

1 **Title: Blink rate measured *in situ* decreases while reading from printed text or digital**
2 **devices, regardless of task duration, complexity or working distance**

3 **Authors**

- 4 1. Ngozi Charity Chidi-Egboka OD, MPH¹
5 2. Isabelle Jalbert, OD, MPH, PhD¹
6 3. Jiaying Chen BSc, MOptom¹
7 4. Nancy E. Briggs PhD^{1,2}
8 5. Blanka Golebiowski, BOptom, PhD¹

9 **Institutional Affiliation**

- 10 1. School of Optometry and Vision Science, Faculty of Medicine and Health, UNSW
11 Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia.
12 2. Mark Wainwright Analytical Centre, UNSW Sydney.

13 **Corresponding author:** Ngozi C. ChidiEgboka
14 School of Optometry and Vision Science
15 Faculty of Medicine and Health
16 Level 3, North Wing, Rupert Myers Building
17 Gate 14 Barker St, UNSW Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia.
18 Email: n.chidi-egboka@unsw.edu.au

19 **Commercial relationship disclosures**

- 20 **1.** Ngozi Charity Chidi-Egboka, None declared; **2.** Isabelle Jalbert, None declared;
21 **3.** Jiaying Chen, None declared; **4.** Nancy E. Briggs, None declared; **5.** Blanka Golebiowski,
22 None declared

23 **Funding**

24 This research did not receive specific funding from agencies in the public, commercial, or not-
25 for-profit sectors.

26 The first author, NC received a UNSW Tuition Fee Remission Postgraduate Research
27 Scholarship and the Australian Government Research Training Program Thesis Completion
28 Scholarship. The research was also supported by the Dorothy Carlborg Research Grant from

29 **NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.
the Cornea and Contact Lens Society of Australia, and the UNSW Faculty of Science Research

30 Infrastructure Scheme. The funding sources have no involvement in the study design, conduct
31 of the research, collection, analysis and interpretation of data, writing of the report,
32 preparation of the article or in the decision to submit the article for publication.

33 **Abstract**

34 **Purpose:** To compare blinking measured *in situ* during various tasks and examine
35 relationships with ocular surface symptoms. Day-to-day repeatability of blink rate and
36 interblink interval was assessed.

37 **Methods:** Twenty-four students (28.6±6.3 years; 8M:16F) completed six reading tasks
38 (printed text, laptop, TV, smartphone, smartphone at 50% brightness, smartphone with
39 complex text), and two non-reading tasks (conversation, walking) in a randomised cross-over
40 study. Ocular surface symptoms and clinical signs were assessed. Blink rate and interblink
41 interval were measured using a wearable eye tracking headset. Blink parameters were
42 compared across tasks and time (linear mixed model and post hoc comparisons with
43 Bonferroni correction). Associations between blinking, symptoms, ocular surface, and clinical
44 signs were assessed (Spearman's correlation). The smartphone reading task was completed
45 twice to determine coefficient of repeatability.

46 **Results:** Blink rate was lower (mean 10.7±9.7 blinks/min) and interblink interval longer (mean
47 9.6±8.7s) during all reading tasks compared to conversation (mean 32.4±12.4 blinks/min;
48 1.5±0.6s) and walking (mean 31.3±15.5 blinks/min; 1.9±1.3s) ($p<0.001$). There were no
49 significant differences in blink parameters between any of the reading tasks, nor between
50 conversation and walking. Changes in blinking occurred within one minute of starting the task.
51 No associations were evident between blink rate or interblink interval and ocular surface
52 symptoms or signs. Coefficient of repeatability was ±12.4 blinks/min for blink rate and ±18.8s
53 for interblink interval.

54 **Conclusion:** Spontaneous blinking can be reliably measured *in situ*. Blink rate was reduced
55 and interblink interval increased during reading compared to conversation and walking.

56 Changes in blinking were immediate and sustained, and not associated with ocular surface
57 symptoms or signs.

58 **Keywords:** Blinking, Dry eye, Smartphone, Ocular Surface, Reading, Repeatability, Digital
59 device

60

61 **1. Introduction**

62 Blinking maintains a stable tear film, thereby sustaining ocular surface integrity and visual
63 function [1]. Disruptions to blinking disturb ocular surface homeostasis and may contribute to
64 ocular discomfort and dry eye [2, 3].

65 Blinking is affected by the type, complexity, and cognitive demand of the task undertaken
66 during measurement [4-8]. Differences in viewing distance, factors such as font size, contrast
67 and device used create different demands on blinking [5, 9]. Previous studies have found
68 increased discomfort linked to impaired blinking during smartphone and computer use [3, 9-
69 11]. Blinking has been investigated during various tasks, (e.g., conversation, reading, playing
70 computer games, watching a film, listening to music, resting quietly) of various complexities
71 and on various devices including printed text, desktop and laptop computer, tablet, and, at
72 various viewing distances and gaze positions [11-18]. However, blink assessment remains
73 hampered by lack of a gold standard method and standardised conditions of measurement.

74 A wide range of mean blink parameters have been previously reported ranging from 11 – 36
75 blinks/min during conversation, 4 – 14 blinks/min during reading, 5 – 26 blinks/min during rest
76 and directed fixed gaze, in adults [19]. This wide range can be explained in part by differences
77 in definitions of spontaneous blinking. Various definitions of a blink include a ‘25% downward
78 movement of the upper eyelid’ from the fully open position [20], an ‘obvious downward eyelid
79 movement’ [21], the ‘upper eyelid reaching downwards from the top of the pupil’ [22], a
80 ‘downward movement of the upper eyelid covering 30%–75% of the cornea’ [7] and a ‘15%
81 decrease in the height of the upper eyelid’ [23]. Blinking is difficult to assess clinically or in situ

82 outside of the laboratory setting, thus a method that allows more natural measurement may
83 be helpful in standardising the definition of spontaneous blinking.

