

# 1 **Aligning visual prosthetic development with implantee needs**

2 Lucas G. Nadolskis<sup>1,†,\*</sup>, Lily M. Turkstra<sup>2,†</sup>, Ebenezer Larnyo<sup>3</sup>, Michael Beyeler<sup>2,4</sup>

3 <sup>1</sup>Interdepartmental Graduate Program in Dynamical Neuroscience, University of California, Santa

4 Barbara

5 <sup>2</sup>Department of Psychological & Brain Sciences, University of California, Santa Barbara

6 <sup>3</sup>Center for Black Studies Research, University of California, Santa Barbara

7 <sup>4</sup>Department of Computer Science, University of California, Santa Barbara

8 <sup>†</sup>These authors contributed equally to this work.

9 \*Corresponding author: [lgilnadolskis@ucsb.edu](mailto:lgilnadolskis@ucsb.edu)

10

11 *Word count: 7,384*

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 are a promising assistive technology for vision loss, yet research often  
19 overlooks the human aspects of this technology. While previous studies focus on the perceptual  
20 experiences or attitudes of implant recipients (implantees), a systematic account of how current implants  
21 are being used in everyday life is still lacking.

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

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

32 *Conclusions:* Our study reveals a significant gap between researcher expectations and implantee  
33 experiences with visual prostheses. Although limited by access to a small population of implantees, this  
34 study highlights the importance of focusing future research on usability and real-world applications.

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

## 38 **Introduction**

39 Visual neuroprostheses, including retinal and cortical implants (commonly known as “bionic eyes”), have  
40 shown promise as assistive technology for individuals with blindness<sup>1-7</sup>. These devices, similar to  
41 cochlear implants, electrically stimulate remaining neurons in the visual pathway to evoke visual percepts  
42 (*phosphenes*)<sup>8,9</sup>. Existing devices have demonstrated improved capabilities in localizing high-contrast  
43 objects and aiding basic orientation and mobility tasks<sup>4,10</sup>. Notable examples include Argus II<sup>1</sup> (Second  
44 Sight Medical Products, Inc., Sylmar, CA), the first retinal implant to obtain FDA approval, and its  
45 successor, Orion<sup>7</sup> (Cortigent, Inc., Valencia, CA; formerly Second Sight), a cortical implant that is  
46 currently in clinical trials (clinicaltrials.gov: NCT03344848). In addition to neuroprostheses, other  
47 promising avenues for sight restoration include optogenetic, gene, and stem cell therapies<sup>11-14</sup>, which  
48 offer less invasive alternatives by targeting the genetic and molecular bases of visual impairment.

49 The Argus II utilizes a 6x10 electrode array implanted on the retina, which receives signals from a camera  
50 mounted on glasses to provide visual information (Figure 1A-B). Additionally, the efficacy of the Argus  
51 II device is primarily contingent upon the condition of the retina and the electrode-retina distance<sup>15-18</sup>.

52 Some stimulation parameters may enhance the device's effectiveness, while other factors (e.g.,  
53 inadvertent activation of passing axon fibers) impose limitations on its performance<sup>17,19,20</sup>. In contrast, the  
54 Orion device bypasses the eye altogether, with electrodes implanted directly on the surface of the visual  
55 cortex, aiming to restore vision by stimulating the brain's visual processing areas (Figure 1C). The  
56 effectiveness of the Orion varies based on stimulation and neuroanatomical parameters<sup>7,21</sup> (e.g.,  
57 amplitude, location, timing). The Argus II has been implanted in 388 recipients worldwide, both  
58 commercially and during clinical trials (157 female and 231 male; personal communication with  
59 Cortigent, Inc., 2024). The Orion device, still in clinical trials, has been implanted in six recipients (1  
60 female and 5 male), with three remaining implanted to date. There is a notable distinction between  
61 clinical trial participants and commercial users regarding selection, training, and ongoing support.  
62 Clinical trial volunteers are meticulously selected, receive extensive training, and regularly visit the lab,

63 providing critical feedback for future device iterations. In contrast, commercial users typically receive  
64 assistance from third-party companies or centers, often at their own motivation, with less rigorous  
65 selection and training protocols, though some may still elect to participate in related research and  
66 experiments.



67  
68 **Figure 1:** Overview of the Argus II (A-B, reused under CC BY-NC-ND from Ref.<sup>22</sup>) and Orion implants (C,  
69 <https://cortigent.com>). (A) The implanted components of the Argus II system include a hermetically sealed  
70 enclosure for the electronics that, along with a receiving antenna, is secured to the eye with a scleral band  
71 and sutures, and an array of 60 electrodes that is inserted into the eye and tacked over the macula. (B) External (body-  
72 worn) components of the Argus II system include a pair of glasses with a small camera mounted in the frame  
73 connected via a cable to a video processing unit (VPU) worn on the belt or on a shoulder strap. (C) This future  
74 depiction of the Orion device includes an external data processing unit, which deciphers visual inputs relayed from a

75 miniature camera mounted on a pair of glasses worn by implantees. These inputs are transmitted via electrical pulses  
76 to a microelectronic cortical implant situated on the surface of the primary visual cortex. Note: The external  
77 components shown represent a future version of the device and were not used by the participants in this study.

78 Research in artificial vision has traditionally followed the medical model of disability<sup>23</sup>, viewing  
79 blindness as a result of an individual's physical impairment that can be “fixed” – in this case, with an  
80 invasive prosthesis. As pointed out by Refs.<sup>24–26</sup>, the majority of research on visual prostheses (and more  
81 generally: low vision aids) has primarily focused on technological and functional aspects of these  
82 implants (e.g., the ability to produce phosphenes and the resulting Snellen acuity) and has rarely  
83 incorporated implant recipients (*implantees*) in the decision-making and design process<sup>26</sup>. However,  
84 blindness is not just about one’s physical impairment, but also about the individual’s subjective  
85 psychological experience and the societal contexts in which they live<sup>27,28</sup>. In the development and  
86 evaluation of assistive technologies for people who are blind, it is crucial to focus not only on the  
87 technical aspects but also on the wants, needs, and lived experiences of the end users, studying how they  
88 might utilize such devices within their daily lives. This approach ensures that technology serves the user,  
89 enhancing their quality of life rather than solely aiming to correct a physical condition.

90 Although tools and surveys have been developed to assess the functional visual ability and well-being of  
91 implantees<sup>10,29–31</sup>, in practice these are often employed as external validation tools that constitute the very  
92 last step of the design process<sup>44,29</sup>. It is therefore perhaps not surprising that none of the current devices  
93 have found broad adoption, and that several device manufacturers had to close their doors because their  
94 device did not (such as in the case of Retina Implant AG) lead to “the concrete benefit in everyday life of  
95 those affected”<sup>1</sup>.

