

1 Usability and acceptability of a corneal-plane α -opic light
2 logger in a 24-hour field trial

3

4 Eljoh Balajadia^{1, +}, Sophie Garcia^{1, +}, Janine Stampfli², Björn Schrader², Carolina
5 Guidolin³, Manuel Spitschan^{3, 4, 5, [0000-0002-8572-9268] *}

6

7 1 Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

8 2 Lucerne School of Engineering and Architecture, Horw, Switzerland

9 3 Translational Sensory & Circadian Neuroscience, Max Planck Institute for Biological Cybernetics,
10 Tübingen, Germany

11 4 Chronobiology & Health, TUM Department of Sport and Health Sciences (TUM SG), Technical
12 University of Munich, Munich, Germany

13 5 TUM Institute for Advanced Study (TUM-IAS), Technical University of Munich, Garching, Germany

14

15 + Joint first author

16 * Corresponding author: manuel.spitschan@tum.de

17 Abstract

18 Exposure to light fundamentally influences human physiology and behaviour by synchronising our
19 biological clock to the external light-dark cycle and controlling melatonin production. In addition to well-
20 controlled laboratory studies, more naturalistic approaches to examining these "non-visual" effects of
21 light have been developed in recent years. As naturalistic light exposure is quite unlike well-controlled
22 stimulus conditions in the laboratory, it is critical to measure light exposure in a person-referenced
23 way, the 'spectral diet'. To this end, light loggers have been developed to capture personalised light
24 exposure. As an alternative to light sensors integrated into wrist-worn actimeters, pendants or brooch-
25 based light loggers, a recently developed wearable light logger laterally attached to spectacle frames
26 enables the measurement of biologically relevant quantities in the corneal plane. Here, we examine
27 the usability and acceptability of using the light logger in an undergraduate student sample (n=18,
28 mean±1SD: 20.1±1.7 yrs; 9 female; Oxford, UK) in real-world conditions during a 24-hour
29 measurement period. We probed the acceptability of the light logger using rating questionnaires and
30 open-ended questions. Our quantitative results show a modest acceptability of the light logger. A
31 thematic analysis of the open-ended questions reveals that the form factor of the device, in particular,
32 size, weight and stability, and reactions from other people to the wearer of the light logger, were
33 commonly mentioned aspects. In sum, the results indicate the miniaturisation of light loggers and
34 "invisible" integration into extant everyday objects as key areas for future technological development,
35 facilitating the availability of light exposure data for developing personalised intervention strategies in
36 both research, clinical and consumer contexts.

37 Introduction

38 The importance of light for human health and well-being

39 Light is a key driver of human physiology and behaviour (1). Exposure to even moderate light levels at
40 night can disrupt our circadian clock, neuroendocrine system and sleep physiology. More specifically,
41 evening and night light can suppress the production of the hormone melatonin, delay the circadian
42 rhythm and affect sleep (2–15). This wide-reaching impact on physiology can lead to significant effects
43 on physical and mental health (16–18). On the other side, daytime light exposure can offset these
44 disruptive effects of light and under some circumstances lead to improvement in alertness.

45 The non-visual effects of light – in contrast to the vision and visual perception – are mediated by a
46 pathway connecting the retina to the hypothalamus. In addition to the cones and rods, the retina
47 contains the intrinsically photosensitive retinal ganglion cells (ipRGCs), which express the short-
48 wavelength-sensitive photopigment melanopsin (19–25). The ipRGCs differ in how they respond to
49 light to the cones and rods, by preferring wavelengths near 480 nm, prompting the development of
50 novel methods for quantifying light (25).

51 Measuring light with wearable devices

52 Due to the significance of light in controlling fundamental aspects of physiology and behaviour, there
53 has been a drive to develop wearable devices for capturing light exposure in a personalized way, the
54 ‘spectral diet’ (26). To our knowledge, the work by Okudaira et al. (27) was the first to measure light
55 exposure in an ambulatory fashion by mounting a light sensor on the forehead and wrist of an
56 observer. Over the past 40 years, various other ways to capture light exposure have been developed
57 (reviewed in (28)), including pendants, brooches, wrist-worn packages and loggers mounted in the
58 plane of the cornea (e.g., (29,30)).

59 Light loggers can be used for a variety of purposes (31–34,29,35–49), spanning both research (e.g.,
60 associational or intervention studies) and clinical (e.g. compliance to light therapy regime) settings.
61 They differ in their ability to capture quantities related to light accurately (50), with some only capturing
62 the photopic illuminance (lux). As photopic illuminance is related to human brightness perception, but
63 not the non-visual effects of light, the International Commission on Illumination (CIE) standardised the
64 spectral sensitivities for the human photoreceptors, and proposed related units (51). The proposed
65 quantities are called α -opic, where “ α ” is a placeholder for the L, M and S cones, the rods and the
66 melanopsin-containing ipRGCs in the human retina.

67 Importantly, different measurement locations may produce different estimates of light exposure which
68 may not be directly relatable or transformable. Furthermore, light loggers worn on the wrist or on the

69 chest may be covered by sleeves or jackets (37,45,48,49), resulting in unreliable data very far
70 removed from actual ocular light exposure, thereby necessitating measurements in the corneal plane.

