	Never	Never	Never	Monthly	Yearly	Never
I2	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Monthly	Never	Never	Never	Yearly	Never	Yearly
I3	Never	Never	Never	Never	Daily	Daily	Never	Never	Never	Daily	Weekly	Daily
I4	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never
I5	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Yearly	Never	Never	Never	Yearly	Never	Never
I6	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never
R1	Daily	Daily	Weekly	Never	Never	Daily	Never	Never	Never	Daily	Monthly	Yearly
R2	Never	Never	Weekly	Never	Weekly	Monthly	Never	Never	Never	Daily	Never	Weekly
R3	Daily	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Weekly	Weekly	Yearly	Monthly	Monthly	Daily	Weekly	Daily
R4	Weekly	Weekly	Weekly	Never	Weekly	Daily	Daily	Never	Never	Daily	Weekly	Daily
R5	Daily	Daily	Daily	Daily	Daily	Daily	Daily	Daily	Daily	Daily	Daily	Never
R6	Weekly	Weekly	Weekly	Never	Weekly	Daily	Yearly	Daily	Never	Daily	Weekly	Daily

160 **Table 3.** Implantee (I1-6) reports and researcher (R1-6) perception of implant use frequency for each iADL, using the scale: Daily, Weekly,

161 Monthly, Yearly, or Never.

162 **Results**

163 *Implant usage expectations vs. reported outcomes*

164 The responses to Q1-I and Q1-R for each iADL are shown in **Table 3**. Participant I3 was reportedly the
165 most prolific implant user, relying daily on his Orion device for several indoor and outdoor activities. He
166 particularly values the device's assistance outdoors where it complements his mobility cane and aids him
167 in navigating streets, identifying buildings, and discerning the status of doors, notably on buses and trains.
168 Participant I1 reported using his implant occasionally for laundry and socializing (“monthly”) and rarely
169 for housekeeping, shopping, or hobbies (“yearly”). Participants I2 and I5 both use their implants for
170 transportation (with limited success) and in social settings.


171 However, the most common answer to how often implantees used their device for a certain iADL was:
172 “never.” I4 and I6 reported that they never used their implant for any everyday activities. Though some
173 may have made use of their implants for these activities in the past, none of the implantees reported
174 currently using their implant for meal preparation, reading, managing finances, managing medication, or
175 using personal electronic devices.

176 This is in stark contrast to the responses of the interviewed researchers, who expected the implant to apply
177 to all iADLs at least to some degree. R3, R5, and R6, who had more device-centric roles at their jobs,
178 expected the implant to be used daily or weekly for most iADLs, although R6 acknowledged that actual
179 device usage may vary from person to person. All researchers agreed that socialization would likely be
180 the most prolific use of the implant. R5 was especially adamant about his expectation of the implant being
181 useful for every iADL on the list except for employment.

182 To allow for a more quantitative comparison between researcher and implantee responses, we converted
183 these answers to a numerical five-point scale (**Figure 1**) and used a linear mixed model to confirm that
184 the answers of implantees and researchers were statistically different. The group effect (researchers vs.
185 implantees) showed a significant difference in rating values ($z = 4.723, p < 0.001$), indicating a strong

186 influence of group membership on the outcome. Specifically, researchers rated the frequency of device
 187 usage significantly higher than implantees, with an estimated increase of 2.0 in rating value (e.g., from
 188 “yearly” to “weekly”, or from “monthly” to “daily”) as compared to implantees ($SE = 0.423, z = 4.723, p$
 189 $< .001, 95\% CI [1.170, 2.830]$). The variance attributed to random intercepts for subjects was estimated to
 190 be 0.407, suggesting variability in rating values across subjects. The model's convergence was
 191 successfully achieved, ensuring the reliability of these estimates.

192 In pairwise comparisons using Tukey's Honest Significant Difference (HSD) test, researchers were
 193 consistently found to have significantly higher frequency ratings compared to implantees ($p < .05$) for
 194 meal preparation, housekeeping, laundry, transportation, socializing, and hobbies, with mean differences
 195 ranging from 1.8333 to 3.0.