96 This lack of end-user involvement and limited adoption underscores the necessity for a deeper exploration  
97 into how implants are actually used in daily life, contrasted with the initial expectations of their designers.  
98 Despite numerous studies assessing functional vision<sup>4,6,29</sup> and documenting the experiences of current  
99 implantees<sup>10,25,32,33</sup>, as well as discussions on ethical considerations in trial participant selection<sup>34,35</sup> and  
100 the attitudes of blind individuals toward implant technology<sup>36</sup>, a comprehensive understanding of the real-  
101 world application of these devices remains elusive.

---

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

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

## 110 **Methods**

111 We conducted semi-structured interviews with 12 participants (six researchers and six implantees, two  
112 with the Orion implant and 4 with the Argus II implant) to assess the actual frequency of implant usage  
113 among Argus II and Orion users, and compared the reported usage to researcher expectations. This  
114 sample represents roughly 1.5% of the global Argus II population and 67% of the individuals who still  
115 have the Orion implant, reflecting the rarity of these implants in both commercial and clinical settings.  
116 We initially posed structured questions covering an extensive array of instrumental activities of daily  
117 living<sup>37,38</sup> (iADLs). We then engaged in open-ended discussions to explore which strategies and usage  
118 patterns that implantees and researchers deemed effective or ineffective, and what the implantees hope to  
119 see in the next generation of implants.

120 The study was deemed exempt from review by the Institutional Review Board of the University of  
121 California, Santa Barbara. Participants received an information sheet, ensuring they understood the  
122 interview expectations. A minor risk of the study concerned participants feeling embarrassed or  
123 experiencing discomfort when answering certain questions during the interview. To mitigate these risks,  
124 participants could choose the level of detail they wanted to provide and could choose not to answer  
125 specific questions. Researchers also paused the interview if they believed the participant was distressed,

126 confirming whether they wanted to continue. No participants experienced distress or required  
127 intervention.

### 128 *Study participants*

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

131 To qualify for the study, implantees (I1-6) had to be current recipients of either the Argus II or Orion  
132 implant. All implantees have had their implant for at least five years, remain currently implanted with  
133 their respective devices, and none had reported medical complications with the device. All four Argus II  
134 users were part of the commercial cohort (i.e., received their implant after it was FDA-approved in 2013)  
135 but have participated in elective research studies. In contrast, the two Orion users are part of the ongoing  
136 clinical trial (clinicaltrials.gov: NCT03344848). Five implantees lived with either family or a spouse  
137 while one lived alone, and all were frequent users of assistive technology both inside and outside of the  
138 home. In addition, four participants reported to be users of either a cane or a guide dog, while one  
139 reported using both and one preferred not to answer. All participants resided in either the United States or  
140 the Netherlands.

141 The other six participants (R1-6) were distinguished researchers and medical professionals who are  
142 prominent figures in the field of visual neuroprosthetics. These participants included principal  
143 investigators and key medical professionals who have played integral roles in the development and  
144 clinical application of the Argus II and Orion implants. Each of these researchers has substantial  
145 experience and has contributed significantly to the field, ensuring that their insights are both authoritative  
146 and relevant. Specifically, R2-AO, R3-AO, and R6-AO had experience with both Argus II and Orion.  
147 None of the researchers reported having any visual impairment.



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

149 **Table 1.** Participant demographics for each of our interviewed implantees (I1-6). Letters (“A”: Argus II, “O”: Orion) after each participant ID denote the type of  
150 implant. “Education” indicates the highest education level completed. Living arrangement: provides a description of other individuals that our participants  
151 currently live with, if any.

152

Subject	Age	Gender	Education level	Professional background	Years in field	Current focus area	Experience with implantee cohort(s)	Implantee interaction experience
R1-A	25-44	female	tertiary degree	vision science / optometry	5-10	implantee-centric	clinical, commercial	patient-centered research
R2-AO	25-44	male	tertiary degree	engineering	15-20	implantee-centric	clinical, commercial	patient-centered research
R3-AO	45-64	male	tertiary degree	engineering	15-20	device-centric, implantee-centric	clinical, commercial	patient-centered research
R4-A	45-64	male	secondary degree	rehabilitation science	5-10	implantee-centric	commercial	clinical interaction
R5-O	25-44	male	tertiary degree	clinical medicine	1-5	device-centric	clinical	clinical interaction
R6-AO	45-64	male	tertiary degree	engineering	10-15	device-centric	clinical, commercial	none

154 **Table 2.** Participant demographics for each of our interviewed researchers (R1-6). Letters after each participant ID (“A”: Argus II, “O”: Orion, “AO”: both  
155 Argus II and Orion) denote implant(s) worked with. Education level: highest educational qualification, where tertiary may include advanced degrees such as MD  
156 or PhD, and secondary may include qualifications like an Associate’s or Bachelor’s degree. Professional background: field in which the researcher is  
157 professionally trained. Current focus area: Primary focus of the researcher’s current work, whether it is centered on the implantees or the device. Experience with  
158 implantee cohort(s): whether the research has worked with implantees in a clinical-trial or commercial setting. Implantee interaction experience: Types of  
159 interactions the researcher has had with implantees. Researchers were not asked about their living situation. None of the researchers were blind.

160 ***Interview procedure***

161 The interviews were conducted via video conferencing technology by the two lead researchers of the  
162 study, one blind and one sighted. Transcripts were generated using the Otter AI transcription software  
163 (Mountain View, CA) and analyzed manually by the research team. Each interview lasted between 30 and  
164 90 minutes.

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

- 167 • Q1-I: How often do you use your implant for <iADL>? Choose from: daily, weekly, monthly,  
168 yearly, never.
- 169 • Q2-I: Please give some examples of how your implant supports <iADL>. What works? What  
170 does not?
- 171 • Q3-I: What do you wish your implant could do to support/facilitate <iADL>?

172 These questions were repeated for each of twelve iADLs, drawn from previous literature<sup>37-40</sup> to ensure a  
173 broad spectrum of everyday tasks. These iADLs included essential activities such as meal preparation,  
174 housekeeping, transportation, and socializing, chosen for their relevance to independence and quality of  
175 life for blind individuals. For each iADL, we formulated a series of questions aimed at uncovering not  
176 only the frequency and extent of visual prosthetic use, but also the practical benefits and limitations  
177 experienced by implantees. Despite these iADLs often requiring multiple steps for satisfactory  
178 completion, we aimed to provide a holistic overview of how individuals in this population conduct these  
179 tasks and their overall and individual expectations for their implants in daily activities.