71 Novel light logger capturing α -opic quantities in the corneal plane

72 More recently, Stampfli et al. (52) developed a novel light logger which attaches to the side of
73 spectacle frames (Figure 1), placing the sensor in the plane of the cornea, the front surface of the eye.
74 This set-up takes account of a participant's head movements and replaces manual measurements
75 taken with spectroradiometers at regular intervals in laboratory settings. The *lido* device weights ~27
76 g, has a battery life of seven days and captures the α -opic irradiance at 10-sec intervals in an
77 approximately cosine fashion. The *lido* device has been characterised extensively with respect to its
78 metrological properties, including spectral measurements to characterize deviations from α -opic
79 equivalent daylight (D65) illuminance and α -opic irradiance (<10% for various white light sources) and
80 from photopic illuminance (<5% for white light sources), and geometric measurements to characterize
81 the angular response of the device (f_2 relative to cosine ~5%). In addition, the *lido* device was
82 characterized with conjoint measurements with a commercial research-grade device by Ocean Insight,
83 showing good agreement. The *lido* device captures light in the range from approx. 5 lx to 100,000 lx.
84 For further details, the reader is pointed to the publication by Stampfli et al. (52).

85 The *lido* device has the potential to yield biologically-relevant measurements of light exposure in the
86 corneal plane over long periods. Going beyond the technical and analytic validation of the device (53),
87 in this work we examine whether the *lido* device is usable and acceptable in a 24-hour field trial. The
88 goal is to learn whether it can be deployed in large-scale field trials, for which acceptability is a key
89 requirement.

90 Materials and methods

91 Participants

92 Participants were recruited from the wider University of Oxford community through an email and
93 internet recruitment campaign targeting participants aged between 18 and 25 years, wearing habitual
94 glasses and living in Oxford. Participants received £25 for their participation in the study.

95 A total of 18 volunteers ($n=18$) aged between 18 and 24 years (mean \pm 1SD: 20.1 \pm 1.7; 9 female, 9
96 male; 1 non-binary gender identity) participated in the study. All volunteers were able to read and
97 understand English, were full time students and lived within the Oxford Ring Road. On average,
98 participants reported spending 2.1 \pm 1.3 hours daily outside (min: 1, max: 6) on weekdays, and 2.6 \pm 1.9
99 hours outside (min: 0, max: 8) on weekend days ($V = 50.5$, $p = 0.01503$, paired Wilcoxon signed rank

100 test). As commuting to work is a key opportunity for outdoors light, we asked whether participants for
101 their mode of transport bicycle: 8, on foot: 9, mainly work from home: 1).

102 Procedure

103 After completing an initial online screening survey, participants were invited to an in-person visit.
104 Participants' glasses were fitted with the *lido* by a researcher using a shrinking tube and heat gun.
105 They were given instructions as to how to use the device, including they were told that should they
106 remove the device for a significant amount of time (i.e., longer than 20 seconds), then they should
107 indicate this by pressing the button on the device. They were informed that the glasses emitted a small
108 green flash from an LED light every 10 seconds, this being an indication that the device is working.
109 The participants were instructed to place their glasses on a flat surface when they went to sleep,
110 facing the same direction as they were lying down. This procedure allowed for the capture of light
111 exposure in the sleep environment, limited by the valid range of light levels that can be captured by
112 the *lido* device. After 24 hours the participants were asked to return to the study site to return the
113 devices and complete rating scales and open-ended questions.

114 Rating scales and open-ended question

115 We probed the usability and acceptability of wearing the *lido* device over the 24-hour data collection
116 period using a series of scales. We probed (a) social acceptability of the device using the WEAR
117 (WEearable Acceptability Range) Scale (54), (b) usability using the System Usability Scale (SUS) (55),
118 (c) acceptance using a previously developed scale (56) and (d) subjective experience using the
119 Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI) (57,58), with specific reference to the 24-hour period of data
120 collection ("the task"). For all scales, we used 7-item Likert items capturing agreement ("Strongly
121 disagree", "Disagree", "Somewhat disagree", "Neither agree or disagree", "Somewhat agree", "Agree",
122 "Strongly agree"). In addition to the quantitative scales, we also asked the open-ended question "Do
123 you have any other comments or observations about the device?". Participants completed the
124 questionnaires via the REDCap system (59,60).

125 Analytic strategy

126 The rating scale data were simply visualised descriptively. The thematic analysis was performed by
127 one author (S.G.) and quality-checked by the senior author (M.S.). We performed thematic analysis
128 using NVivo v12 (QSR International, Burlington, MA), following the steps presented by Braun & Clarke
129 (2006). These steps are as follows: familiarisation with the data; generating initial codes; searching for
130 themes; reviewing themes; defining and naming themes; and producing the report. The *lido* was

131 created by some authors of this paper (development: J.S., B.S.; validation: M.S.). These authors did
132 not not perform any qualitative analysis of the data presented here, which could have led to biases.

133 Results

134 Subjective ratings

135 The quantitative data are shown in Figure 2, showing the rating data for the WEAR (WEearable
136 Acceptability Range) Scale, the System Usability Scale (SUS), acceptance using a previously
137 developed scale and subjective experience using the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI). As the scales
138 probes a large number of items, we highlight only the most salient aspects here, concerning comfort
139 and public perception.

140 Convenience and comfort of using the light logger

141 The light logger was found to be annoying, uncomfortable, aesthetically not pleasing and not
142 fashionable, and bulky. We highlight representative items in Figure 2 in colour: “Wearing the
143 components feels weird physically” (high agreement), “I think using the device was annoying” (high
144 agreement), “I think the device was comfortable” (low agreement), “I think the device is well suited to
145 my body” (low agreement), “This device is sleek, not clunky” (low agreement), and “This device seems
146 comfortable, not bulky” (low agreement).

147 Perception of light logger users

148 Participants rated the perception that users, scoring high agreement on the item “This device could
149 make people uncomfortable” and low agreement on the items “There is no chance of being ridiculed
150 when wearing this device” and “This device would enhance the wearer's image” (Figure 2).

