

http://www.gizmodo.com.au/2013/05/is-google-glass-bad-for-your-eyes/[5/22/2013 4:19:53 PM]

us.

"I don't see any particular reason why smart glasses would be especially harmful to children. The manufacturer warning about usage by children is given out of caution and from a position of legal prudence. As smart glasses become more commonly used, as I expect they will, we will all become more comfortable with advocating their usage by children."

So probably OK for kids, but what about the rest of us?

We already stare at laptops and phones and tablets all day long, which isn't exactly ideal. You've probably experienced eye ache, dry eyes, and other common symptoms of discomfort. But Google Glass is a different use case. While we're married to our computers for hours a day, Google Glass was designed to spend less time in action. Maybe you're always *wearing* Glass, but you only *use* it when you need it, whether you're just responding to a message or listening to Glass tell you to take a right at the next street. There's not a display constantly running in front of your retinas, though. In fact, even if you did use Glass continuously, you'd only get about a full hour of battery life.

Experts aren't particularly concerned. Sheedy said he doesn't foresee any degenerative risks stemming from wearing the glasses and he doesn't see any reason that they would cause any damage to your eye balls.

Glass has some built-in limitations, that, intentional or not, actively limit eye strain. For example, video records in 10-second snippets by default. And you can write a text message just by telling Glass what to say, rather than having to stare at a screen. From that standpoint, your eyes might prefer that you text on Glass rather than your smartphone's LCD. Sure, donning Google Glass might make you look like a cyborg, but it was engineered to get tech out of the way. It's understandably difficult to think of it that way when you're, you know, wearing a computer smack on your face — or looking at someone else who is. But that's another topic entirely.

As far as any real vision problems go, Sheedy says the potential risk posed has more to do with the eye's shift from different visual fields of reality. When you're moving through space, you have certain receptors that tell your brain where you're situated. But when you're given some sort of stimulation — a map flashing before their eyes, for example — the brain gets confused, and that can cause symptoms like dizziness, or in the most extreme cases, nausea, which Sheedy has seen in his the Vision Lab's studies on 3D.

But the spatial recognition problems aren't something most people experience. In a recent Q&A with Google, Harvard ophthalmology professor Dr. Eli Peli says these problems are probably minimal.

"Some people's eyes take a bit longer to adjust to these systems," he said. "That's to be expected. Theories about potentially serious consequences like confusion or disorientation were raised in the media and had echoes in the literature in the 1990s, but they were associated with virtual reality type displays that completely enclosed the viewer."

A Google spokesperson told us in a statement:

"We've studied design comfort and safety very closely, and we haven't found cause for concern. It's something we'll continue to watch carefully. We have been working with ophthalmologists throughout our development process."

Of course, it's only natural that Google's outlook on this is all going to be positive. They're the ones selling the \$US1,500 Star Trek shades. And for most of us, this is all still very hypothetical; right now Glass remains in the hands of a very few beta-testing Explorers. But if and when Glass does go mainstream, you shouldn't worry one bit about your eyes. Which is just as well; there are enough cost and privacy concerns to keep you occupied as is.

SHARE	TAGS
	feature glass google google glass wearables
	7 COMMENTS REPLY
G WillD @wild MAY 3, 2013 12:14 PM	
If its using bluetooth or any other radio communic your frontal lobes. Might take a while.	cation (microwave radiation), it will very slowly fry
G TUALMASOK Guest MAY 3, 2013 12:24 PM	
Is that anything like the exposure my brain is	already receiving?
Reply	

Five Things I Learned At The Gartner Enterprise Architecture Summit



Five Technology Trends That Make Running A Data Centre Harder

Why Your App Development Approach Sucks

Would Your Workplace Security Improve If You Killed Most Of It?

G Jimmyba	deal current MAY & 2012 14:04 AM			
	dsol Guest MAY 4, 2013 11:04 AM it is. In fact the level of radiation you would re		1	
the same That's bec It is near The powe from that	as if you were not wearing them. In fact it's in cuse the transmitter is nowhere near the front the lateral temporal lobe, but it is not close e rr signal being used is similar to that of Blueto power signature. r when you would only be using it for a maxim	dentical. al lobe. nough to cause any damage. oth; and there are no adverse effects		
Reply				
G Jackson Bison @j	acksonbison MAY 3, 2013 12:25 PM		-	
	n that while we all believe you'll look like a co complete tosser taking photos with a tablet (
You can fill in the t	blanks.			
Reply	0			
G Just This Guy	Guest MAY 3, 2013 12:49 PM			
Only a concern	if you give a toss what some other tosser the	nks.		
□ Reply □	4		_	
G bryan @bryan MAY	(4, 2013 10:29 AM			
I would of thought t when the camera is	the legality of these in Oz would be of greater	concern. Do we need to carry a sign	1	
	0			
G droider @droider M	AV 6 2012 7:22 DM		-	
	his question on Lifehacker. thankfully its alrea			
I want the #HTCOr				
Reply	0			
Join the discussion!				
🗆 Log In	□ Register	Guest Access		
	l:fabaa			
пқо тақи"	life hac	кег	FABSUGAR	