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

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

### 187    ***Data analysis***

188    To get a qualitative understanding of the device usage for the different iADLs, we performed an inductive  
189    thematic analysis<sup>41</sup> on Q2-I, Q-R, and Q3-I. Themes were individually identified from transcripts, with  
190    new ones added for unclassified examples. This iterative process continued across all transcripts until no  
191    new themes emerged, culminating in a consensus on 13 definitive themes. Both implantees' and  
192    researchers' responses were categorized under these themes, with unique codes assigned to each for  
193    systematic analysis.

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

195 **Table 3.** Implantee (I1-6) reports and researcher (R1-6) perception of implant use frequency for each iADL, using the scale: Daily, Weekly, Monthly, Yearly, or  
196 Never.

## 197 **Results**

### 198 *Implant usage expectations vs. reported outcomes*

199 **Table 3** provides a detailed breakdown of the responses to Q1-I and Q1-R regarding implant use for  
200 various iADLs (see Supplementary Materials for a more quantitative analysis). Overall, the most frequent  
201 response from implantees on how often they used their device for specific iADLs was “never,” with I4-A  
202 and I6-A reporting no use across any everyday activities. Notably, none of the implantees reported current  
203 usage of their implants for meal preparation, reading, managing finances or medication, or using personal  
204 electronic devices. However, I3-A stood out as the most frequent user, utilizing his implant daily,  
205 particularly for outdoor activities like navigating streets and identifying buildings.

206 The researchers, in contrast, had much higher expectations for implant use. Most, except for R5-O,  
207 anticipated the implant being used for nearly all iADLs. Researchers in device-centric roles (R3-AO and  
208 R6-AO) expected daily or weekly use for most iADLs, particularly in social settings. Despite these  
209 expectations, variability in actual use was acknowledged, with socialization emerging as the most likely  
210 area for device application according to a majority of researchers.

### 211 *Thematic analysis of implant usage*

212 We performed an inductive thematic analysis on Q2-I, Q3-I, Q1-R, and Q-2R (see Methods) to get a  
213 qualitative understanding of device usage in daily life, revealing 13 distinct themes that were further  
214 categorized into broader topics, as presented in **Table 4**.

215 Implantees reported *functional benefits* in general visual perception abilities, orientation, and mobility.  
216 Researchers perceived these benefits more frequently, with higher numbers in vision enhancement (13),  
217 orientation (15), and navigation (9). Implantees expressed a strong wish for future improvements in vision  
218 enhancement (36) and navigation (12), indicating a desire for better practical utility in everyday life.

219 Enjoyment and safety were key themes relevant to the *user experience*. While actual usage of the implant  
220 for enjoyment was low (2), both researchers and implantees noted the importance of safety, with  
221 researchers perceiving more actual usage (6) than implantees reported (0).

222 In terms of *daily activities*, researchers expected the implant to find widespread use (8), but implantee  
223 reports disagreed. Accessibility aids were recognized by both groups, with researchers perceiving more  
224 usage (17) compared to implantees' reports (5).

225 When discussing *device limitations*, a major theme among implantees was the lack of utility (58),  
226 indicating frequent scenarios where the implant did not provide additional benefits. This is somewhat  
227 anticipated for tasks like reading and identifying people, where the current implants lack the needed  
228 spatial resolution. However, it is less expected for household tasks like housekeeping and meal  
229 preparation, areas where one might assume the basic vision enhancement from the implant would offer  
230 some advantage. This observation sharply contrasts with researcher expectations (center column), who  
231 had anticipated broader application of the implant across a variety of activities.

### 232 ***Examples of implant usage in the daily life of implantees***

233 To gain deeper insight into everyday device usage, we solicited specific examples (Q2-I and Q2-R) and  
234 compared these with researchers' expectations of device use in daily life. Activities were sorted by their  
235 reported frequency of occurrence, as gathered from our interviews, and the most commonly performed  
236 activities are discussed below.

237 Note that some iADLs are more complex than others, often requiring a variety of assistive tools to replace  
238 lost visual cues or existing workarounds to complete these tasks without assistive tools. While an implant  
239 may not be necessary for all steps of every iADL, our goal is to provide a holistic understanding of how  
240 implantees interpret these activities, how they expect implants to aid them, and real-life use cases for their  
241 completion.

242

Theme	Description	Implantee Actual Usage	Researcher Perceived Usage	Implantee Wishes
<b>Functional benefits:</b>				
<b>Vision enhancement</b>	Improvements in visual perception, such as reading ability, contrast sensitivity, resolution, and definition	6	13	36
<b>Orientation</b>	Techniques for self-orientation, mobility, and obstacle avoidance	9	15	11
<b>Mobility</b>	Safe and accurate movement from one place to another	8	9	12
<b>Object identification</b>	Identifying objects (not people) through computer or natural vision	3	16	16
<b>People identification</b>	Identifying people (not objects) through computer or natural vision	0	7	14
<b>Independence</b>	Performing instrumental activities of daily living (iADLs) without external assistance	0	0	13
<b>User experience:</b>				
<b>Enjoyment</b>	Using the implant for non-technical, enjoyable activities	2	2	2
<b>Safety</b>	Feeling less at risk for injury or danger (e.g., fire safety)	0	6	2
<b>Daily activities:</b>				
<b>Home organization</b>	Strategies for maintaining organization at home (e.g., folding clothes, keeping counters clean)	0	8	3
<b>Accessibility aids</b>	Assistance from low-tech (e.g., tactile aids) or people	5	17	6
<b>Device limitations &amp; improvements:</b>				
<b>(Lack of) utility</b>	Situations where the implant does not provide additional benefit or assistance to the user	58	25	12
<b>Smart integration</b>	Enhancements to device capabilities through emerging technologies. (e.g., distance perception, color recognition, 3D object detection)	0	14	20
<b>Device improvement suggestions</b>	General suggestions for future device enhancements	0	7	7

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



246 *Transportation*

247 One application area that both implantees and researchers agree to be of potential value for a visual  
248 implant user is that of transportation. Implantees who live in urban areas remarked that the device proved  
249 useful for stepping in and out of the bus, avoiding obstacles, and for detecting people when entering and  
250 exiting a train. Participant I2-A specifically reported using his implant occasionally to aid him in staying  
251 oriented with his surroundings, and to help from bumping into walls and other obstacles. However, the  
252 implant could rarely replace the use of a mobility cane or a guide dog completely. In the words of  
253 Participant I4-A:

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

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

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

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

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

#### 274 *Socializing*

275 Participant I3-A found the implant extremely useful for orientation in social environments, enabling him  
276 to monitor the movements of people arriving and departing. This feature was especially helpful for  
277 recognizing when someone was approaching to engage in conversation, departing, or coming back, thus  
278 helping I3-A discern the presence of others nearby. I3-A mentioned the specific utility of his implant for  
279 socialization when navigating through birthday parties or restaurants. I2-A agreed:

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

284 Participant I1-O emphasized the implant's significant role in enhancing social experiences and memorable  
285 moments, stating:

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

288 All researchers similarly emphasized the importance of socialization, and how the implants might  
289 facilitate this instrumental aspect of daily life. Various use cases of the implant in socialization settings  
290 were mentioned, with R1-A providing some specific context as to how the implant might have aided in a  
291 situation similar to that of I2-A above:

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

### 296 *Meal preparation*

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

301 Participant R1-A provided insights into how the device could potentially complement other assistive tools  
302 in meal preparation if an implantee chose to use it for this purpose:

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

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

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

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

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

### 321 *Housekeeping, laundry, and tidying*

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

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

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

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

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

### 335 *Reading*

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

339 “I think text-to-voice systems are so advanced that it doesn't make sense to use the device to read.