151 Qualitative results

152 Eleven (n=11) of the 18 participants completed the open-ended feedback. The thematic analysis
153 revealed three main clusters: (1) size and weight of the device, (2) reactions of others, (3) positive
154 feedback. The themes and sub-themes contained within these are presented in Table 1, along with
155 illustrative quotes, and are detailed below.

156 Size and weight of the device

157 **Instability on the glasses frame.** One criticism of the prototype device was that it felt unstable on the
158 participants' glasses, with one participant “[fearing] the device would fall off” during a dance class, and

159 another stating the device felt like it was going to fall off even when they were working (“made it want
160 to fall off whenever I was working [and] turning my head”). This suggests that for both vigorous
161 (dancing) and non-vigorous (working) activities, the device does not feel secure when attached to a
162 glasses frame.

163 **Affecting the tilt of the glasses.** A key criticism seen in replies to the open-ended question are those
164 referencing the way in which the device causes glasses frames to tilt. 8/11 participants who completed
165 this question referenced this issue. This device was cited as having “tilted” a participant’s glasses
166 which “affected [their] vision a little bit”. The weight of the glasses, and the resulting tilt of some
167 participants’ glasses also appeared to have a negative effect on concentration, with one subject
168 stating: “Because the device is heavy I could feel my specs leaning on one side which made it difficult
169 to focus on studies, because you are wearing diagonal specs”.

170 **The dimensions of the device being too great.** The idea of the device being too “bulky” was also a
171 theme that reoccurred throughout participant’s feedback. This was not referencing the effect of the
172 size and weight of the device on the participants’ glasses, but rather on the participants themselves.
173 Participants could have been “aware of the device for most of the task” due to its size. One participant
174 called the device “[v]ery cumbersome to wear”.

175 **Suggestions for improvements.** Of those participants who raised an issue with the tilt of their
176 glasses caused by the device, a number also offered ways they thought this could be overcome. All
177 these suggestions involved adding a “load on the other side” of the glasses frame being used, to offset
178 the weight of the device, and keep the frames “balanced” (“[t]his can be solved by adding a
179 counterweight on the opposite arm of the glasses”). To address the size of the device being too great,
180 a suggestion was given to move the position of the device such that participants would no longer
181 “glance at the device”. This would detract from its distractions during activities like “cycling” (“could
182 potentially be moved further back so it can’t be seen”).

183 Reactions of others

184 **Positive reactions from peers.** A few participants described others’ positive reactions to the device.
185 These appear to centre on curiosity in the device, with friends interested in “knowing more about it”:
186 “She was quite intrigued knowing I was wearing a [dosimeter] as part of an experiment – neutral to
187 positive reaction”.

188 **Negative reaction from others.** One theme that was seen was a suspicion from others as to the
189 purpose of the device. This was seen both for peers and members of authority. Although the device
190 does not record anything other than light and tilt measures, those who are not participating in the
191 study may not be aware of this. This may lead to another issue, that regarding negative attention such
192 as “having people stare at the device while you wear it” which may act to make participants “feel a little
193 uncomfortable”. This is illustrated in the following quote: “The placement of the device and the small

194 circle on the front meant that some people assumed that it was a video recording device, which made
195 them feel uncomfortable due to privacy issues”

196 Positive Feedback

197 **Positive feedback regarding physical aspects of the device.** There were also comments relating to
198 advantages of the device itself and its usage. One participant cited it as being “mostly comfortable”.
199 Another stated that it was “unobtrusive and easy to use”. This latter participant had thicker glasses
200 frames and this may have influenced why they thought it was more subtle than others with
201 smaller/thinner frames.

202 **Usefulness of the information recorded by the device.** Another theme which was seen was
203 reference to the use of the information collected by the device. The device was seen as “very useful”
204 by some participants. One avenue which was referenced as being particularly useful was to track “all
205 of the artificial light from electronic devices” and suggests that participants may be interested in this
206 device for more clinical reasons. One participant wrote: “Might be very beneficial for [...] eye health,
207 sleep circadian rhythms, and brain health! I think the device therefore has a lot of potential in its future
208 uses!”

209 Objective light measurements

210 Throughout the trial, we collected actual corneal light exposure data. We present the quantitative data
211 collected for 17 participants in Figures 3 and 4. One participant (P03) was excluded from this analysis
212 due to abnormal and physiologically implausible patterns of light exposure. The exemplary 24-hour
213 time courses of light exposure are shown in Figure 3, with each panel corresponding to one
214 participant. The data was thresholded to remove melanopic equivalent daylight illuminance (mEDI)
215 values below 1 lux, in accordance with the estimated valid and trustworthy range of light levels. This
216 enabled the identification of a main sleep or “lights off” period for each participant, which was scored
217 visually by one author (C.G.). An overview of variations in melanopic light exposure across the 24-
218 hour period for all participants can be observed in Figure 4, where a 1-hour centered moving average
219 was applied to the data for each participant for smoothing. As shown, mEDI levels progressively drop
220 towards individuals’ bed time, to increase again after wake. Figure 4 also illustrates the relationship
221 between mEDI and photopic illuminance, calculated for day periods.

222

223 Discussion

224 Known limitations

225 A key limitation of this study is the duration of the data collection and wearing period, which was
226 restricted to 24-hours. While a 24-hour observation duration may be useful for obtaining exemplary
227 data for a participant, it is expected that there are significant inter-daily variations in light exposure. As
228 a consequence, our quantitative and qualitative data may provide only a partial insight into the
229 usability and acceptability with longer data collection periods. In the assessment of sleep-wake
230 rhythms using actigraphy, for example, data collection periods of >1 week are recommended (62–64).
231 Given that there are differences in light exposure between weekdays and weekends (65–69), it is
232 expected that a similar or longer measurement duration would be necessary to yield useful light
233 logging data. Additionally, metrics to summarise light exposure, such as the recently proposed Light
234 Regularity Index (70), require longer data collection periods. It is expected that if anything, the
235 concerns raised by the participants during a 24-hour trial will be similar, if not worse, in longer trials.