84 Blink measurements in previous studies have typically occurred in settings not representative
85 of real-life situations, requiring participants to keep a stationary head position on a chin and
86 forehead rest which may limit the complete view of the anterior eye during measurement [19].
87 Fixed head positions during measurement may stimulate participants awareness and impact
88 the accuracy of blink parameters [24]. Robust blink measurement requires the whole anterior
89 eye to be constantly visible so that the full range of eyelid movements can be observed [25]. A
90 higher than 95% blink detection accuracy in relation to pupil detection has previously been
91 demonstrated with head mounted eye-tracking technology which allows free head position
92 [25]. Measuring spontaneous blink activities in real time under real-life situation is desirable to
93 improve understanding of blink behaviour and for the relationship between ocular symptoms
94 and blink parameters to be adequately characterised.

95 A recent study in children demonstrated that the blinks counted by the Pupil software blink
96 detection algorithm using the wearable eye tracker were in agreement with a manual count
97 [26]. Hence blinking *in situ* could be reliably measured using a wearable eye tracking headset,
98 showing a rapid decrease in blink rate during one hour of smartphone gaming, which was linked
99 to ocular discomfort [26, 27]. However, it is not clear if this effect was due to the use of
100 smartphones per se, or due to the task of reading itself.

101 The repeatability of recent and commonly used blink measurement methods has not been
102 assessed. Repeated measurements of blink rate have been reported for electrophysiology
103 methods (magnetic search coil technique and electro-oculography) [6, 18, 28], and for manual

104 counting of blinks from eye video recording [29-31] conducted in a laboratory setting where
105 participants' head position was fixed. However, none of these studies reported standard
106 measures of repeatability [32].

107 The current study aimed to compare blink parameters (blink rate, interblink interval) during
108 various reading and non-reading tasks measured *in situ* using a wearable eye tracking headset
109 and to examine associations with ocular surface symptoms. In addition, the day-to-day
110 repeatability of blink rate and interblink interval measurement was assessed.

111 **2. Methods**

112 A randomised cross-over open label study was conducted. Approval was obtained from the
113 UNSW Human Research Ethics Advisory Panel and the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki were
114 adhered to. Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to participation.

115 **2.1 Participants**

116 Students aged 18-40 years were recruited from the UNSW Sydney campus. Minimum unaided
117 visual acuity of 0.1LogMAR at 6m and 40cm and binocular vision (accommodation and
118 convergence) normal for age were required for participants to be enrolled in the study
119 including a minimum amplitude of accommodation of 5D (push up to blur with Royal Air Force
120 rule (RAF rule)) and a near phoria equal or smaller than 6 prism dioptres (modified Thorington
121 test) [33]. Participants were excluded if they wore spectacle or contact lenses or had a history
122 of ocular conditions including eye allergies, systemic conditions (e.g., Parkinson's disease,
123 diabetes) or medications (e.g., cornea cold thermoreceptor stimulants such as menthol
124 ointment; dopamine antagonist drugs) likely to impact blinking [34, 35]. Sample size calculation
125 (SAS 9.4 (2012) NC, USA) showed that 24 participants were required to detect a difference in

126 blink rate between various tasks of 5.8 blinks/min [12, 15], with 90% power at alpha (α) level
127 of 0.05/7 (statistical significance corrected for multiple comparison of seven conditions) and to
128 account for a possible 20% attrition. Twenty-four participants were also sufficient to assess day-
129 to-day repeatability of blink rate and interblink interval, based on a desired precision of $\pm 30\%$
130 which was expressed as a percentage of within-person standard deviation, with two repeated
131 measurements.

132 **2.2 Procedures**

133 All participants attended two visits (Figure 1) during which they completed a questionnaire on
134 demographics and daily hours of digital device use, and eight tasks as described below. Ocular
135 symptoms and the ocular surface were assessed and *in situ* blinking was measured. In line with
136 the COVID-19 safety protocol and guidelines which came into effect in Sydney, Australia, part-
137 way through the study, some of the participants wore a surgical mask that covered from nose
138 to chin for all assessments during both study visits (Figure 2c, 2d).

139 **2.2.1 Tasks**

140 The tasks comprised of six reading tasks (printed text, laptop, smart TV at 6m, smartphone,
141 smartphone at 50% brightness, smartphone with more complex text), and two non-reading
142 tasks (conversation, walking indoors). All tasks were of 15 minutes duration. Tasks were
143 completed in random order, other than the smartphone task, which was completed first at
144 each visit (repeated twice) (Figure 1). Data for the repeat 1 of the smartphone task was used
145 for all analyses except for repeatability where both repeats were used. A break of
146 approximately three minutes was allowed between tasks to allow completion of a pre- and
147 post-task questionnaire (section 2.2.2).

148 A reading level 5th to 7th grade was selected for the reading task [36, 37]. A text of reading
149 level of university graduate was selected for the complex smartphone reading task [38]. For all
150 reading tasks, the default text font size was 16 pixels (equivalence of 12 points), black Times
151 New Roman. However, the viewing distances, screen or display size and the varying digital
152 device pixel may affect the actual angular extent and therefore alter the font sizes [39, 40]. The
153 printed text reading task was printed one-sided in A4 format. Conversation was elicited using
154 age-appropriate 'great conversation starters' [41]. The walking indoors task was conducted in
155 a level corridor of a temperature-controlled university building.