196
 197 **Figure 1:** Implantee and research perceptions implant use frequency for each iADL. Same data as
 198 presented in Table 2, converted to a numerical five-point scale (0: never, 1: yearly, 2: monthly, 3: weekly,
 199 4: daily). Significant differences between implantee and research perceptions (corrected for multiple
 200 comparisons using Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test) are denoted as *: $p < .05$, **: $p < .01$, ***:
 201 $p < .001$.

202 *Examples of implant usage in the daily life of implantees*

203 To gain insight into the everyday use of their devices by implantees, we solicited specific examples (Q2-I
204 and Q2-R) and compared these with researchers' expectations of how their devices would be used in
205 implantees' daily life. Activities were sorted by their reported frequency of occurrence, as gathered from
206 our interviews, and the most commonly performed activities are discussed below.

207 *Transportation*

208 One application area that both implantees and researchers agree to be of potential value for a visual
209 implant user is that of transportation. Implantees who live in urban areas remarked that the device proved
210 useful for stepping in and out of the bus, avoiding bumping into walls and other obstacles, and for
211 detecting people when entering and exiting a train. However, the implant could rarely replace the use of a
212 mobility cane or a guide dog completely. In the words of Participant I4:

213 “I use my device in combination with my guide dog - he walks me to the front of a shop. [Then I
214 use the implant] mostly for orienting myself inside.”

215 In contrast, Participants I1 and I6, who reside in the city, report that they never use the implant for
216 navigation. Further inquiry revealed that their limited use did not stem from a lack of effort. Specifically,
217 I6 noted that the ideal scenario for using the implant would be assistance with street-crossing. Yet, the
218 implant's artificial vision proved too inundating and lacked the necessary detail for her to feel secure
219 using it for navigation in a busy city setting, leading her to prefer being driven as a more reliable
220 alternative. She recounts:

221 “I remember my experience crossing the street with the Argus, and that I decided to turn off the
222 stimulation because there were too many flashing lights. The ideal way for me to cross the street
223 is to be able to focus on the important points and detect the distance when crossing...without so
224 much stimulation.”

225 Participants I1, I2, and I5 were quick to remark that the implant slowed them down, as they had learned to
226 (e.g.) navigate much faster and more reliably with a mobility cane. Participant I2 hoped to use the implant
227 for navigation, but remarked that it did not provide any concrete benefit:

228 “I have kind of given up on using it outdoors [...], because I hoped it would serve as a navigation
229 device, or something to help me get my bearings and aid in mobility. But it really doesn't bring any
230 benefit. Lately, I've been involved in research studies, just trying to help people understand and
231 advance the science around it, but it doesn't really provide anything useful enough for me to use in
232 my daily life at all. I don't know if anybody really does [use it in daily life] at this point.”

233 *Socializing*

234 Participant I3 found the implant extremely useful for orientation in social environments, enabling him to
235 monitor the movements of people arriving and departing. This feature was especially helpful for
236 recognizing when someone was approaching to engage in conversation, departing, or coming back, thus
237 helping I3 discern the presence of others nearby. I2 agreed:

238 “You know, if you're sitting at a table, you could maybe tell if somebody was getting up and
239 walking away. Sometimes people have gotten up and walked away while you're talking, and you
240 end up talking to an empty table. So, there could be some minimal benefit to having the [implant]
241 in a social or entertainment environment.”

242 Participant I1 emphasized the implant's significant role in enhancing social experiences and memorable
243 moments, stating:

244 “I use the implant everytime that something new happens to see what I can see. So far I have used
245 it for seeing my birthday candles, fireworks and going to baseball games.”