340 I see no reason why anybody needs to use the device to read anymore, other than for the pleasure

341 [or joy] of being able to read letters.”

342 Conversely, R5-O highlighted the desire among potential future implantees to regain some form of

343 reading ability, noting the varied proficiency levels among blind and low-vision individuals with braille

344 and screen readers, and the general wish to read again. Echoing this sentiment, I1-O expressed a specific

345 desire:

346 “I would love to be able to read stop signs or road signs. Just having these signs been read to me

347 in some capacity would be great.”

#### 348 *Other activities of daily living*

349 Despite not being presented as an iADL in our interviews, one common theme between implantees and

350 researchers was the mention of using the device to locate lost, dropped, or missing objects. Participant I1-

351 O specifically mentioned using their implant more frequently to locate their smartphones and computers

352 than to actually operate these personal electronic devices.

353 However, Participant I3-A (the most prolific implant user in our sample) found less use for the implant

354 for activities that require navigating websites and reading, such as managing his finances. He summarized

355 his thoughts as follows:

356 “The reason I no longer use my implant in these different daily activities is because it doesn't

357 provide a real benefit beyond the techniques that a blind person typically develops to do things.”

358 Researchers were more positive about the prospects of using the implant they helped design in everyday

359 life. Researchers R1-4, who were more closely involved with the implantees, expected the implant to be

360 used daily or monthly for most iADLs, but also acknowledged that the implant may not be useful at all

361 for some activities. Similarly, R4-A, whose employment focuses on working directly with implantees,

362 states:

363 “I think that the blind are already doing many of these kinds of things without assistance. They  
364 can do it already in more natural ways, because they have had time to learn and adapt.”

365 Specifically, these researchers thought that the implant would not be used for reading, managing  
366 medication, or using personal electronic devices, but expected the implant to be most commonly used for  
367 socializing, transportation, and doing one’s laundry.

368 Researchers were aware of the current implants' potential limitations in supporting reading and object  
369 recognition. In regard to the employment of implantees, R5-O mentioned that a majority of the employed  
370 implantees he works with have daily career tasks tailored to their individual needs, and that an implant  
371 might not provide the most aid in these situations.

372 “A lot of the subjects that I work with have employment that is adapted to their visual  
373 impairment, and in a lot of cases they invested a substantial amount of time and money and effort  
374 and retraining to do those.”

375 When responding to question Q2-R, most researchers referred to recent R&D efforts aimed at enhancing  
376 the functionality of the current implant, citing advancements that have not yet been incorporated into the  
377 commercial version. Participant R6-AO opted not to comment on the implant’s effectiveness for  
378 implantees, citing a disconnect from their experiences:

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

### 382 *Implantee wishes for the next generation of implants*

383 When asked to describe how an ideal future implant would assist in various iADLs (Q3-I and Q3-R),  
384 implantees mentioned a wide range of use cases (rightmost column of **Table 4**).

385 Unsurprisingly, *vision enhancement* topped the list of desires among implantees, aligning with the core  
386 promise of bionic eye technologies. This encompasses any improvement in the quality of vision the

387 implant provides. Desired enhancements include better depth perception, as mentioned by I6-A, and color  
388 detection. Implantees seemed mostly unaware of ongoing research aiming to improve visual perception  
389 through eye movement compensation<sup>42,43</sup> and stimulus optimization<sup>44-48</sup>, but had heard of efforts to add  
390 image filtering<sup>49-51</sup> and a zoom feature. A prevalent wish among implantees was the ability to read or  
391 recognize faces again, though there is a shared understanding that such advancements may not be  
392 achievable with current or imminent technology. Reflecting a collective hope, all implantees resonated  
393 with I5-O's desire for any improvement that would enable a shift from relying on tactile to visual cues.  
394 The theme of *smart integration* ranked as the second most frequently mentioned by implantees. All six  
395 participants expressed a desire to see their implants work in tandem with widely-used technologies, such  
396 as barcode readers, smart glasses, text-to-speech (TTS) audio devices, and color identifiers. Participant  
397 I5-O specifically noted the potential benefits of audio enhancements for tasks like meal preparation.  
398 Encouragingly, these aspirations align with ongoing research initiatives<sup>49,52-55</sup>. Researchers discussed a  
399 variety of smart integration possibilities for different iADLs, including thermal imaging for identifying  
400 hot surfaces in the kitchen, as suggested by R3-AO, depth imaging for housekeeping, and compatibility  
401 with advanced technological aids like Microsoft's Seeing AI and OrCam's MyEye.  
402 *Object identification* emerged as the third most discussed theme, encompassing the ability to discern  
403 items ranging from books to debit and credit cards in a wallet, and even bus lines. Researchers believe  
404 that current implants already have the potential to facilitate object identification for various iADLs.  
405 However, implantees view this capability more as a hope for future device enhancements.  
406 The theme of *independence* stood out among implantees' aspirations for future implants, yet it was  
407 notably absent in discussions about current technology. This discrepancy underscores a gap between the  
408 existing capabilities of devices and the ultimate desires of implantees. Participant I5-O expressed a  
409 longing for an implant that could assist in securing and maintaining employment by improving his ability  
410 to adapt and navigate the workplace.

411 The prominence of *lack of utility* as a theme highlights the advances that have been made in current  
412 assistive technologies and training, indicating that implantees would not need the implant's assistance to  
413 perform certain tasks. However, it also underscores the necessity for future implants to demonstrate their  
414 ability to assist people with vision loss in very specific situations. Implantees frequently mentioned this  
415 theme when discussing their wishes, expressing that many of their desired functionalities are currently  
416 unmet by existing implants. Therefore, a key wish for future implants is to reduce the lack of utility and  
417 ensure that the implants provide tangible benefits in a broader range of daily activities.