236 Although providing us with important information about the participants' opinion regarding the device,
237 a major limitation is the sample size for the qualitative analysis. Only eleven of the eighteen
238 participants provided this type of data. This meant that searching for consistent themes across
239 participants was challenging. For some of the themes (positive reactions from peers, instability on the
240 glasses frame, positive feedback regarding physical aspects of the device, and usefulness of the
241 information recorded by the device) there were only two examples available. Although this gives us
242 insight into the opinions of some participants, a larger investigation may be necessary to uncover
243 these aspects in detail. To maximise the completeness of the qualitative data, it may be useful to
244 require participants to answer the open-ended question included in the surveys.

245 The approach taken here focused on the use a single light logger form factor, that of the *lido* device
246 worn as an attachment to spectacle frames. As a consequence, the data presented here are not
247 indicative of the “absolute” acceptability and usability of this specific instance of the device. Instead,
248 the study primarily provides qualitative insights into which design features may be targets for
249 improvement. To advance our understanding of the practical needs of light logging forward, it may be
250 advisable to investigate other form factors, e.g., brooches or pendants, in a systematic investigation,
251 Such an investigation, which does not necessarily require the availability of functional devices but
252 could work with mock devices, could deploy focus-group methodology to discover potentially novel
253 ways of designing a wearable light logger. Importantly, we believe that the choice of light logger for a
254 given research or clinical application follows a trade-off of form factor, usability, long-term deployability
255 and demands on data quality, fidelity and physiological relevance.

256 Finally, the sample in this study consisted of 18 young, healthy and cooperative students in Oxford,
257 UK, representing a “WEIRD” (White, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic) sample (71).
258 There may be idiosyncrasies in the subjective evaluation of usability and acceptability in of the
259 corneal-plane devices used here due to the moderate sample size and limited geographical context.
260 The results of this study indicate modest acceptability of the devices, which we expect may decrease
261 further in clinical populations, or other samples. Consequently, the usability and acceptability of light
262 loggers – of any form factor – may require further investigation across diverse samples and diverse
263 contexts.

264 Towards convenient, continuous all-weather personal light logging

265 The thematic analysis undertaken produced three themes: size and weight of the device; reactions of
266 others; and positive feedback. The majority of feedback (8/11) included negative comments regarding
267 the weight of device. Not only did this include concerns about the size of the device and the
268 consequences of this, but also suggestions on how to correct its instability and the tilt of glasses
269 frames. These combined suggest that the device is currently too large and heavy. This feedback
270 should be integrated by researchers and developers when developing new wearables, as it
271 emphasizes the importance of size and weight both from a practical and acceptable standpoint.

272 The device has an IP20 rating, which means that it is product and will be resistant to objects >12 mm
273 in size. However, this also means that it has no protection against liquids and will be susceptible to
274 damage if it comes into contact sprays of water. This meant that we could not perform data collection
275 on days when it was raining heavily. However, it is likely that participants would have spent a greater
276 amount of time indoors anyway on days with particular rain. It is more likely to have been affected on
277 days in which rain was light, as individuals may have performed normal daily activities, including
278 outdoor ones, but the device would still need to be removed from the glasses frame in this instance. In
279 this situation, the light data gathered would not reflect the “spectral diet” of the affected individual.
280 Future devices should consider weather-proofing the devices comprehensively to allow for continuous
281 all-weather light logging. The *lido* device is mounted on spectacle frames, limiting the range of use
282 cases, as it requires the wearer to habitually and continually wear glasses. Participants were
283 instructed to place their glasses on a flat surface when they went to sleep, thereby allowing us to
284 collect data in the sleep-environment. Due to the lower end of the dynamic range of the *lido* device (~5
285 lx), this procedure represents a compromise in being able sample light in the sleep environment.

286 There have been recent advances in towards miniaturization of light sensors with spectral capabilities
287 (73–77). These may result in new opportunities for developing light loggers and dosimeters that are
288 nearly invisible or at least to some degree integrated into common objects (e.g., earrings, spectacles).
289 Such developments could aid in addressing some of the challenges brought forward by the


290 participants here, specifically regarding size and weight, and intrusiveness, and also mitigate the
291 potential loss of data due to sensors being covered by sleeves or other clothing.

292 Conclusion

293 Wearable light loggers represent a methodology to capture light exposure in a personalised fashion.
294 Here, we examined the acceptability of a spectacle-attached light logger capturing α -opic irradiance.
295 Through quantitative and qualitative analysis, we found modest acceptability in real-world conditions.
296 The qualitative analysis highlights size and weight as key targets for improvement, providing
297 imperatives for developing novel light sensors with a smaller footprint to enable the “invisible” capture
298 of visible optical radiation in everyday settings.


299 Figures

300 Figure 1




301

302 **Figure 1:** Wearable corneal-plane α -opic light logger. **A** Light logger unattached to spectacle frame,
303 highlighting magnets for secure attachment. **B** Light logger attached to spectacle frames, highlighting
304 diffuser and event button for logging user-defined events. Photos by Licht@hslu.




306
307
308
309

Figure 2: Rating data. Highlight colours correspond to specific areas highlighted in the text (blue: convenience and comfort of using the device, green: perception of others)



310
311
312

Figure 3: Objective light exposure data for participants with valid data (n=17). Yellow regions show visually scored main sleeping/"lights off" periods.



