Figure 1 Screenshots made by iPhone 6 for (a) EyeHandBook app and (b) app designed by the author. Zoomed optotypes for the 20/20 line of (c) EyeHandBook app and (d) app designed by the author.

consecutive levels above this. The detail for 20/20 is around 1.34 PS that is not physically possible to be displayed. In cases on which detail of the optotype does not coincide with an integer number of pixels or if the location of the detail does not fall exactly on a pixel, IOS uses a drawing interface for anti-aliased rendering.[2] Anti-aliasing[3] consists of contours smoothing by multiple gray levels of the neighboring pixels as shown in Figure 1c and d. Figure 1a shows the EyeHandBook and Figure 1b shows another app designed to test near VA at 40 cm according to the ETDRS standard. I performed a screenshot of both apps with an iPhone 6 and I zoomed them in order to check anti-aliasing effect on each app. Figure 1c shows that EyeHandBook fails in the standardized design of letters inside a 5 × 5 grid (width exceeds height, at least with iPhone 6). On the other hand, Figure 1d shows that the optotype of the ETDRS near chart is in a 5 × 5 grid but it has also poor definition. In conclusion, although disagreement between smartphone near charts and printed charts could be due to all the reasons that are described in the discussion,[1] authors do not mention what I believe is an important reason for the lack of agreement, the poor definition of optotypes due to PS in applications for testing near VA.

Conflict of interest

R-VM has developed vision applications for smartphones and tablets that he currently distributes by the apple store.

References

1 Tofigh S, Shortridge E, Elkeeb A, Godley BF. Effectiveness of a smartphone application for testing near visual acuity. *Eye* 2015; **29**: 1464–1468.

2 IOS Developer Library. iOS Drawing Concepts. Draw. Print. Guid. iOS. Available at https://developer.apple.com/library/ios/documentation/2DDrawing/Conceptual/DrawingPrintingiOS/GraphicsDrawingOverview/GraphicsDrawingOverview.html. Accessed on 13 December 2015.

3 Bach M. Anti-aliasing and dithering in the 'Freiburg Visual Acuity Test'. *Spat Vis* 1997; **11**: 85–89.

M Rodríguez-Vallejo

Qvision, Unidad de Oftalmología Vithas Hospital Virgen del Mar, Almería, Spain
E-mail: manuelrodriguezid@qvision.es

Sir,
Comment on: 'Effectiveness of a smartphone application for testing near visual acuity'

We read with interest the article by Tofigh et al,[1] which found a disparity in visual acuity measurement between the Eye HandBook (EHB) smartphone application compared to the conventional near vision card. The modern smartphone has become a ubiquitous possession in the developed world, with various applications granting the devices multifunctional utility to their users.[2] In ophthalmology alone, there has been an extraordinary 12-fold increase in the number of applications produced in recent years.[3] This gives the smartphone a potentially important role for both patients and physicians.

However, alongside this rapid expansion, studies suggest a worryingly small portion are actually affiliated with an academic institution or association. Results from one study demonstrated only 68 ophthalmology apps, out of 182 analyzed, had documented professional involvement,[3] which correlates with the findings of a study investigating a wider range of surgical specialties.[4] Therefore, the approach by Tofigh et al in validating this smartphone application is indeed welcome and needed. However, the study's own findings raise the point that professional involvement may not be enough, which is another point overlooked in this field of research. The EHB is one of the most popular ophthalmology applications, endorsed by the American Academy of Ophthalmology,[5] yet this study highlights legitimate concerns regarding its accuracy in measuring visual acuity.

Beyond purely top–down regulation, we feel that encouraging an attitude of evidence-based application production is now needed. Although this is being adopted in the production of some applications, there is still much work to be done in ensuring that further applications are medically accurate and clinically robust. There is a risk that avoiding such an approach may lead to the rapid dissemination of outdated or outright false information through haphazard and unregulated application production. With the potential for new applications to quickly land directly into the hands of patients and doctors alike, we call for more validation of

smartphone applications and for future research to foster an attitude of evidence-based application production.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Author contributions

Authors ITH and HHM both planned and wrote this piece of work. MF read and approved this final manuscript.

References

1 Tofigh S, Shortridge E, Elkeeb A, Godley BF. Effectiveness of a smartphone application for testing near visual acuity. *Eye (Lond)* 2015; **29**(11): 1464–1468.
2 Lord RK, Shah VA, San Filippo AN, Krishna R. Novel uses of smartphones in ophthalmology. *Ophthalmology* 2010; **117**(6): 1274–1274.e3.
3 Cheng NM, Chakrabarti R, Kam JK. iPhone applications for eye care professionals: a review of current capabilities and concerns. *Telemed J E Health* 2014; **20**(4): 385–387.
4 Kulendran M, Lim M, Laws G, Chow A, Nehme J, Darzi A *et al.* Surgical smartphone applications across different platforms: their evolution, uses, and users. *Surg Innov* 2014; **21**(4): 427–440.
5 American Academy of Ophthalmology Joins Forces with Cloud Nine Development, LLC on the Eye Handbook iPhone Application—American Academy of Ophthalmology. Available from: http://www.aao.org/newsroom/news-releases/detail/american-academy-of-ophthalmology-joins-forces-wit. Accessed 7 December 2015.

IT Hossain, HH Malik and M Franka

School of Medicine, Imperial College London, London, UK
E-mail: Ibtesham.hossain11@imperial.ac.uk