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



## 420 **Discussion**

421 This retrospective qualitative study examines the perspectives of researchers and implantees on the Argus  
422 II and Orion visual prostheses. A key finding of our analysis is that socializing emerged as the most  
423 frequent use of the implants among implantees, in contrast to other iADLs, which were less frequently  
424 supported by the devices. The majority of implantees reported never using their implants for activities  
425 such as meal preparation, managing finances, or using personal electronic devices, highlighting a gap  
426 between the anticipated use of the implants by researchers and the actual reported use by implantees in  
427 everyday life. Researchers, on the other hand, generally expected more frequent use of the implants across  
428 most iADLs. This discrepancy emphasizes the importance of aligning device development with real-  
429 world user experiences.

### 430 ***Implant use falls short of researcher expectations***

431 A key finding of our study is that the frequency and application of implant usage did not align with  
432 researchers' expectations. Researchers anticipated that the implants would be used for all iADLs to some  
433 extent. However, implantees reported occasional use for specific activities, such as social settings (I1-O,  
434 I2-A, I3-A, I5-O), transportation (I2-A, I3-A, I5-O), shopping (I1-O, I3-A), employment (I2-A, I3-A),  
435 and around the house (I1-O). Notably, implantees I4-A and I6-A reported never using their implants for  
436 everyday activities.

437 Several factors may account for these discrepancies. First, all four Argus II users were from the  
438 commercial cohort and received less support on implant use compared to Orion users, who were part of a  
439 clinical trial. This difference in support likely contributed to the more positive experiences reported by  
440 Orion users, underscoring the importance of adequate training and support for enabling daily use of these  
441 implants. Nevertheless, it is important to note that all four Argus II users had been regularly participating  
442 in elective research studies, which provided them with frequent interactions with researchers. This  
443 ongoing engagement may have mitigated some of the challenges associated with the reduced initial  
444 support. Second, these results should be viewed in light of implantees' existing skills in navigating

445 blindness before implantation. Participant R2-AO (who had been working with Argus II as well as Orion  
446 recipients) commented on the efficiency of pre-developed strategies by implantees with employment,  
447 suggesting the implant might not enhance, and could even impede, their performance. This sentiment is  
448 encapsulated in R2-AO's observation:

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

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

456 Yet, not all researchers fully grasp this perspective, as highlighted by R6-AO's admission of a disconnect  
457 from the patient experience due to his engineering role. This gap between device designers and end users  
458 underpins a broader issue: the challenge of ensuring that clinical research aligns with the real-world needs  
459 of the blind community. This challenge is exacerbated by the fact that all interviewed researchers are  
460 sighted, complicating their ability to truly understand the lived experiences of implantees. Participant I4-  
461 A felt the strongest about this:

462 "Researchers have no clue how it is to be blind, and do not open themselves up to opportunities [to  
463 learn about the blind community]."

464 We also noted a tendency among implantees to blame themselves for the device's failures (a phenomenon  
465 initially reported by Ref.<sup>13</sup>). This is in stark contrast to how researchers and companies often attribute the  
466 successes of the device to its technological capabilities. For instance, Participant I2-A felt his challenges  
467 were due to both the implant and his own limitations, and I5-O believed his difficulty in using the implant  
468 stemmed from his low vision levels, that his "current vision level and abilities are so low that the implant

469 doesn't work properly.” Successes are celebrated as triumphs of technology, whereas failures are  
470 internalized by users as personal deficiencies.

### 471 ***Implants need to compete with existing technologies***

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

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

481 Moreover, visual implants face competition from other vision restoration approaches, such as stem cell  
482 therapies and optogenetics. Each of these methods comes with its own set of challenges and potential  
483 benefits. For instance, stem cell therapies aim to regenerate damaged retinal cells, while optogenetics  
484 involves using light to control neurons that have been genetically modified. Regardless of the method, it  
485 is crucial for any field aiming to restore useful vision to consider the wants and needs of their target  
486 population.

487 It is essential to consider user needs comprehensively, irrespective of the treatment type. Our study aims  
488 to contribute valuable insights not only to researchers developing bionic eyes but also to app developers,  
489 scientists, and ophthalmologists. Understanding user expectations and real-life applications will ensure  
490 that these technologies are tailored to enhance the quality of life for individuals with vision loss. By  
491 addressing the practical and emotional needs of users, we can foster the development of more effective  
492 and user-centered vision restoration solutions.

493 ***Study limitations***

494 We acknowledge that, as with most qualitative retrospective interview studies, hindsight bias is a  
495 potential issue. Recent negative headlines about the Argus II may have further influenced perceptions. To  
496 mitigate this, we employed several strategies.

497 First, we interviewed a diverse group of implantees, representing approximately 1.5% of the global Argus  
498 II population and 67% of the individuals who still have the Orion implant. However, the small sample  
499 size limits the generalizability of our findings, as it reflects only a fraction of the broader population of  
500 visual prosthesis users. Despite this, the study offers valuable insights into real-world implant use. We  
501 asked participants to provide specific examples to illustrate their opinions, ensuring that their responses  
502 were based on concrete experiences rather than retrospective bias. For instance, I2-A stated:

503 “I learned in the first few months of using the Argus II that the device was very limited, contrary  
504 to what I had seen from ads of people skiing. But I was fortunate to participate in the early trials  
505 and test a lot of the new technologies.”

506 In contrast, I3-A mentioned positive feelings towards the device, saying that the implant met and  
507 occasionally exceeded expectations. However, these feelings did not always translate into the measured  
508 usefulness of the implant, as reflected across implantee responses in Table 4.

509 Second, we conducted a thematic analysis where two researchers independently identified common  
510 themes across all participants at different stages of their visual prosthetic journey. These insights are  
511 crucial for new and existing companies developing future visual prostheses. While hindsight bias is  
512 inevitable, the lived experiences of past implantees offer invaluable guidance for the next generation of  
513 visual prostheses.

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

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

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

521 The technology is still in its infancy, and implantees recognize this. While current devices meet their  
522 expectations, they anticipate substantial progress. Participant I5-O's expressed:

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

525 However, fulfilling these user wishes requires addressing fundamental technical challenges in the  
526 interactions between electrical stimulation and neuronal activity in the visual system. Issues such as  
527 electrical current spread and neuronal crosstalk<sup>56-58</sup>, nonselective activation of neurons<sup>59,60</sup>, phosphene  
528 persistence and fading<sup>61-63</sup>, lack of eye movement compensation<sup>42,43</sup> and retinal remodeling<sup>64,65</sup>  
529 significantly influence neural responses to stimulation<sup>19,66-69</sup>. Interviewed implantees were not aware of  
530 these technical challenges, but overcoming them will require significant advancements in electrode array  
531 design, stimulation protocols, and the integration of emerging technologies. Improved understanding of  
532 the neural code of vision may also lead to better strategies for interfacing with the visual system<sup>70</sup>.