313

314

315

316

317

318

Figure 4: Melanopic light exposure across the 24-hour period and during day periods. (A) Changes in melanopic equivalent daylight illuminance (mEDI) across 24 hours (n=17). Individual lines represent 1-h centred moving averages and black dots indicate start and end of data collection and sleep periods. (B) Correlation between mean photopic illuminance and mean equivalent daylight illuminance (n=17) participants. Individual points represent mean values calculated for “day” periods.

319 Tables

320 Table 1: Themes and sub-themes identified from thematic analysis

321

Theme	Sub-themes	Illustrative Quotes
Size and weight of the device	Instability on the glasses frame	“In my dance class I was unable to participate in all the steps as a lot of jumping is involved and I feared the device would fall off.”
	Affecting the tilt of the glasses	“The weight is noticeable, as it causes a slight imbalance of the glasses.”
	The dimensions of the device being too great	“Which made it very cumbersome to wear.”
	Suggestions for improvements	“An idea would be to have a weight on the other side of the specs as well so that it remains balanced.”
Reactions of peers	Positive reactions	“All my friend asked me what that was but they took it in a fun way and actually enjoyed the device and knowing more about it.”
	Negative reactions	“My tutors feared that it was a secret recording device with a camera so they were very suspicious in the start.”
Positive feedback	Positive feedback regarding physical aspects of the device	“The device was mostly comfortable.”
	Usefulness of the information recorded by the device	“I think the information it can record is very useful.”

322

323

324 Statements

325 Statement of Ethics

326 The research project was reviewed and approved by the Medical Sciences Interdivisional Research
327 Ethics Committee (MS IDREC) of the University of Oxford (R79098/RE001, R79102/RE001). All
328 participants gave written informed consent. The research was conducted in accordance with the World
329 Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki.

330 Conflict of Interest Statement

331 The authors have no relevant conflicts of interest to declare.

332 Funding Sources

333 During parts of this work, M.S. was supported by a Sir Henry Wellcome Postdoctoral Fellowship
334 (Wellcome Trust, 204686/Z/16/Z) and Linacre College, University of Oxford (Biomedical Sciences
335 Junior Research Fellowship).

336 Author Contributions

337 *Conceptualization*: Manuel Spitschan

338 *Data curation*: Manuel Spitschan

339 *Formal Analysis*: n/a

340 *Funding acquisition*: Manuel Spitschan

341 *Investigation*: Eljoh Balajadia, Sophie Garcia, Carolina Guidolin, Manuel Spitschan

342 *Methodology*: Eljoh Balajadia, Sophie Garcia, Manuel Spitschan

343 *Project administration*: n/a

344 *Resources*: Janine Stampfli, Björn Schrader

345 *Software*: Janine Stampfli, Björn Schrader, Carolina Guidolin,

346 *Supervision*: Manuel Spitschan

347 *Validation*: n/a

348 *Visualization*: Carolina Guidolin, Manuel Spitschan

349 *Writing – original draft*: Manuel Spitschan

350 *Writing – review & editing*: Eljoh Balajadia, Sophie Garcia, Janine Stampfli, Björn Schrader, Carolina
351 Guidolin, Manuel Spitschan

352 Data Availability Statement

353 All data, code and materials are available on GitHub ([https://github.com/TUMChronobiology/lido-](https://github.com/TUMChronobiology/lido-acceptability)
354 [acceptability](https://github.com/TUMChronobiology/lido-acceptability)).

355

356 References

- 357 1. Blume C, Garbazza C, Spitschan M. Effects of light on human circadian rhythms, sleep and mood.
358 Somnologie Schlafforschung Schlafmed Somnology Sleep Res Sleep Med. 2019 Sep;23(3):147–
359 56.
- 360 2. Czeisler CA, Kronauer RE, Allan JS, Duffy JF, Jewett ME, Brown EN, et al. Bright light induction of
361 strong (type 0) resetting of the human circadian pacemaker. Science. 1989 Jun
362 16;244(4910):1328–33.
- 363 3. Boivin DB, Duffy JF, Kronauer RE, Czeisler CA. Sensitivity of the human circadian pacemaker to
364 moderately bright light. J Biol Rhythms. 1994;9(3–4):315–31.
- 365 4. Boivin DB, Duffy JF, Kronauer RE, Czeisler CA. Dose-response relationships for resetting of
366 human circadian clock by light. Nature. 1996 Feb 8;379(6565):540–2.
- 367 5. Zeitzer JM, Dijk DJ, Kronauer R, Brown E, Czeisler C. Sensitivity of the human circadian
368 pacemaker to nocturnal light: melatonin phase resetting and suppression. J Physiol. 2000 Aug
369 1;526 Pt 3(Pt 3):695–702.
- 370 6. Gooley JJ, Rajaratnam SMW, Brainard GC, Kronauer RE, Czeisler CA, Lockley SW. Spectral
371 responses of the human circadian system depend on the irradiance and duration of exposure to
372 light. Sci Transl Med. 2010 May 12;2(31):31ra33.
- 373 7. Rüger M, St Hilaire MA, Brainard GC, Khalsa SBS, Kronauer RE, Czeisler CA, et al. Human
374 phase response curve to a single 6.5 h pulse of short-wavelength light. J Physiol. 2013 Jan
375 1;591(1):353–63.
- 376 8. St Hilaire MA, Ámundadóttir ML, Rahman SA, Rajaratnam SMW, Rüger M, Brainard GC, et al.
377 The spectral sensitivity of human circadian phase resetting and melatonin suppression to light
378 changes dynamically with light duration. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2022 Dec
379 20;119(51):e2205301119.
- 380 9. Lewy AJ, Wehr TA, Goodwin FK, Newsome DA, Markey SP. Light suppresses melatonin secretion
381 in humans. Science. 1980 Dec 12;210(4475):1267–9.
- 382 10. Brainard GC, Hanifin JP, Greeson JM, Byrne B, Glickman G, Gerner E, et al. Action spectrum for
383 melatonin regulation in humans: evidence for a novel circadian photoreceptor. J Neurosci Off J
384 Soc Neurosci. 2001 Aug 15;21(16):6405–12.
- 385 11. Brainard GC, Hanifin JP, Rollag MD, Greeson J, Byrne B, Glickman G, et al. Human melatonin
386 regulation is not mediated by the three cone photopic visual system. J Clin Endocrinol Metab.
387 2001 Jan;86(1):433–6.
- 388 12. Thapan K, Arendt J, Skene DJ. An action spectrum for melatonin suppression: evidence for a
389 novel non-rod, non-cone photoreceptor system in humans. J Physiol. 2001 Aug 15;535(Pt 1):261–
390 7.
- 391 13. Gooley JJ, Chamberlain K, Smith KA, Khalsa SBS, Rajaratnam SMW, Van Reen E, et al.
392 Exposure to room light before bedtime suppresses melatonin onset and shortens melatonin
393 duration in humans. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2011 Mar;96(3):E463-472.