246 All researchers similarly emphasized the importance of socialization, and how the implants might
247 facilitate this instrumental aspect of daily life. Various use cases of the implant in socialization settings

248 were mentioned, with R1 providing some specific context as to how the implant might have aided in a
249 situation similar to that of I2 above:

250 “When people use their implants ... they can perceive movements: if someone just left, or if the
251 flash of the person that was right in front of them is not there anymore - they can actually pick
252 that up. [The person in front of them] could be anybody, and they won't be able to recognize them
253 as their friend or anything, but at least it's some information.”

254 *Meal preparation*

255 None of the implantees reported using their devices for meal preparation, although most researchers
256 believed the implant could be somewhat helpful. Implantees mentioned that living with family or a
257 spouse, along with utilizing other assistive tools already in place for cooking, proved more useful for
258 these tasks.

259 R1 provided insights into how the device could potentially complement other assistive tools in meal
260 preparation if an implantee chose to use it for this purpose:

261 “One aspect of the process for individuals who've undergone blind rehabilitation involves having
262 an occupational therapist visit their home to label items and make modifications for easier
263 navigation. This can include adding high-contrast colors to cabinets or using tape and paint for
264 visual cues. With these adaptations in place, introducing an implant can further assist by enhancing
265 their ability to perceive contrasts, helping them locate items by size, and distinguish between
266 things like salt and pepper during meal preparation. Although these improvements might seem
267 basic, they could significantly ease daily activities.”

268 Other researchers expressed skepticism regarding the device's suitability for meal preparation, offering
269 more cautious perspectives on its effectiveness as a standalone aid. R6 elaborated on these views:

270 “The device performs much better when you're in high contrast situations, and a kitchen is not
271 necessarily a high contrast situation. So I would anticipate that this is not the ideal usage situation
272 for a system like this.”

273 Implantees reported not currently using their devices for meal preparation tasks, primarily due to safety
274 concerns, reliance on existing strategies, and assistance from other tools and cohabitants. I1 and I4
275 highlighted a lack of specific training on utilizing the implant in the kitchen, leading them to prefer
276 established routines. I1 encapsulated their perspective, stating:

277 “I don't really think I've had any success using the device in the kitchen. I can't even come up
278 with any use cases at the moment.”

279 *Housekeeping, laundry, and tidying*

280 Regarding housekeeping activities like laundry and maintaining general organization, several implantees
281 noted their attempts to incorporate their implants, albeit with challenges. I5 had previously tried to use his
282 implant to do laundry, including sorting his socks, but found that:

283 “The glasses would actually be more of a problem than a solution - and the cord would get in the
284 way.”

285 Other implantees found more success when applying their implants to similar tasks. They noted the
286 implant's utility for specific housekeeping duties, with I1 highlighting the ability to discern whether lights
287 were on or off, aligning with the device's effectiveness in high-contrast situations.

288 Furthermore, researchers had expectations for the implants to facilitate housekeeping activities, especially
289 once an implantee's home had been customized to suit their needs. R1 commented:

290 “Assuming that their home is already modified to help them with these things... I would think
291 that having an implant would only enhance housekeeping, it can actually enhance the contrast or
292 things of that nature for the objects that they are looking at.”

293 *Reading*

294 While current implants fall short of enabling the reading of fine print and text, R6 challenges the notion of
295 prioritizing reading capabilities in future implant developments, pointing to the superior utility of existing
296 assistive technologies like audiobooks and screen readers. R6 stated:

297 “I think text to text-to-voice systems are so advanced that it doesn't make sense to use the device to
298 read. I see no reason why anybody needs to use the device to read anymore, other than for the
299 pleasure [or joy] of being able to read letters.”

300 Conversely, R5 highlighted the desire among potential future implantees to regain some form of reading
301 ability, noting the varied proficiency levels among blind and low-vision individuals with braille and
302 screen readers, and the general wish to read again. Echoing this sentiment, I1 expressed a specific desire:

303 “I would love to be able to read stop signs or road signs. Just having these signs been read to me
304 in some capacity would be great.”