156 The same smartphone (iPhone 8 Plus, 5.5-inch, 1920 x 1080 pixel at 401ppi, 2017) was used for
157 all smartphone reading tasks. A MacBook Pro (13.3-inch, 2560x1600 ppi built-in display, 2019)
158 was used for the laptop task, and a smart TV (NEC, Model: V754Q, 75-inch, 3840x2160 ppi) for
159 reading at 6m (Figure 2). Participants were instructed to hold the smartphone at their habitual
160 reading distance, to use one finger to scroll to the next page or the side arrow button on the
161 laptop keyboard to scroll to the next page during reading, and to not alter the screen brightness
162 or font size. The smartphone was set at maximum screen brightness of measured luminance
163 380 cd/m^2 (Konica Minolta CS-100A) for two tasks and reduced to half during from the
164 smartphone at 50% brightness task (measured luminance 121 cd/m^2). The laptop screen and
165 smart TV were also set at maximum screen brightness, measured luminance 316 cd/m^2 and 316
166 cd/m^2 respectively. The measured luminance for the printed text reading was 77 cd/m^2 .

167 **2.2.2 Ocular symptoms and ocular surface clinical assessments**


168 Baseline ocular surface symptoms were assessed using the Instant Ocular Symptoms Survey
169 (IOSS) [42], Dry Eye Questionnaire 5 (DEQ-5) [43], Symptoms Assessment in Dry Eye (SANDE)

170 [44], and Ocular Surface Disease Index (OSDI) [45] questionnaires, self-completed by
171 participants. The IOSS questionnaire (printed text) was completed by participants between
172 (pre- and post-) tasks. The IOSS was found to be an effective tool for instant symptom
173 measurement, with good diagnostic ability and was developed to measure instantaneous
174 symptoms, i.e., at the time of administration (compared to the other questionnaires which
175 record symptoms experienced over the preceding weeks), and as such is appropriate to
176 administer for repeated comfort assessment [42].

177 The following baseline tear film clinical assessments were conducted prior to blink
178 measurements: tear film lipid layer thickness (LLT) (LipiView® interferometer; Tear Science,
179 Morrisville, NC), tear meniscus height (TMH), and non-invasive tear break-up time (NIBUT),
180 (Oculus® Keratograph 5; Oculus®, Arlington, WA). The index of LLT based on mean
181 interferometry colour units was recorded [46]. TMH was assessed in the regions vertically
182 below the pupil centre, and directly under the nasal and temporal corneal limbal edge
183 (determined using the integrated ruler) to account for variability in TMH along the length of
184 the lower meniscus, and the average of the three measurements was recorded [47]. The
185 automated detection of the first tear break-up was recorded for NIBUT [48]. Measurement of
186 the tear breakup time with NIBUT technique was considered preferable [49, 50], because it is
187 automated compared to other subjective methods e.g., videokeratoscope, Tearscope, with
188 which measurements have been found to vary between sessions and observers [50, 51].

189 Ocular surface clinical assessments were performed on the right eye only, in the same
190 temperature-controlled examination room, in ascending order of invasiveness [50]. General
191 ocular surface health, corneal staining (Fluorescein) and conjunctival staining (Lissamine green
192 strips, GreenGlo™) (Oxford grading scale) [52, 53], telangiectasia [54], meibomian gland

193 expressibility, meibography imaging of the upper eyelid (Oculus® Keratograph 5; Oculus®,
194 Arlington, WA) was scored in relation to loss of meibomian glands using the meiboscore
195 (meiboscore: degree 0=no gland loss, 1≤25% gland area of loss, 2=26%–50% gland area loss,
196 3=51%–75% gland area loss, 4≥75% gland area loss) [55] and the pattern of meibomian gland
197 morphological changes were assessed [55-57] after all tasks were completed as shown in Figure
198 1.



199 **Figure 1.** Flowchart of study visits and order of clinical assessments.

200 Note: Visit 2 was conducted two days after visit 1. Smartphone task was completed twice
201 before other tasks at each visit for assessment of repeatability. Other tasks randomly allocated
202 include: six reading tasks (printed text, laptop, smart TV at 6m, smartphone, smartphone at
203 50% brightness, smartphone more complex text), and two non-reading tasks (conversation,
204 walking indoors). IOSS - Instant Ocular Symptoms Survey; DEQ-5 - Dry Eye Questionnaire 5;
205 SANDE - Symptoms Assessment in Dry Eye; OSDI - Ocular Surface Disease Index; LLT - Lipid layer
206 thickness; TMH - Tear meniscus height; NIBUT - Non-invasive tear break-up time.

207 **2.2.3 *In situ* Blink measurement**

208 Blink assessment was conducted after tear film assessment, following 10 minutes of rest. *In situ*
209 assessment of blink parameters was conducted during each task using a binocular wearable
210 eye tracking headset (Pupil Labs Core GmbH Berlin, Germany) [58] (Figure 2). Data were
211 analysed using mean values for each minute as well mean values over 12 or 15 minutes of
212 recording.

213 The wearable eye tracking headset recorded participants' eyes using the two inbuilt eye
214 cameras with a resolution of 192x192 pixels at 120 Hz (Figure 2) [58]. The eye camera (providing
215 a view of the participant and their eye) together with the scene camera (providing a view of
216 what the participant is looking at) (Figure 2) enabled continuous monitoring of participant
217 adherence in real-time. Blink activity was detected using the open-source eye tracking software
218 Pupil v2.0 (Pupil Labs GmbH Berlin, Germany), based on visibility of the pupil as previously
219 described [26, 58]. Briefly, the Pupil software assigns a quality measure for the detected pupil
220 in each video frame, referred to as 'pupil confidence'. The pupil confidence value indicates how
221 accurately the edge of the detected pupil fits an ellipse (range: 0 (no fit) to 1 (good fit) [26, 58].
222 Blinks are assumed to occur during pupil confidence drops evident when the pupil is obscured,
223 hence pupil confidence is a proxy measure for blink detection [58]. Blink data was extracted
224 from the eye tracker recordings using Pupil software Player module (Pupil Labs GmbH Berlin,
225 Germany) as CSV files [26]. Blink rate (number of blinks per minute) and interblink interval (the
226 time between the end of one blink to the start of the following blink) data were estimated using
227 Pupil software blink detection algorithm as described elsewhere [26].