533 Integrating the perspectives and experiences of implantees into the development of future implants may  
534 be crucial to transforming this implantable device technology into a vital tool for improving quality of  
535 life. By prioritizing implantee experiences and needs, and addressing these fundamental technical  
536 challenges, we can ensure that upcoming generations of implants not only push the boundaries of what is  
537 technically possible but are genuinely useful in the daily life of people who are blind.

538

## References

- 539 1. Luo YH, da Cruz L. The Argus((R)) II Retinal Prosthesis System. *Prog Retin Eye Res.* 2016  
540 Jan;50:89–107.
- 541 2. Palanker D, Le Mer Y, Mohand-Said S, Muqit M, Sahel JA. Photovoltaic Restoration of Central  
542 Vision in Atrophic Age-Related Macular Degeneration. *Ophthalmology.* 2020 Feb 25;
- 543 3. Stingl K, Schippert R, Bartz-Schmidt KU, Besch D, Cottrill CL, Edwards TL, et al. Interim Results  
544 of a Multicenter Trial with the New Electronic Subretinal Implant Alpha AMS in 15 Patients Blind  
545 from Inherited Retinal Degenerations. *Front Neurosci [Internet].* 2017 [cited 2020 May 27];11.  
546 Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnins.2017.00445/full>
- 547 4. Karapanos L, Abbott CJ, Ayton LN, Kolic M, McGuinness MB, Baglin EK, et al. Functional Vision  
548 in the Real-World Environment With a Second-Generation (44-Channel) Suprachoroidal Retinal  
549 Prosthesis. *Transl Vis Sci Technol.* 2021 Aug 12;10(10):7–7.
- 550 5. Fernández E, Alfaro A, Soto-Sánchez C, Gonzalez-Lopez P, Lozano AM, Peña S, et al. Visual  
551 percepts evoked with an intracortical 96-channel microelectrode array inserted in human occipital  
552 cortex. *J Clin Invest [Internet].* 2021 Dec 1 [cited 2022 Feb 1];131(23). Available from:  
553 <https://www.jci.org/articles/view/151331>
- 554 6. Barry MP, Sadeghi R, Towle VL, Stipp K, Puhov H, Diaz W, et al. Preliminary visual function for  
555 the first human with the Intracortical Visual Prosthesis (ICVP). *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2023 Jun  
556 1;64(8):2842.
- 557 7. Beauchamp MS, Oswalt D, Sun P, Foster BL, Magnotti JF, Niketghad S, et al. Dynamic Stimulation  
558 of Visual Cortex Produces Form Vision in Sighted and Blind Humans. *Cell.* 2020 May  
559 14;181(4):774–783.e5.
- 560 8. Fernandez E. Development of visual Neuroprostheses: trends and challenges. *Bioelectron Med.* 2018  
561 Aug 13;4(1):12.
- 562 9. Weiland JD, Walston ST, Humayun MS. Electrical Stimulation of the Retina to Produce Artificial  
563 Vision. *Annu Rev Vis Sci.* 2016;2(1):273–94.
- 564 10. Duncan JL, Richards TP, Arditi A, Cruz L da, Dagnelie G, Dorn JD, et al. Improvements in vision-  
565 related quality of life in blind patients implanted with the Argus II Epiretinal Prosthesis. *Clin Exp  
566 Optom.* 2017;100(2):144–50.
- 567 11. Parnami K, Bhattacharyya A. Current approaches to vision restoration using optogenetic therapy.  
568 *Front Cell Neurosci.* 2023 Aug 16;17:1236826.
- 569 12. Hu ML, Edwards TL, O’Hare F, Hickey DG, Wang JH, Liu Z, et al. Gene therapy for inherited  
570 retinal diseases: progress and possibilities. *Clin Exp Optom.* 2021 Mar 2;0(0):1–11.
- 571 13. Siy Uy H, Chan PS, Cruz FM. Stem Cell Therapy: a Novel Approach for Vision Restoration in  
572 Retinitis Pigmentosa. *Med Hypothesis Discov Innov Ophthalmol.* 2013;2(2):52–5.
- 573 14. McGregor JE. Restoring vision at the fovea. *Curr Opin Behav Sci.* 2019 Dec 1;30:210–6.
- 574 15. Ahuja AK, Yeoh J, Dorn JD, Caspi A, Wuyyuru V, McMahon MJ, et al. Factors Affecting Perceptual  
575 Threshold in Argus II Retinal Prosthesis Subjects. *Transl Vis Sci Technol.* 2013 Apr;2(4):1.
- 576 16. Yücel EI, Sadeghi R, Kartha A, Montezuma SR, Dagnelie G, Rokem A, et al. Factors affecting two-  
577 point discrimination in Argus II patients. *Front Neurosci [Internet].* 2022 [cited 2022 Sep 11];16.  
578 Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnins.2022.901337>
- 579 17. Hou Y, Nanduri D, Granley J, Weiland JD, Beyeler M. Axonal stimulation affects the linear  
580 summation of single-point perception in three Argus II users. *J Neural Eng.* 2024 Apr;21(2):026031.
- 581 18. Gregori NZ, Callaway NF, Hoepfner C, Yuan A, Rachitskaya A, Feuer W, et al. Retinal Anatomy  
582 and Electrode Array Position in Retinitis Pigmentosa Patients After Argus II Implantation: An  
583 International Study. *Am J Ophthalmol.* 2018 Sep 1;193:87–99.
- 584 19. Granley J, Beyeler M. A Computational Model of Phosphene Appearance for Epiretinal Prostheses.  
585 In: 2021 43rd Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine Biology Society  
586 (EMBC). 2021. p. 4477–81.