- 394 14. Phillips AJK, Vidadfar P, Burns AC, McGlashan EM, Anderson C, Rajaratnam SMW, et al. High
395 sensitivity and interindividual variability in the response of the human circadian system to evening
396 light. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2019 Jun 11;116(24):12019–24.
- 397 15. Cain SW, McGlashan EM, Vidadfar P, Mustafovska J, Curran SPN, Wang X, et al. Evening home
398 lighting adversely impacts the circadian system and sleep. *Sci Rep*. 2020 Nov 5;10(1):19110.
- 399 16. Paksarian D, Rudolph KE, Stapp EK, Dunster GP, He J, Mennitt D, et al. Association of Outdoor
400 Artificial Light at Night With Mental Disorders and Sleep Patterns Among US Adolescents. *JAMA*
401 *Psychiatry*. 2020 Dec 1;77(12):1266–75.
- 402 17. Burns AC, Saxena R, Vetter C, Phillips AJK, Lane JM, Cain SW. Time spent in outdoor light is
403 associated with mood, sleep, and circadian rhythm-related outcomes: A cross-sectional and
404 longitudinal study in over 400,000 UK Biobank participants. *J Affect Disord*. 2021 Dec 1;295:347–
405 52.
- 406 18. Mason IC, Grimaldi D, Reid KJ, Warlick CD, Malkani RG, Abbott SM, et al. Light exposure during
407 sleep impairs cardiometabolic function. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*. 2022 Mar 22;119(12):e2113290119.
- 408 19. Provencio I, Rodriguez IR, Jiang G, Hayes WP, Moreira EF, Rollag MD. A novel human opsin in
409 the inner retina. *J Neurosci Off J Soc Neurosci*. 2000 Jan 15;20(2):600–5.
- 410 20. Hattar S, Liao HW, Takao M, Berson DM, Yau KW. Melanopsin-containing retinal ganglion cells:
411 architecture, projections, and intrinsic photosensitivity. *Science*. 2002 Feb 8;295(5557):1065–70.
- 412 21. Lucas RJ, Hattar S, Takao M, Berson DM, Foster RG, Yau KW. Diminished pupillary light reflex at
413 high irradiances in melanopsin-knockout mice. *Science*. 2003 Jan 10;299(5604):245–7.
- 414 22. Rollag MD, Berson DM, Provencio I. Melanopsin, ganglion-cell photoreceptors, and mammalian
415 photoentrainment. *J Biol Rhythms*. 2003 Jun;18(3):227–34.
- 416 23. Brown TM. Melanopic illuminance defines the magnitude of human circadian light responses
417 under a wide range of conditions. *J Pineal Res*. 2020 Aug;69(1):e12655.
- 418 24. Spitschan M. Melanopsin contributions to non-visual and visual function. *Curr Opin Behav Sci*.
419 2019 Dec;30:67–72.
- 420 25. Lucas RJ, Peirson SN, Berson DM, Brown TM, Cooper HM, Czeisler CA, et al. Measuring and
421 using light in the melanopsin age. *Trends Neurosci*. 2014 Jan;37(1):1–9.
- 422 26. Webler FS, Spitschan M, Foster RG, Andersen M, Peirson SN. What is the “spectral diet” of
423 humans? *Curr Opin Behav Sci*. 2019 Dec;30:80–6.
- 424 27. Okudaira N, Kripke DF, Webster JB. Naturalistic studies of human light exposure. *Am J Physiol*.
425 1983 Oct;245(4):R613-615.
- 426 28. Hartmeyer S, Webler F, Andersen M. Towards a framework for light-dosimetry studies:
427 Methodological considerations. *Light Res Technol*. 2022 Jul 19;147715352211032.
- 428 29. Hubalek S. LuxBlick: Messung der täglichen Lichtexposition zur Beurteilung der nicht-visuellen
429 Lichtwirkungen über das Auge. [Zürich]: Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule ETH Zürich;
430 2007.