228 For the reading from a smartphone task (repeats 1 and 2), data from the first three minutes of
229 video recording were discarded and the remaining 12 minutes used for analysis, to allow for

230 adjustment and adaptation to wearing the headset as recommended [59]. Complete recordings
231 (15 minutes) were analysed for all other tasks, as participants continued with each subsequent
232 tasks without removing the headset.

233 **This figure was removed due to medRxiv preprint policy against the inclusion
234 of photographs and any other identifying information of people, whether it
be authors, patients, participants, test volunteers or experimental stimuli.**

235 **Readers may contact the corresponding author to request access to the
236 images in this figure.**

237 **Figure 2.** Study set-up showing the wearable eye tracking headset (Pupil Labs GmbH Berlin,
238 Germany) with two inbuilt high-speed eye cameras and a scene camera for real time monitoring
239 from participants' vantage point. The headset was worn by study participants during various
240 tasks including reading from **a)** printed text, **b)** laptop, **c)** smart TV at 6m, **d)** smartphone, **e)**
241 walking indoors and conversation (not shown). The wearable eye tracking headset was
242 connected to a laptop for task monitoring and data acquisition for all tasks other than walking
243 indoors, where an android phone was used for the same purpose, while the examiner followed
244 behind the participant holding the android phone to monitor recording (Figure 2e).
245 Participants' consents were obtained for use of these images.

246 **2.3 Repeatability of blink measurements**

247 Participants completed the reading from smartphone task with maximum screen brightness
248 twice at separate study visits occurring two days apart at the same time of day (between 10 am
249 and 11 am). Time of the day was controlled as blink rate has been reported to exhibit diurnal
250 variation (higher in the evening) [60].

251 **2.4 Statistical analysis**

252 Statistical analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics (version 26, 2019; Armonk, NY,
253 USA). A linear mixed model with fixed effect of task and mask wear and their interactions was
254 used to examine differences in blink parameters between tasks and the effect of mask wearing
255 on the differences in blink parameters. A separate linear mixed model with fixed effect of time

256 was used to compare differences in blink parameters across time, within each task. Another
257 model with fixed effect of task, time and mask wear was used to examine the differences in
258 ocular symptoms across tasks and time. All models included a random effect for individual to
259 account for repeated measures within-person. Model-estimated means were obtained and
260 post-hoc pairwise comparisons were performed between tasks, between each minute within
261 each task duration, and between pre- and post-task symptoms within each task, and p-values
262 corrected for multiple comparisons by a Bonferroni adjustment. Spearman's bivariate
263 correlation was used to examine associations between blinking and changes in ocular
264 symptoms, and ocular surface and tear film indices; p-values for the correlations were adjusted
265 for multiple comparisons using the one-step Bonferroni method. The statistical approach
266 suggested by Bland and Altman was used to examine repeatability of blink rate and interblink
267 interval. The coefficient of repeatability ($CoR = 1.96 \times SD$ of differences between the two
268 repeats), mean difference (bias) between repeats and limits of agreement ($LOA = bias \pm CoR$)
269 were calculated and paired t-tests were used to examine agreement between repeats [32].
270 Significance was established at $p \leq 0.05$.

271 **3. Results**

272 Twenty-four participants with normal ocular surface health completed the study. Participants
273 were aged 18 to 40 years (mean 28.6 ± 6.3 years), 67% were female and comprised different
274 ethnicities: African (38%), South Asian (21%), Middle Eastern (17%), East Asian (12%), Caucasian
275 (12%). Fourteen participants wore a surgical mask during data collection.

276 Thirteen data points were excluded, where more than 60% pupil confidence values were below
277 0.6, as per the manufacturer's recommendation [26]: three from the printed text task, one from

278 smart TV, five from smartphone, two from smartphone (50% brightness), and two from
279 smartphone (more complex text). Ocular surface symptoms and clinical signs reported by
280 participants who had excluded data points were within the range of other participants.

281 Baseline ocular surface symptoms and clinical assessments are presented in Table 1.
282 Examination room temperature was maintained at $21.9 \pm 0.7^\circ\text{C}$.


283 **3.1 Differences in blink parameters between tasks**

284 There were significant differences in blink rate ($F = 29.94$, $p < 0.001$) and interblink interval ($F =$
285 38.32 , $p < 0.001$) between tasks. Blink rate was lower and interblink interval was longer during
286 all reading tasks compared to conversation ($p < 0.001$) and walking indoors ($p < 0.001$) (Figure 3).
287 There were no significant differences in blink rate or interblink interval between conversation
288 and walking indoors, nor between any of the reading tasks. Interactions between tasks and
289 mask wear were not significant, indicating that mask wear did not have an effect on the
290 differences in blink rate ($p = 0.65$) or interblink interval ($p = 0.72$) between tasks. Blink rate and
291 interblink interval remained unchanged throughout measurement duration for each task
292 ($p > 0.05$) (Figure 4).