305 *Other activities of daily living*

306 Despite not being presented as an iADL in our interviews, one common theme between implantees and
307 researchers was the mention of using the device to locate lost, dropped, or missing objects. Participant I1
308 specifically mentioned using their implant more frequently to locate their smartphones and computers
309 than to actually operate these personal electronic devices.

310 However, Participant I3 (the most prolific implant user in our sample) found less use for the implant for
311 activities that require navigating websites and reading, such as managing his finances. He summarized his
312 thoughts as follows:

313 “The reason I no longer use my implant in these different daily activities is because it doesn't
314 provide a real benefit beyond the techniques that a blind person typically develops to do things.”

315 Researchers were more positive about the prospects of using the implant they helped design or adopt in
316 everyday life. Researchers R1-4, who were more closely involved with the implantees, expected the

317 implant to be used daily or monthly for most iADLs, but also acknowledged that the implant may not be
318 useful at all for some activities. Specifically, these researchers thought that the implant would not be used
319 for reading, managing medication, or using personal electronic devices, but expected the implant to be
320 most commonly used for socializing, transportation, and doing one's laundry.

321 Researchers were aware of the current implants' potential limitations in supporting reading and object
322 recognition. When responding to question Q2-R, most researchers referred to recent R&D efforts aimed at
323 enhancing the functionality of the current implant, citing advancements that have not yet been
324 incorporated into the commercial version. Participant R6 opted not to comment on the implant's
325 effectiveness for implantees, citing a disconnect from their experiences:

326 “Honestly, this is a question for the users, because as an engineer, as someone who's working on
327 the device side, I can talk to the performance of the device but I cannot [speak to the user
328 experience side because] I have not been involved on that side of it.”

329 *Implantee wishes for the next generation of implants*

330 We further conducted a thematic analysis that revealed a total of 13 distinct themes among researcher and
331 implantee responses (see Methods). Presented in **Table 4**, the theme of "irrelevance" emerges as the most
332 frequently cited by implantees (leftmost column), signifying that they frequently find the implant
333 unhelpful in their daily routines. This finding is somewhat anticipated for tasks like reading and
334 identifying people, where the current implants lack the needed spatial resolution. However, it's more
335 unexpected for household tasks like housekeeping and meal preparation, areas where one might assume
336 the basic vision enhancement from the implant would offer some advantage. This observation sharply
337 contrasts with researcher expectations (center column), who had anticipated broader application of the
338 implant across a variety of activities.

339

340

Theme	Description	Implantee Actual Usage	Researcher Perceived Usage	Implantee Wishes
Smart integration	Addition of high-tech tools to implant (e.g., IR, LiDAR, audio, TTS)	0	14	20
Accessibility aids	Assistance from either low-tech (e.g., tactile) tools and/or people	5	17	6
Vision enhancement	General improvements to visual perception abilities, in cases such as reading, contrast, resolution, definition, etc	6	13	36
Safety	Feeling less at risk for injury (e.g., fire safety)	0	6	2
Irrelevance	Situations in which the implant does not help	58	25	12
Organization	Existing strategies around the house to keep organized (e.g., folding, keeping counters clean)	0	8	3
Orientation	Orienting self, mobility techniques, and avoiding obstacles	9	15	11
Navigation	Moving from place to place safely and accurately	8	9	12
Independence	Performing iADLs without external assistance	0	0	13
Object ID	Locating an object (not people) through computer vision or natural vision	3	16	16
People ID	Locating people (not objects) through computer vision or natural vision	0	7	14
Device improvements	Broad suggestions for future devices	0	7	7
Enjoyment	Use of the implant as a novel item in a non-technical way	2	2	2

341 **Table 4:** Themes and definitions synthesized from an inductive thematic analysis. Numbers indicate the
 342 counts of themes: of actual implant usage as reported by implantees, of expected implant usage as
 343 reported by researchers, of implantee wishes for future visual implants.

344 When asked to describe how an ideal future implant would assist in various iADLs (Q3-I and Q3-R),
345 implantees mentioned a wide range of use cases (rightmost column of **Table 4**), spanning more themes
346 than found in their examples of current uses.