- 431 30. Howell CM, McCullough SJ, Doyle L, Murphy MH, Saunders KJ. Reliability and validity of the
432 Actiwatch and Clouclip for measuring illumination in real-world conditions. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt.*
433 2021 Sep;41(5):1048–59.
- 434 31. Savides TJ, Messin S, Senger C, Kripke DF. Natural light exposure of young adults. *Physiol*
435 *Behav.* 1986;38(4):571–4.
- 436 32. Campbell SS, Kripke DF, Gillin JC, Hrubovcak JC. Exposure to light in healthy elderly subjects
437 and alzheimer’s patients. *Physiol Behav.* 1988;42(2):141–4.
- 438 33. Bierman A, Klein TR, Rea MS. The Daysimeter: a device for measuring optical radiation as a
439 stimulus for the human circadian system. *Meas Sci Technol.* 2005;16(11):2292–9.
- 440 34. Dumont M, Beaulieu C. Light exposure in the natural environment: relevance to mood and sleep
441 disorders. *Sleep Med.* 2007 Sep;8(6):557–65.
- 442 35. Hubalek S, Brink M, Schierz C. Office workers’ daily exposure to light and its influence on sleep
443 quality and mood. *Light Res Technol.* 2010;42(1):33–50.
- 444 36. Jardim AC, Pawley MD, Cheeseman JF, Guesgen MJ, Steele CT, Warman GR. Validating the use
445 of wrist-level light monitoring for in-hospital circadian studies. *Chronobiol Int.* 2011 Nov;28(9):834–
446 40.
- 447 37. Figueiro MG, Hamner R, Bierman A, Rea MS. Comparisons of three practical field devices used to
448 measure personal light exposures and activity levels. *Light Res Technol.* 2013 Aug;45(4):421–34.
- 449 38. Smolders KCHJ, de Kort YAW, van den Berg SM. Daytime light exposure and feelings of vitality:
450 Results of a field study during regular weekdays. *J Environ Psychol.* 2013;36:270–9.
- 451 39. Reid KJ, Santostasi G, Baron KG, Wilson J, Kang J, Zee PC. Timing and intensity of light correlate
452 with body weight in adults. *PLoS One.* 2014;9(4):e92251.
- 453 40. Markvart J, Hansen ÅM, Christoffersen J. Comparison and Correction of the Light Sensor Output
454 from 48 Wearable Light Exposure Devices by Using a Side-by-Side Field Calibration Method.
455 *Leukos.* 2015;11(3):155–71.
- 456 41. Aarts MPJ, van Duijnhoven J, Aries MBC, Rosemann ALP. Performance of personally worn
457 dosimeters to study non-image forming effects of light: Assessment methods. *Build Environ.*
458 2017;117:60–72.
- 459 42. Price LL, Lyachev A, Khazova M. Optical performance characterization of light-logging actigraphy
460 dosimeters. *J Opt Soc Am Opt Image Sci Vis.* 2017 Apr 1;34(4):545–57.
- 461 43. Wams EJ, Woelders T, Marring I, van Rosmalen L, Beersma DGM, Gordijn MCM, et al. Linking
462 Light Exposure and Subsequent Sleep: A Field Polysomnography Study in Humans. *Sleep.* 2017
463 Dec 1;40(12).
- 464 44. Woelders T, Beersma DGM, Gordijn MCM, Hut RA, Wams EJ. Daily Light Exposure Patterns
465 Reveal Phase and Period of the Human Circadian Clock. *J Biol Rhythms.* 2017 Jun;32(3):274–86.
- 466 45. Bhandari KR, Mirhajianmoghadam H, Ostrin LA. Wearable Sensors for Measurement of Viewing
467 Behavior, Light Exposure, and Sleep. *Sens Basel.* 2021 Oct 26;21(21).

- 468 46. Bohmer MN, Hamers PCM, Bindels PJE, Oppewal A, van Someren EJW, Festen DAM. Are we
469 still in the dark? A systematic review on personal daily light exposure, sleep-wake rhythm, and
470 mood in healthy adults from the general population. *Sleep Health*. 2021 Oct;7(5):610–30.
- 471 47. Estevan I, Tassinio B, Vetter C, Silva A. Bidirectional association between light exposure and sleep
472 in adolescents. *J Sleep Res*. 2021 Oct 4;e13501.
- 473 48. Scheuermaier K, Laffan AM, Duffy JF. Light exposure patterns in healthy older and young adults. *J*
474 *Biol Rhythms*. 2010 Apr;25(2):113–22.
- 475 49. Thorne HC, Jones KH, Peters SP, Archer SN, Dijk DJ. Daily and Seasonal Variation in the
476 Spectral Composition of Light Exposure in Humans. *Chronobiol Int*. 2009 Jan;26(5):854–66.
- 477 50. Price LL, Lyachev A, Khazova M. Optical performance characterization of light-logging actigraphy
478 dosimeters. *J Opt Soc Am Opt Image Sci Vis*. 2017 Apr 1;34(4):545–57.
- 479 51. CIE. CIE S 026/E:2018: CIE System for Metrology of Optical Radiation for ipRGC-Influenced
480 Responses to Light. Vienna: CIE Central Bureau; 2018.
- 481 52. Stampfli, J. R., Schrader, B., di Battista, C., Häfliger, R., Schälli, O., Wichmann, G., et al. The
482 Light-Dosimeter: A new device to help advance research on the nonvisual responses to light[.
483 *Light Res Technol*. :1–13.
- 484 53. Spitschan M, Smolders K, Vandendriessche B, Bent B, Bakker JP, Rodriguez-Chavez IR, et al.
485 Verification, analytical validation and clinical validation (V3) of wearable dosimeters and light
486 loggers. *Digit Health*. 2022 Jan;8:205520762211448.
- 487 54. Kelly N. The WEAR Scale: Development of a measure of the social acceptability of a wearable
488 device [Internet] [Doctor of Philosophy]. [Ames]: Iowa State University, Digital Repository; 2016
489 [cited 2023 Feb 1]. p. 9199807. Available from: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/15230/>
- 490 55. Brooke J. SUS: A “quick and dirty” usability scale. In: Jordan, P.W., Thomas, B., Weerdmeester,
491 B.A., McClelland, A. L., editors. *Usability evaluation in industry*. London: Taylor & Francis; 1996.
- 492 56. Spagnolli A, Guardigli E, Orso V, Varotto A, Gamberini L. Measuring User Acceptance of
493 Wearable Symbiotic Devices: Validation Study Across Application Scenarios. In: Jacucci G,
494 Gamberini L, Freeman J, Spagnolli A, editors. *Symbiotic Interaction* [Internet]. Cham: Springer
495 International Publishing; 2014 [cited 2023 Feb 1]. p. 87–98. (Lecture Notes in Computer Science;
496 vol. 8820). Available from: https://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-13500-7_7
- 497 57. McAuley E, Duncan T, Tammen VV. Psychometric properties of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory
498 in a competitive sport setting: a confirmatory factor analysis. *Res Q Exerc Sport*. 1989
499 Mar;60(1):48–58.
- 500 58. Ryan RM. Control and information in the intrapersonal sphere: An extension of cognitive
501 evaluation theory. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1982 Sep;43(3):450–61.
- 502 59. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data
503 capture (REDCap)—A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing
504 translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform*. 2009 Apr;42(2):377–81.
- 505 60. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O’Neal L, et al. The REDCap consortium:
506 Building an international community of software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform*. 2019
507 Jul;95:103208.