293 **3.2 Differences in ocular symptoms pre- and post-task and association with blinking**

294 Ocular symptoms (IOSS) pre- and post-tasks differed between tasks ($F = 4.69$, $p < 0.001$).
295 Symptoms worsened after reading from a smartphone when text was more complex ($p = 0.01$)
296 or at 50% brightness ($p = 0.02$), and from a smart TV ($p < 0.001$) but did not change during other
297 tasks (Figure 5). There was no evidence that mask wearing influenced these differences (mask
298 wear*task*time interaction, $p = 1.00$). These changes in symptoms were not associated with
299 blink rate or interblink interval ($\rho = -0.09$ to 0.41 , $p = 1.00$) (supplementary Table 1). There were


- 300 no associations between blinking and baseline ocular surface symptoms (OSDI, SANDE, DEQ-5,
301 IOSS), tear film and other clinical indices (ρ -0.01 to 0.45, $p=1.00$) (supplementary Table 2).



302 **Figure 3. a)** Blink rate and **b)** Interblink interval during various tasks of 15 minutes duration, measured using a wearable eye tracking headset
 303 (Pupil Labs GmbH Berlin, Germany) for 24 students with healthy eyes. Note, data from the first three minutes of the smartphone task were
 304 discarded and the remaining 12 minutes used for analysis. Data are presented as median and interquartile range. *Open circles represent mild*
 305 *outliers (measurements >1.5 to 3 times the interquartile range) and stars represent extreme outliers (measurements >3 times the interquartile*
 306 *range).*



307 **Figure 4. a) Blink rate and b) Interblink interval during various tasks of 15 minutes duration, measured**
 308 **using a wearable eye tracking headset (Pupil Labs GmbH Berlin, Germany) for 24 students with healthy**
 309 **eyes. The tasks include: six reading tasks (printed text, laptop, smart TV at 6m, smartphone, smartphone**
 310 **at 50% brightness, smartphone more complex text), and two non-reading tasks (conversation, walking**
 311 **indoors). *Note, data from the first three minutes of the smartphone task were discarded and the**
 312 **remaining 12 minutes used for analysis.**



328 **Figure 5.** Ocular surface symptoms of discomfort and dryness scores (median and IQR)
329 measured using Instant Ocular Symptoms Survey (IOSS) pre- and post- various tasks of 15
330 minutes duration for 24 students with healthy eyes. Note, data from the first three minutes of
331 the smartphone task were discarded and the remaining 12 minutes used for analysis. Higher
332 IOSS scores indicate worse discomfort. *Blue and red circles represent mild outliers (symptom*
333 *scores >1.5 to 3 times the interquartile range).*



334 **Table 1:** Baseline ocular surface symptoms and clinical assessments for 24 students with
 335 healthy eyes. Data are presented as mean±SD (range) and median (range). Higher eye symptom
 336 questionnaire scores indicate worse discomfort.
 337 *IOSS - Instant Ocular Symptoms Survey; DEQ-5 - Dry Eye Questionnaire 5; SANDE - Symptoms*
 338 *Assessment in Dry Eye; OSDI - Ocular Surface Disease Index.*

Variables	Value
Ocular surface symptoms (score)	
IOSS (0 – 10)	1.9±1.6 (0 – 5)
DEQ-5 (0 – 22)	5.9±4.1 (0 – 16)
SANDE (0 – 100)	18.1±22.9 (0 – 81)
OSDI (0 – 100)	15.1±16.6 (0 – 61)
Tear film	
Lipid layer thickness (nm)*	43.0±18.8 (20 – 75)
Tear meniscus height (mm)	0.29±0.08 (0.17 – 0.47)
Non-invasive tear break-up time (s)	10.3±6.7 (3.4 – 22.9)
Cornea white light staining (grade)	
	0 (0 – 0)
Meibomian gland evaluation (grade)	
Eyelid telangiectasia (grade)	0 (0 – 2)
Expressibility (number of expressible glands)	2 (0 – 3)
Expressibility (amount of pressure applied)	2 (0 – 3)
Expressed meibum quality (grade)	0 (0 – 1)
Cornea staining - fluorescein (0 – 15)	
	0 (0 – 0)
Conjunctival staining - Lissamine green (0 – 15)	
	0 (0 – 2)
Meibography	
Meibomian gland area loss (score)	1 (0 – 3)
Meibomian gland morphological pattern present:	
Dilation	13 (54%)
Shortening	18 (75%)
Tortuosity	14 (58%)

339 *Data for 21 participants only included because lipid layer thickness values measuring
 340 above the upper cut-off of 100 “interferometric colour units (ICU)” were not displayed
 341 by the instrument for three participants.

342 **3.3 Repeatability of blink rate and interblink interval**

343 Group mean blink rate for participants while reading from a smartphone was 10.6±10.4
 344 blinks/min for the first repeat and 11.3±10.4 blinks/min for the second repeat. Interblink
 345 interval was 10.3±9.7s and 9.7±11.2s for the first and second repeats respectively. There was
 346 no significant difference between two repeated measurements for blink rate (p=0.62) or
 347 interblink interval (p=0.55). The Bland and Altman plots for blink rate and interblink interval
 348 showing the bias and limits of agreement are presented in Figure 6. The CoR was calculated to
 349 be ±12.4 blinks/min for blink rate and ±18.8s for interblink interval.



350 **Figure 6.** Differences between **a)** blink rate and **b)** interblink interval measured using the wearable eye tracking headset (Pupil Labs GmbH Berlin,
 351 Germany) during two repeats plotted against their mean for 24 students with healthy eyes, while reading easy book series on a smartphone for
 352 12 minutes. The dotted line shows a bias of **a)** -0.7 blinks/min ($p=0.62$) and **b)** 0.7s ($p=0.55$). The dashed lines represent the limits of agreement
 353 of **a)** +11.7 to -13.1 blinks/min and **b)** +19.5 to -18.2s. CoR is the coefficient of repeatability.