347 Unsurprisingly, *vision enhancement* topped the list of desires among implantees, aligning with the core
348 promise of bionic eye technologies. Vision enhancement here encompasses any improvement in the
349 quality of vision the implant provides. Desired enhancements include better depth perception, as
350 mentioned by I6, and color detection. A prevalent wish among implantees was the ability to read or
351 recognize faces again, though there's a shared understanding that such advancements may not be
352 achievable with current or imminent technology. Reflecting a collective hope, all implantees resonated
353 with I5's desire for any improvement that would enable a shift from relying on tactile to visual cues.

354 The theme of *smart integration* ranked as the second most frequently mentioned by implantees. All six
355 participants expressed a desire to see their implants work in tandem with widely-used technologies, such
356 as barcode readers, smart glasses, text-to-speech (TTS) audio devices, and color identifiers. Participant I5
357 specifically noted the potential benefits of audio enhancements for tasks like meal preparation.

358 Encouragingly, these aspirations align with ongoing research initiatives²⁹⁻³³. Researchers discussed a
359 variety of smart integration possibilities for different iADLs, including thermal imaging for identifying
360 hot surfaces in the kitchen, as suggested by R3, depth imaging for housekeeping, and compatibility with
361 advanced technological aids like Microsoft's Seeing AI and OrCam's MyEye.

362 *Object identification* emerged as the third most discussed theme, encompassing the ability to discern
363 items ranging from books to debit and credit cards in a wallet, and even bus lines. Researchers believe
364 that current implants already have the potential to facilitate object identification for various iADLs.
365 However, implantees view this capability more as a hope for future device enhancements.

366 Equally significant, the theme of *independence* stood out among implantees' aspirations for future
367 implants, yet it was notably absent in discussions about current technology. This discrepancy underscores
368 a further gap between the existing capabilities of devices and the ultimate desires of implantees.

369 Participant I5 expressed a longing for an implant that could assist in securing and maintaining
370 employment by improving his ability to adapt and navigate the workplace.

371 In essence, implantees envision their implant offering benefits that surpass those provided by traditional
372 mobility aids such as canes, guide dogs, or smartphone applications.

373 **Discussion**

374 In this study, we combined quantitative and qualitative methods to explore the views of both researchers
375 and implantees on two prominent visual prostheses, Argus II and Orion, designed for individuals
376 experiencing vision loss. Employing both thematic and statistical analyses, we uncovered a discrepancy
377 between researchers and implantees regarding the practical utility of these implants in daily activities.
378 Furthermore, the study highlights the future expectations implantees have for visual implants,
379 emphasizing the critical need for ongoing research in this field.

380 *Implant use falls short of researcher expectations*

381 A key finding of our study is that the frequency and application of implant usage did not align with
382 researchers' anticipations. These results should be viewed in light of implantees' existing skills in
383 navigating blindness before implantation. Participant R2 commented on the efficiency of pre-developed
384 strategies by implantees with employment, suggesting the implant might not enhance, and could even
385 impede, their performance. This sentiment is encapsulated in R2's observation:

386 "I suspect that [individuals] we enroll in this study, and likely those who opt for the implant later
387 on, will have already undergone extensive training in blindness skills before getting the implant.
388 Consequently, [getting the implant] probably won't change how they [perform certain iADLs, as it
389 is] easier for them to stick to the [...] method they've already mastered as blind individuals."

390 Furthermore, all but one interviewed implantee lived with a sighted spouse or family member. This may
391 have potentially reduced the utility of the implant in situations where spouses or family members may
392 have aided if needed, or where preexisting assistive heuristics were established.