- 508 61. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol*. 2006 Jan;3(2):77–
509 101.
- 510 62. Briscoe S, Hardy E, Pengo MF, Kosky C, Williams AJ, Hart N, et al. Comparison of 7 versus 14
511 days wrist actigraphy monitoring in a sleep disorders clinic population. *Chronobiol Int*. 2014
512 Apr;31(3):356–62.
- 513 63. Martin JL, Hakim AD. Wrist actigraphy. *Chest*. 2011 Jun;139(6):1514–27.
- 514 64. Sadeh A, Acebo C. The role of actigraphy in sleep medicine. *Sleep Med Rev*. 2002 Apr;6(2):113–
515 24.
- 516 65. Crowley SJ, Molina TA, Burgess HJ. A week in the life of full-time office workers: Work day and
517 weekend light exposure in summer and winter. *Appl Ergon*. 2015 Jan;46:193–200.
- 518 66. Parisi AV, Meldrum LR, Kimlin MG, Wong JCF, Aitken J, Mainstone JS. Evaluation of differences
519 in ultraviolet exposure during weekend and weekday activities. *Phys Med Biol*. 2000 Aug
520 1;45(8):2253–62.
- 521 67. Read SA, Collins MJ, Vincent SJ. Light Exposure and Physical Activity in Myopic and Emmetropic
522 Children. *Optom Vis Sci*. 2014 Mar;91(3):330–41.
- 523 68. Read SA, Vincent SJ, Tan CS, Ngo C, Collins MJ, Saw SM. Patterns of Daily Outdoor Light
524 Exposure in Australian and Singaporean Children. *Transl Vis Sci Technol*. 2018 May 30;7(3):8.
- 525 69. Ostrin LA. Objectively Measured Light Exposure in Emmetropic and Myopic Adults. *Optom Vis Sci*.
526 2017 Feb;94(2):229–38.
- 527 70. Hand AJ, Stone JE, Shen L, Vetter C, Cain SW, Bei B, et al. Measuring light regularity: sleep
528 regularity is associated with regularity of light exposure in adolescents. *Sleep*. 2023 Jan
529 10;zsad001.
- 530 71. Henrich J, Heine SJ, Norenzayan A. The weirdest people in the world? *Behav Brain Sci*. 2010
531 Jun;33(2–3):61–83; discussion 83-135.
- 532 72. Brown TM, Brainard GC, Cajochen C, Czeisler CA, Hanifin JP, Lockley SW, et al.
533 Recommendations for daytime, evening, and nighttime indoor light exposure to best support
534 physiology, sleep, and wakefulness in healthy adults. *PLoS Biol*. 2022 Mar;20(3):e3001571.
- 535 73. Grotevent MJ, Yakunin S, Bachmann D, Romero C, Vázquez de Aldana JR, Madi M, et al.
536 Integrated photodetectors for compact Fourier-transform waveguide spectrometers. *Nat*
537 *Photonics*. 2023;17(1):59–64.
- 538 74. Heo SY, Kim J, Gutruf P, Banks A, Wei P, Pielak R, et al. Wireless, battery-free, flexible,
539 miniaturized dosimeters monitor exposure to solar radiation and to light for phototherapy. *Sci*
540 *Transl Med*. 2018 Dec 5;10(470):eaau1643.
- 541 75. Kwon K, Heo SY, Yoo I, Banks A, Chan M, Lee JY, et al. Miniaturized, light-adaptive, wireless
542 dosimeters autonomously monitor exposure to electromagnetic radiation. *Sci Adv*. 2019
543 Dec;5(12):eaay2462.
- 544 76. Li A, Yao C, Xia J, Wang H, Cheng Q, Penty R, et al. Advances in cost-effective integrated
545 spectrometers. *Light Sci Appl*. 2022 Jun 7;11(1):174.

546 77. Yoon HH, Fernandez HA, Nigmatulin F, Cai W, Yang Z, Cui H, et al. Miniaturized spectrometers
547 with a tunable van der Waals junction. *Science*. 2022 Oct 21;378(6617):296–9.

548