354 **4. Discussion**

355 A wearable eye tracking headset can be utilised to reliably measure blinking in a variety of
356 real-life settings and was found to be repeatable day to day. Blink rate was consistently
357 reduced and interblink interval was longer during reading compared to conversation or
358 walking, irrespective of reading task complexity, screen brightness, working distance or
359 device used. Changes in blink rate and interblink interval occurred immediately upon starting
360 tasks and did not change throughout the 15-minute duration. No relationship was apparent
361 between blinking and ocular surface comfort or clinical signs.

362 Blink rate during reading (mean for all reading tasks 10.7 ± 9.7 blinks/min) and conversation
363 (32.4 ± 12.4 blinks/min) in this study aligns with previous findings of a slower blink rate while
364 reading printed text and on a computer (pooled mean 7.9 ± 3.3 blinks/min) than during
365 conversation in adults (mean 21 blinks/min) [4] and in children (20.5 blinks/min) [26]. A
366 reduced blink rate has been consistently reported with computer or smartphone reading and
367 gaming relative to conversation [27, 61, 62] and rest or primary gaze [5, 7, 12-14, 57, 63].
368 Blink rate while reading on a smartphone (10.6 blinks/min) is similar to a previously reported
369 mean of 8.9 blinks/min within one minute of gaming on a smartphone [27] and median of
370 12.5 blinks/min within 10 minutes of reading on a smartphone [50]. A reduced blink rate
371 during reading tasks compared to conversation and walking is as expected, as tasks involving
372 higher cognitive demand and concentration are associated with slower blink rate compared
373 to tasks of lower cognitive demand [4, 5, 8, 9, 64, 65].

374 Interblink interval measured during conversation in this study (1.5 ± 0.6 s) is shorter compared
375 to the only previously reported value of 6 ± 3 s in healthy adults [66]. Interblink interval has not

376 been previously measured during reading or walking. Other reports were during rest,
377 predetermined gaze, or steady fixation, and viewing a game or movie on computer with
378 reported mean interblink interval values ranging from 3 to 10 seconds [15, 18, 19, 66-69]. As
379 with blink rate, interblink interval has been speculated to be unconsciously adjusted
380 depending on the importance of perceived visual information - prolonged with greater
381 cognitive demand [68].

382 Enabled by the portability of the wearable eye tracking headset, this was the first study to
383 report blink rate while walking. Blinking during walking did not differ from conversation. A
384 previous study speculated that the cognitive demand during conversation compares to that
385 during orientation simulated in a laboratory, similar to walking [70].

386 Blinking was not affected by the type of device used in this study. These results align with
387 previous reports that blink rate remains unchanged when an identical reading task is
388 performed in print and on any type of digital device [8, 9, 11, 63, 71, 72].

389 Text complexity did not modulate the effect of reading on blinking in this study, in agreement
390 with a previous study which compared blink rate while reading regular words with re-ordered
391 mirrored images of the same words [65]. In contrast, another study found a small reduction
392 in blink rate during complex reading compared to non-complex reading on tablet and printed
393 text [8]. Other studies [3, 5, 10, 63] which report reduced blinking while reading complex text
394 on a computer, tablet or printed text did not directly compare texts of differing complexities.
395 The likely high reading comprehension ability level of university student participants may
396 have limited this study's ability to demonstrate an effect of text complexity.

397 Screen brightness did not affect blink rate in the present study. Another study found reduced
398 blinking while reading from computer with high screen brightness compared to low screen
399 brightness [73]. The higher blinking with low screen brightness under standard background
400 luminance was speculated to be caused by increased glare discomfort [21, 73]. An effect of
401 screen brightness on blink rate may not be expected as in the photopic range, the eye and
402 visual system constantly and rapidly adapts to luminance changes [74].

403 The presentation of the reading tasks at near or distance did not impact blinking in this study.
404 A relationship between screen viewing distance and blink rate has not been previously
405 reported. Direction of gaze during tasks may also modulate blink behaviour. Tasks involving
406 down gaze such as reading on printed text and smartphone, may be less likely to trigger
407 blinking compared to tasks involving upward (e.g., smart TV at 6m) [21, 67] or primary gaze
408 [65]. Upward gaze direction could lead to ocular surface area exposure, thereby stimulating
409 blinks [9, 21, 75].

410 The impact of task on blink rate and interblink interval in this study was immediate and
411 remained unchanged throughout task duration, in agreement with earlier work. A study that
412 investigated blink rate each 30s over the course of 10 minutes reading on a tablet also found
413 no changes in blink rate [8]. A study using the same eye tracker device in school-aged children
414 similarly found a rapid slowing of blink rate and lengthening of interblink interval which
415 occurred within the first minute of gaming on a smartphone, and this remained further
416 unchanged throughout one hour of gaming [27]. A study in adults found no difference in blink
417 rate over the course of one hour gaming on a smartphone [76]. An intervention study in adults
418 found an increase in rate of incomplete blinks from 1 to 60 minutes of smartphone reading,
419 but no change in rate of complete blinks [77].

420 Ocular symptoms worsened when reading on a smartphone with 50% screen brightness,
421 more complex text on smartphone and reading on smart TV at 6m but there was no
422 association between these changes in symptoms and blink rate or interblink interval.
423 Whereas previous studies in adults did not find direct associations between symptoms and
424 blink rate during digital device use similar to this study [3, 11, 22], increased occurrence of
425 incomplete blinking has been implicated in the worsening of ocular symptoms while reading
426 on a computer or smartphone [11, 22, 77, 78]. Complete blinking is essential to replenishment
427 of the tear film and maintenance of ocular comfort [79] and incomplete blinking can
428 potentially impact dry eye symptoms [80, 81]. Blink amplitude was not characterised in the
429 current study but its usefulness as a possible marker of ocular surface health warrants
430 exploration.