393 Yet, not all researchers fully grasp this perspective, as highlighted by R6's admission of a disconnect from
394 the patient experience due to his engineering role. This gap between device designers and end-users
395 underpins a broader issue: the challenge of ensuring that clinical research aligns with the real-world needs
396 of the blind community. This challenge is exacerbated by the fact that all interviewed researchers are

397 sighted, complicating their ability to truly understand the lived experiences of implantees. Participant I4
398 felt the strongest about this:

399 “Researchers have no clue how it is to be blind, and do not open themselves up to opportunities [to
400 learn about the blind community].”

401 We also noted a tendency among implantees to blame themselves for the device's failures (a phenomenon
402 initially reported by Ref.¹³). This is in stark contrast to how researchers and companies often attribute the
403 successes of the device to its technological capabilities. For instance, Participant I2 felt his challenges
404 were due to both the implant and his own limitations, and I5 believed his difficulty in using the implant
405 stemmed from his low vision levels, that his “current vision level and abilities are so low that the implant
406 doesn't work properly.” Successes are celebrated as triumphs of technology, while failures are
407 internalized by users as personal deficiencies.

408 ***Implants need to compete with existing technologies***

409 Implants have shown promise in areas like orientation and navigation, where even current aids, such as
410 smartphone apps, fall short. Researchers acknowledge that these implants operate within a technological
411 landscape filled with pre-existing solutions, setting a high bar for new devices to offer distinct
412 advantages.

413 Therefore, visual implants might be better off focusing on fulfilling specific needs unmet by other
414 technologies. Participant I1’s observation, “None of the [accessibility-related smartphone] apps can do
415 what the implant can do, but the implant can't do what any of the apps can do,” highlights the potential for
416 implants to complement rather than compete with existing aids, leveraging their unique capabilities to fill
417 gaps in the current assistive technology ecosystem.

418 ***Future implants: Vision enhancement, smart integration, and independence***

419 Our study highlights implantee wishes for future implant generations, revealing a profound desire for not
420 only enhanced visual perception but also for greater independence. This underscores a crucial need for

421 advancements that go beyond basic navigation aids and aim for a richer, autonomous life experience.
422 Such feedback illuminates the complex dynamics between technological expectations, personal
423 adaptation, and the real challenges of living with vision impairment, pointing out the stark gap in current
424 implant discussions, which rarely touch on the crucial aspect of independence.

425 This technology is still in its infancy. Implantees recognize that current devices meet their expectations
426 but look forward to substantial progress. Participant I5's words reflect this statement:

427 “It met my expectations [...] We're at Orion 1 now. Just wait till we get to Orion 15 [...] So, the
428 faster and harder you guys work, the quicker we'll get there.”

429 Integrating the perspectives and experiences of implantees into the development of future implants may
430 be crucial to transforming this implantable device technology into a vital tool for improving quality of
431 life. By prioritizing their experiences and needs, we can ensure that upcoming generations of implants not
432 only push the boundaries of what is technically possible but are genuinely useful in the daily life of
433 people who are blind.