- 587 20. Beyeler M, Nanduri D, Weiland JD, Rokem A, Boynton GM, Fine I. A model of ganglion axon  
588 pathways accounts for percepts elicited by retinal implants. *Sci Rep*. 2019 Jun 24;9(1):1–16.
- 589 21. Barry MP, Armenta Salas M, Patel U, Wuyyuru V, Niketeghad S, Bosking WH, et al. Video-mode  
590 percepts are smaller than sums of single-electrode phosphenes with the Orion® visual cortical  
591 prosthesis. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2020 Jun 10;61(7):927.
- 592 22. da Cruz L, Dorn JD, Humayun MS, Dagnelie G, Handa J, Barale PO, et al. Five-Year Safety and  
593 Performance Results from the Argus II Retinal Prosthesis System Clinical Trial. *Ophthalmology*.  
594 2016 Oct 1;123(10):2248–54.
- 595 23. Marks D. Models of disability. *Disabil Rehabil*. 1997 Jan 1;19(3):85–91.
- 596 24. Htike HM, Margrain TH, Lai YK, Eslambolchilar P. Ability of Head-Mounted Display Technology  
597 to Improve Mobility in People With Low Vision: A Systematic Review. *Transl Vis Sci Technol*  
598 [Internet]. 2020 Sep 24 [cited 2021 Jan 4];9(10). Available from:  
599 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7521174/>
- 600 25. Erickson-Davis C, Korzybska H. What do blind people “see” with retinal prostheses? Observations  
601 and qualitative reports of epiretinal implant users. *PLOS ONE*. 2021 Feb 10;16(2):e0229189.
- 602 26. Kasowski J, Johnson BA, Neydavood R, Akkaraju A, Beyeler M. A systematic review of extended  
603 reality (XR) for understanding and augmenting vision loss. *J Vis*. 2023 May 4;23(5):5.
- 604 27. Hogan AJ. Social and medical models of disability and mental health: evolution and renewal. *CMAJ*  
605 *Can Med Assoc J*. 2019 Jan 7;191(1):E16–8.
- 606 28. Gatchel RJ, Peng YB, Peters ML, Fuchs PN, Turk DC. The biopsychosocial approach to chronic  
607 pain: scientific advances and future directions. *Psychol Bull*. 2007 Jul;133(4):581–624.
- 608 29. Geruschat DR, Richards TP, Arditi A, da Cruz L, Dagnelie G, Dorn JD, et al. An analysis of  
609 observer-rated functional vision in patients implanted with the Argus II Retinal Prosthesis System at  
610 three years. *Clin Exp Optom*. 2016 May;99(3):227–32.
- 611 30. Kartha A, Singh RK, Bradley C, Dagnelie G. Self-Reported Visual Ability Versus Task Performance  
612 in Individuals With Ultra-Low Vision. *Transl Vis Sci Technol*. 2023 Oct 17;12(10):14.
- 613 31. Ayton LN, Rizzo JF III, Bailey IL, Colenbrander A, Dagnelie G, Geruschat DR, et al. Harmonization  
614 of Outcomes and Vision Endpoints in Vision Restoration Trials: Recommendations from the  
615 International HOVER Taskforce. *Transl Vis Sci Technol*. 2020 Jul 16;9(8):25.
- 616 32. Lane FJ, Huyck MH, Troyk PR. The Experiences Of Recipients Of A Cortical Visual Prosthesis: A  
617 Preliminary Analysis Of Nine Participants Expressed Motivation, Decision-making Process, Risks,  
618 And Functional Use Of Phosphenes. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2012 Mar 26;53(14):5553.
- 619 33. Lane J, Rohan EMF, Sabeti F, Essex RW, Maddess T, Dawel A, et al. Impacts of impaired face  
620 perception on social interactions and quality of life in age-related macular degeneration: A qualitative  
621 study and new community resources. *PloS One*. 2018;13(12):e0209218.
- 622 34. Xia Y, Peng X, Ren Q. Retinitis pigmentosa patients’ attitudes toward participation in retinal  
623 prosthesis trials. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2012 Jul 1;33(4):628–32.
- 624 35. Xia Y, Ren Q. Ethical Considerations for Volunteer Recruitment of Visual Prosthesis Trials. *Sci Eng*  
625 *Ethics*. 2013 Sep 1;19(3):1099–106.
- 626 36. Karadima V, Pezaris EA, Pezaris JS. Attitudes of potential recipients toward emerging visual  
627 prosthesis technologies. *Sci Rep*. 2023 Jul 6;13(1):10963.
- 628 37. Finger RP, Tellis B, Crewe J, Keeffe JE, Ayton LN, Guymer RH. Developing the Impact of Vision  
629 Impairment–Very Low Vision (IVI-VLV) Questionnaire as Part of the LoVADA Protocol. *Investig*  
630 *Ophthalmology Vis Sci*. 2014 Oct 1;55(10):6150.
- 631 38. Terheyden JH, Fink DJ, Pondorfer SG, Holz FG, Finger RP. Instrumental Activities of Daily Living  
632 Tools in Very-Low Vision: Ready for Use in Trials? *Pharmaceutics*. 2022 Nov;14(11):2435.
- 633 39. Owsley C, McGWIN GJ, Sloane ME, Stalvey BT, Wells and J. Timed Instrumental Activities of  
634 Daily Living Tasks: Relationship to Visual Function in Older Adults. *Optom Vis Sci*. 2001  
635 May;78(5):350.
- 636 40. Turkstra LM, Van Os A, Bhatia T, Beyeler M. Information Needs and Technology Use for Daily  
637 Living Activities at Home by People Who Are Blind [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Jul 22]. Available