431 Day to day repeatability of blink rate was CoR ± 12.4 blinks/min; this sets the smallest
432 measurable difference in blink rate in longitudinal studies. A closer inspection of the limits of
433 agreement in Figure 6 suggests that CoR may differ with magnitude of blink measurement.
434 Therefore, the CoR was calculated separately for blink rate values higher than 10 blinks/min.
435 Repeatability was better with blink rates ≤ 10 blinks/min (CoR: ± 5.4 blinks/min) but less
436 reliable above 10 blinks/min (CoR: ± 18.8 blinks/min) (supplementary data Table 3). Previous
437 studies intending to report repeatability of blink rate do not provide a standard repeatability
438 measure to enable comparison with the present findings [6, 18, 28, 29]. These findings
439 suggest that the wearable eye tracker is able to reliably measure blink rate within the normal
440 ranges of spontaneous blinking. These results provide a basis on which to estimate sample
441 size in future studies.

442 As for blink rate, the repeatability of interblink interval was better for values below 10s (CoR:
443 ± 3.9 s) and poorer for longer interblink interval values (CoR: ± 29.6 s) (supplementary data
444 Table 3). The overall CoR for interblink interval is higher compared to the normal range
445 previously reported [19]. No studies have previously examined repeatability of interblink
446 interval.

447 The strengths of this study lie with measurement of blinking *in situ* without the need for head
448 restraint. Also, blink rate and interblink interval were compared between various tasks on
449 differing devices, controlling for complexity, viewing distance, direction of gaze, and
450 luminance, within the one study. Based on these results, *in situ* measurements of blinking
451 parameters may not be feasible in a small proportion of participants due to poor pupil
452 detection confidence the causes of which require further investigation. Poor pupil confidence
453 unrelated to blinks can occur when using the wearable headset due to extreme gaze angles
454 or pupil obscuration by eyelashes [58]. Excluded data in the current study was likely unrelated
455 to gaze angle, as no extreme gaze angles were observed by the continuous eye monitoring
456 during data collection. Future studies should explore whether this limitation is uniquely
457 related to participant's eye characteristics (e.g., long eye lashes) [58].

458 Incomplete blinking has been reported as an important marker of ocular symptoms during
459 reading on smartphone and computer [9, 11, 77] and also during driving [82]. Future studies
460 using the wearable eye tracker will enable examination of blink amplitude *in situ* during
461 various task and conditions.

462 5. Conclusion

463 Blink rate was reduced and interblink interval increased during reading compared to
464 conversation and walking. Changes in blink rate and interblink interval were immediate and
465 sustained for all tasks, suggesting blinking is a rapidly responsive marker of changes. The
466 similarity in blink rate and interblink interval response during a variety of reading tasks,
467 including smartphone, suggests that reduced blink rate during reading is not driven by type
468 of device used, working distance, screen brightness, nor duration or complexity of task, but
469 rather is intrinsic to the task of reading itself. There was no apparent relationship between
470 changes in blinking and ocular surface comfort or signs.

471 Blink rate measured using a wearable device *in situ* was repeatable day to day. The current
472 study established solid foundations for the usefulness of blinking as a repeatable and
473 responsive marker of ocular surface health when measured *in situ*. Future research should
474 explore its utility in the settings of dry eye diagnosis and monitoring of treatment
475 effectiveness.

476 **Acknowledgements**

477 Dr. Peter Wagner for technical support during data collection using the wearable eye tracking
478 headset. The authors acknowledge the Eye Research Group at the School of Optometry and
479 Vision Science for the provision of clinical facilities in support of this research.

480 **Data Availability Statement**

481 The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current study are available in the
482 Mendeley Data repository, <https://data.mendeley.com/drafts/j63x6bxj8k>, Doi:
483 10.17632/j63x6bxj8k.1