434

References

- 435 1. Luo YH, da Cruz L. The Argus((R)) II Retinal Prosthesis System. *Prog Retin Eye Res.* 2016
436 Jan;50:89–107.
- 437 2. Palanker D, Le Mer Y, Mohand-Said S, Muqit M, Sahel JA. Photovoltaic Restoration of Central
438 Vision in Atrophic Age-Related Macular Degeneration. *Ophthalmology.* 2020 Feb 25;
- 439 3. Stingl K, Schippert R, Bartz-Schmidt KU, Besch D, Cottrill CL, Edwards TL, et al. Interim Results
440 of a Multicenter Trial with the New Electronic Subretinal Implant Alpha AMS in 15 Patients Blind
441 from Inherited Retinal Degenerations. *Front Neurosci [Internet].* 2017 [cited 2020 May 27];11.
442 Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnins.2017.00445/full>
- 443 4. Karapanos L, Abbott CJ, Ayton LN, Kolic M, McGuinness MB, Baglin EK, et al. Functional Vision
444 in the Real-World Environment With a Second-Generation (44-Channel) Suprachoroidal Retinal
445 Prosthesis. *Transl Vis Sci Technol.* 2021 Aug 12;10(10):7–7.
- 446 5. Fernández E, Alfaro A, Soto-Sánchez C, Gonzalez-Lopez P, Lozano AM, Peña S, et al. Visual
447 percepts evoked with an intracortical 96-channel microelectrode array inserted in human occipital
448 cortex. *J Clin Invest [Internet].* 2021 Dec 1 [cited 2022 Feb 1];131(23). Available from:
449 <https://www.jci.org/articles/view/151331>
- 450 6. Barry MP, Sadeghi R, Towle VL, Stipp K, Puhov H, Diaz W, et al. Preliminary visual function for
451 the first human with the Intracortical Visual Prosthesis (ICVP). *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2023 Jun
452 1;64(8):2842.
- 453 7. Beauchamp MS, Oswald D, Sun P, Foster BL, Magnotti JF, Niketeghad S, et al. Dynamic Stimulation
454 of Visual Cortex Produces Form Vision in Sighted and Blind Humans. *Cell.* 2020 May
455 14;181(4):774-783.e5.
- 456 8. Fernandez E. Development of visual Neuroprostheses: trends and challenges. *Bioelectron Med.* 2018
457 Aug 13;4(1):12.
- 458 9. Weiland JD, Walston ST, Humayun MS. Electrical Stimulation of the Retina to Produce Artificial
459 Vision. *Annu Rev Vis Sci.* 2016;2(1):273–94.
- 460 10. Duncan JL, Richards TP, Arditi A, Cruz L da, Dagnelie G, Dorn JD, et al. Improvements in vision-
461 related quality of life in blind patients implanted with the Argus II Epiretinal Prosthesis. *Clin Exp*
462 *Optom.* 2017;100(2):144–50.
- 463 11. Marks D. Models of disability. *Disabil Rehabil.* 1997 Jan 1;19(3):85–91.
- 464 12. Htike HM, Margrain TH, Lai YK, Eslambolchilar P. Ability of Head-Mounted Display Technology
465 to Improve Mobility in People With Low Vision: A Systematic Review. *Transl Vis Sci Technol*
466 *[Internet].* 2020 Sep 24 [cited 2021 Jan 4];9(10). Available from:
467 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7521174/>
- 468 13. Erickson-Davis C, Korzybska H. What do blind people “see” with retinal prostheses? Observations
469 and qualitative reports of epiretinal implant users. *PLOS ONE.* 2021 Feb 10;16(2):e0229189.
- 470 14. Kasowski J, Johnson BA, Neydavood R, Akkaraju A, Beyeler M. A systematic review of extended
471 reality (XR) for understanding and augmenting vision loss. *J Vis.* 2023 May 4;23(5):5.
- 472 15. Hogan AJ. Social and medical models of disability and mental health: evolution and renewal. *CMAJ*
473 *Can Med Assoc J.* 2019 Jan 7;191(1):E16–8.
- 474 16. Gatchel RJ, Peng YB, Peters ML, Fuchs PN, Turk DC. The biopsychosocial approach to chronic
475 pain: scientific advances and future directions. *Psychol Bull.* 2007 Jul;133(4):581–624.
- 476 17. Geruschat DR, Richards TP, Arditi A, da Cruz L, Dagnelie G, Dorn JD, et al. An analysis of