- 638 from: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.03019v1>
- 639 41. Abdolrahmani A, Kuber R, Branham SM. “Siri Talks at You”: An Empirical Investigation of Voice-  
640 Activated Personal Assistant (VAPA) Usage by Individuals Who Are Blind. In: Proceedings of the  
641 20th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility [Internet]. New  
642 York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2018 [cited 2023 Apr 30]. p. 249–58.  
643 (ASSETS '18). Available from: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3234695.3236344>
- 644 42. Caspi A, Roy A, Wuyyuru V, Rosendall PE, Harper JW, Katyal KD, et al. Eye Movement Control in  
645 the Argus II Retinal-Prosthesis Enables Reduced Head Movement and Better Localization Precision.  
646 Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2018 Feb 1;59(2):792–802.
- 647 43. Caspi A, Barry MP, Patel UK, Salas MA, Dorn JD, Roy A, et al. Eye movements and the perceived  
648 location of phosphenes generated by intracranial primary visual cortex stimulation in the blind. Brain  
649 Stimulat. 2021 Jul 1;14(4):851–60.
- 650 44. Granley J, Relic L, Beyeler M. Hybrid Neural Autoencoders for Stimulus Encoding in Visual and  
651 Other Sensory Neuroprostheses. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems [Internet].  
652 2022 [cited 2023 Apr 4]. p. 22671–85. Available from:  
653 [https://papers.nips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2022/hash/8e9a6582caa59fda0302349702965171-Abstract-](https://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/8e9a6582caa59fda0302349702965171-Abstract-Conference.html)  
654 [Conference.html](https://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/8e9a6582caa59fda0302349702965171-Abstract-Conference.html)
- 655 45. Granley J, Fauvel T, Chalk M, Beyeler M. Human-in-the-Loop Optimization for Deep Stimulus  
656 Encoding in Visual Prostheses. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems [Internet].  
657 2023 [cited 2024 Jul 13]. p. 79376–98. Available from:  
658 [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2023/hash/fb06bc3abcece7b8725a8b83b8fa3632-](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/fb06bc3abcece7b8725a8b83b8fa3632-Abstract-Conference.html)  
659 [Abstract-Conference.html](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/fb06bc3abcece7b8725a8b83b8fa3632-Abstract-Conference.html)
- 660 46. Haji Ghaffari D. Improving the Resolution of Prosthetic Vision through Stimulus Parameter  
661 Optimization [Internet] [Thesis]. 2021 [cited 2021 Oct 3]. Available from:  
662 <http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/169970>
- 663 47. de Ruyter van Steveninck J, Güçlü U, van Wezel R, van Gerven M. End-to-end optimization of  
664 prosthetic vision. J Vis. 2022 Feb 28;22(2):20.
- 665 48. Leite de Castro DDC, Grayden DB, Meffin H, Spencer M. Neural activity shaping in visual  
666 prostheses with deep learning. J Neural Eng. 2024 Jul 10;
- 667 49. Sadeghi R, Kartha A, Barry MP, Gibson P, Caspi A, Roy A, et al. Thermal and Distance image  
668 filtering improve independent mobility in Argus II retinal implant. J Vis. 2019 Dec 1;19(15):23–23.
- 669 50. Sadeghi R, Kartha A, Barry MP, Bradley C, Gibson P, Caspi A, et al. Glow in the dark: Using a heat-  
670 sensitive camera for blind individuals with prosthetic vision. Vision Res. 2021 Jul 1;184:23–9.
- 671 51. McCarthy C, Walker JG, Lieby P, Scott A, Barnes N. Mobility and low contrast trip hazard  
672 avoidance using augmented depth. J Neural Eng. 2014 Nov;12(1):016003.
- 673 52. McCarthy C, Walker JG, Lieby P, Scott A, Barnes N. Mobility and low contrast trip hazard  
674 avoidance using augmented depth. J Neural Eng. 2014 Nov;12(1):016003.
- 675 53. Han N, Srivastava S, Xu A, Klein D, Beyeler M. Deep Learning–Based Scene Simplification for  
676 Bionic Vision. In: Augmented Humans Conference 2021 [Internet]. Rovaniemi Finland: ACM; 2021  
677 [cited 2022 Jan 14]. p. 45–54. Available from: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3458709.3458982>
- 678 54. Beyeler M, Sanchez-Garcia M. Towards a Smart Bionic Eye: AI-powered artificial vision for the  
679 treatment of incurable blindness. J Neural Eng. 2022 Dec;19(6):063001.
- 680 55. Sanchez-Garcia M, Martinez-Cantin R, Guerrero JJ. Semantic and structural image segmentation for  
681 prosthetic vision. PLOS ONE. 2020 Jan 29;15(1):e0227677.
- 682 56. Wilke RGH, Moghadam GK, Lovell NH, Suaning GJ, Dokos S. Electric crosstalk impairs spatial  
683 resolution of multi-electrode arrays in retinal implants. J Neural Eng. 2011 Jun;8(4):046016.
- 684 57. Jepson LH, Hottowy P, Mathieson K, Gunning DE, Dąbrowski W, Litke AM, et al. Focal Electrical  
685 Stimulation of Major Ganglion Cell Types in the Primate Retina for the Design of Visual Prostheses.  
686 J Neurosci. 2013 Apr 24;33(17):7194–205.
- 687 58. Madugula SS, Gogliettino AR, Zaidi M, Aggarwal G, Kling A, Shah NP, et al. Focal electrical  
688 stimulation of human retinal ganglion cells for vision restoration. J Neural Eng. 2022 Dec 19;19(6).



- 689 59. Chang YC, Ghaffari DH, Chow RH, Weiland JD. Stimulation strategies for selective activation of  
690 retinal ganglion cell soma and threshold reduction. *J Neural Eng.* 2019 Feb;16(2):026017.
- 691 60. Gaillet V, Cutrone A, Artoni F, Vagni P, Mega Pratiwi A, Romero SA, et al. Spatially selective  
692 activation of the visual cortex via intraneural stimulation of the optic nerve. *Nat Biomed Eng.* 2019  
693 Aug 19;1–14.
- 694 61. Pérez Fornos A, Sommerhalder J, da Cruz L, Sahel JA, Mohand-Said S, Hafezi F, et al. Temporal  
695 Properties of Visual Perception on Electrical Stimulation of the Retina. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.*  
696 2012;53(6):2720–31.
- 697 62. Avraham D, Jung JH, Yitzhaky Y, Peli E. Retinal prosthetic vision simulation: temporal aspects. *J*  
698 *Neural Eng.* 2021 Aug;18(4):0460d9.
- 699 63. Hou Y, Pullela L, Su J, Aluru S, Sista S, Lu X, et al. Predicting the Temporal Dynamics of Prosthetic  
700 Vision [Internet]. arXiv; 2024 [cited 2024 Jul 17]. Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2404.14591>
- 701 64. Jones BW, Marc RE. Retinal remodeling during retinal degeneration. *Exp Eye Res.* 2005  
702 Aug;81(2):123–37.
- 703 65. Pfeiffer RL, Jones BW. Current perspective on retinal remodeling: Implications for therapeutics.  
704 *Front Neuroanat* [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Feb 8];16. Available from:  
705 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnana.2022.1099348>
- 706 66. Beyeler M, Rokem A, Boynton GM, Fine I. Learning to see again: biological constraints on cortical  
707 plasticity and the implications for sight restoration technologies. *J Neural Eng.* 2017 Jun  
708 14;14(5):051003.
- 709 67. Avraham D, Yitzhaky Y. Simulating the perceptual effects of electrode–retina distance in prosthetic  
710 vision. *J Neural Eng* [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 May 17]; Available from:  
711 <http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1741-2552/ac6f82>
- 712 68. Guo T, Tsai D, Bai S, Shivdasani M, Muralidharan M, Li L, et al. Insights from Computational  
713 Modelling: Selective Stimulation of Retinal Ganglion Cells. In: Makarov SN, Noetscher GM,  
714 Nummenmaa A, editors. *Brain and Human Body Modeling 2020: Computational Human Models*  
715 *Presented at EMBC 2019 and the BRAIN Initiative® 2019 Meeting* [Internet]. Cham: Springer  
716 International Publishing; 2021 [cited 2020 Aug 9]. p. 233–47. Available from:  
717 [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45623-8\\_13](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45623-8_13)
- 718 69. Golden JR, Erickson-Davis C, Cottaris NP, Parthasarathy N, Rieke F, Brainard DH, et al. Simulation  
719 of visual perception and learning with a retinal prosthesis. *J Neural Eng.* 2019 Apr;16(2):025003.
- 720 70. Abbasi B, Rizzo JF. Advances in Neuroscience, Not Devices, Will Determine the Effectiveness of  
721 Visual Prostheses. *Semin Ophthalmol.* 2021 Mar 18;0(0):1–8.
- 722