- 477 observer-rated functional vision in patients implanted with the Argus II Retinal Prosthesis System at
478 three years. *Clin Exp Optom*. 2016 May;99(3):227–32.
- 479 18. Kartha A, Singh RK, Bradley C, Dagnelie G. Self-Reported Visual Ability Versus Task Performance
480 in Individuals With Ultra-Low Vision. *Transl Vis Sci Technol*. 2023 Oct 17;12(10):14.
- 481 19. Lane FJ, Huyck MH, Troyk PR. The Experiences Of Recipients Of A Cortical Visual Prosthesis: A
482 Preliminary Analysis Of Nine Participants Expressed Motivation, Decision-making Process, Risks,
483 And Functional Use Of Phosphenes. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2012 Mar 26;53(14):5553.
- 484 20. Lane J, Rohan EMF, Sabeti F, Essex RW, Maddess T, Dawel A, et al. Impacts of impaired face
485 perception on social interactions and quality of life in age-related macular degeneration: A qualitative
486 study and new community resources. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(12):e0209218.
- 487 21. Xia Y, Peng X, Ren Q. Retinitis pigmentosa patients’ attitudes toward participation in retinal
488 prosthesis trials. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2012 Jul 1;33(4):628–32.
- 489 22. Xia Y, Ren Q. Ethical Considerations for Volunteer Recruitment of Visual Prosthesis Trials. *Sci Eng
490 Ethics*. 2013 Sep 1;19(3):1099–106.
- 491 23. Karadima V, Pezaris EA, Pezaris JS. Attitudes of potential recipients toward emerging visual
492 prosthesis technologies. *Sci Rep*. 2023 Jul 6;13(1):10963.
- 493 24. Finger RP, Tellis B, Crewe J, Keefe JE, Ayton LN, Guymer RH. Developing the Impact of Vision
494 Impairment–Very Low Vision (IVI-VLV) Questionnaire as Part of the LoVADA Protocol. *Investig
495 Ophthalmology Vis Sci*. 2014 Oct 1;55(10):6150.
- 496 25. Terheyden JH, Fink DJ, Pondorfer SG, Holz FG, Finger RP. Instrumental Activities of Daily Living
497 Tools in Very-Low Vision: Ready for Use in Trials? *Pharmaceutics*. 2022 Nov;14(11):2435.
- 498 26. Owsley C, McGWIN GJ, Sloane ME, Stalvey BT, Wells and J. Timed Instrumental Activities of
499 Daily Living Tasks: Relationship to Visual Function in Older Adults. *Optom Vis Sci*. 2001
500 May;78(5):350.
- 501 27. Turkstra LM, Van Os A, Bhatia T, Beyeler M. Information Needs and Technology Use for Daily
502 Living Activities at Home by People Who Are Blind [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Jul 22]. Available
503 from: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.03019v1>
- 504 28. Abdolrahmani A, Kuber R, Branham SM. “Siri Talks at You”: An Empirical Investigation of Voice-
505 Activated Personal Assistant (VAPA) Usage by Individuals Who Are Blind. In: Proceedings of the
506 20th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility [Internet]. New
507 York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2018 [cited 2023 Apr 30]. p. 249–58.
508 (ASSETS ’18). Available from: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3234695.3236344>
- 509 29. Sadeghi R, Kartha A, Barry MP, Gibson P, Caspi A, Roy A, et al. Thermal and Distance image
510 filtering improve independent mobility in Argus II retinal implant. *J Vis*. 2019 Dec 1;19(15):23–23.
- 511 30. McCarthy C, Walker JG, Lieby P, Scott A, Barnes N. Mobility and low contrast trip hazard
512 avoidance using augmented depth. *J Neural Eng*. 2014 Nov;12(1):016003.
- 513 31. Han N, Srivastava S, Xu A, Klein D, Beyeler M. Deep Learning–Based Scene Simplification for
514 Bionic Vision. In: *Augmented Humans Conference 2021* [Internet]. Rovaniemi Finland: ACM; 2021
515 [cited 2022 Jan 14]. p. 45–54. Available from: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3458709.3458982>
- 516 32. Beyeler M, Sanchez-Garcia M. Towards a Smart Bionic Eye: AI-powered artificial vision for the
517 treatment of incurable blindness. *J Neural Eng*. 2022 Dec;19(6):063001.
- 518 33. Sanchez-Garcia M, Martinez-Cantin R, Guerrero JJ. Semantic and structural image segmentation for
519 prosthetic vision. *PLOS ONE*. 2020 Jan 29;15(1):e0227677.
- 520

521

522