484 References

- 485 [1] Evinger C, Bao JB, Powers AS, Kassem IS, Schicatano EJ, Henriquez VM, et al. Dry eye,
486 blinking, and blepharospasm. *Mov Disord.* 2002;17 Suppl 2:S75-8.
- 487 [2] Nakamori K, Odawara M, Nakajima T, Mizutani T, Tsubota K. Blinking is controlled primarily
488 by ocular surface conditions. *Am J Ophthalmol.* 1997;124:24-30.
- 489 [3] Dumery B, Van Toi V. Relationship between blink rate, ocular discomfort, and visual tasks.
490 *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 1997;38:326.
- 491 [4] Doughty MJ. Consideration of Three Types of Spontaneous Eyeblink Activity in Normal
492 Humans: during Reading and Video Display Terminal Use, in Primary Gaze, and while in
493 Conversation. *Optom Vis Sci.* 2001;78:712-25.
- 494 [5] Jaiswal S, Asper L, Long J, Lee A, Harrison K, Golebiowski B. Ocular and visual discomfort
495 associated with smartphones, tablets and computers: what we do and do not know. *Clin Exp*
496 *Optom.* 2019;102:463-77.
- 497 [6] Stern JA, Boyer D, Schroeder D. Blink Rate: A Possible Measure of Fatigue. *Hum Factors.*
498 1994;36:285-97.
- 499 [7] Cardona G, García C, Serés C, Vilaseca M, Gispets J. Blink Rate, Blink Amplitude, and Tear
500 Film Integrity during Dynamic Visual Display Terminal Tasks. *Curr Eye Res.* 2011;36:190-7.
- 501 [8] Rosenfield M, Jahan S, Nunez K, Chan K. Cognitive demand, digital screens and blink rate.
502 *Comput Human Behav.* 2015;51:403-6.
- 503 [9] Argilés M, Cardona G, Pérez-Cabré E, Rodríguez M. Blink rate and incomplete blinks in six
504 different controlled hard-copy and electronic reading conditions. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.*
505 2015;56:6679-85.
- 506 [10] Tanaka Y, Yamaoka K. Blink Activity and Task Difficulty. *Percept Mot Skills.* 1993;77:55-
507 66.
- 508 [11] Chu CA, Rosenfield M, Portello JK. Blink patterns: Reading from a computer screen versus
509 hard copy. *Optom Vis Sci.* 2014;91:297-302.
- 510 [12] Bentivoglio AR, Bressman SB, Cassetta E, Carretta D, Tonali P, Albanese A. Analysis of
511 blink rate patterns in normal subjects. *Mov Disord.* 1997;12:1028-34.
- 512 [13] Tsubota K, Nakamori K. Dry Eyes and Video Display Terminals. *N Engl J Med.*
513 1993;328:584.
- 514 [14] Himebaugh NL, Begley CG, Bradley A, Wilkinson JA. Blinking and tear break-up during
515 four visual tasks. *Optom Vis Sci.* 2009;86:E106-E14.
- 516 [15] Doughty MJ. Further Assessment of Gender- and Blink Pattern-Related Differences in the
517 Spontaneous Eyeblink Activity in Primary Gaze in Young Adult Humans. *Optom Vis Sci.*
518 2002;79:439-47.
- 519 [16] Cardona G, Quevedo N. Blinking and driving: the influence of saccades and cognitive
520 workload. *Curr Eye Res.* 2014;39:239-44.
- 521 [17] Wu Z, Begley CG, Situ P, Simpson T, Liu H. The Effects of Mild Ocular Surface Stimulation
522 and Concentration on Spontaneous Blink Parameters. *Curr Eye Res.* 2014;39:9-20.
- 523 [18] Borges FP, Garcia DM. Distribution of spontaneous inter-blink interval in repeated
524 measurements with and without topical ocular anesthesia. *Arq Bras Oftalmol.* 2010;73:329-
525 32.
- 526 [19] Chen J, Chidi-Egboka NC, Jalbert I, Golebiowski B. Is there a consistent way to measure
527 spontaneous blinking? - A narrative review. 2022;invited review conditionally accepted.

- 528 [20] Navascues-Cornago M, Morgan PB, Maldonado-Codina C, Read ML. Characterisation of
529 blink dynamics using a high-speed infrared imaging system. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt.*
530 2020;40:519-28.
- 531 [21] Doughty MJ. Spontaneous eyeblink activity under different conditions of gaze (eye
532 position) and visual glare. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol.* 2014;252:1147-53.
- 533 [22] Portello JK, Rosenfield M, Chu CA. Blink rate, incomplete blinks and computer vision
534 syndrome. *Optom Vis Sci.* 2013;90:482-7.
- 535 [23] Tsubota K, Hata S, Okusawa Y, Egami F, Ohtsuki T, Nakamori K. Quantitative videographic
536 analysis of blinking in normal subjects and patients with dry eye. *Arch Ophthalmol.*
537 1996;114:715-20.
- 538 [24] Muntz A, Turnbull PR, Kim AD, Gokul A, Wong D, Tsay TS-W, et al. Extended screen time
539 and dry eye in youth. *Cont Lens Anterior Eye.* 2021:101541.
- 540 [25] Chen S, Epps J. Efficient and robust pupil size and blink estimation from near-field video
541 sequences for human-machine interaction. *IEEE transactions on cybernetics.* 2014;44:2356-
542 67.
- 543 [26] Chidi-Egboka NC, Jalbert I, Wagner P, Golebiowski B. Blinking and normal ocular surface
544 in school-aged children, and the effects of age and screen time. *Br J Ophthalmol.* 2022;doi:
545 10.1136/bjophthalmol-2022-321645.
- 546 [27] Chidi-Egboka NC, Jalbert I, Golebiowski B. Smartphone gaming induces dry eye symptoms
547 and reduces blinking in school-aged children. *Eye* 2022;DOI 10.1038/s41433-022-02122-2.
- 548 [28] Hidalgo-Lopez E, Zimmermann G, Pletzer B. Intra-subject consistency of spontaneous eye
549 blink rate in young women across the menstrual cycle. *Sci Rep.* 2020;10:1-8.
- 550 [29] Yong PT, Arif N, Sharanjeet-Kaur S, Hairol MI. Double Eyelid Tape Wear Affects Anterior
551 Ocular Health among Young Adult Women with Single Eyelids. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.*
552 2020;17:7701.
- 553 [30] Doughty MJ. Effects of background lighting and retinal illuminance on spontaneous
554 eyeblink activity of human subjects in primary eye gaze. *Eye & contact lens.* 2013;39:138-46.
- 555 [31] Doughty MJ. Influence of mouth and jaw movements on dynamics of spontaneous eye
556 blink activity assessed during slitlamp biomicroscopy. *Clin Exp Optom.* 2018;101:345-53.
- 557 [32] Bland JM, Altman DG. Measuring agreement in method comparison studies. *Stat*
558 *Methods Med Res.* 1999;8:135-60.
- 559 [33] Scheiman M, Wick B. Clinical management of binocular vision : heterophoric,
560 accommodative, and eye movement disorders. 3. Aufl. ed: Philadelphia, Pa. : Lippincott.;
561 2008.
- 562 [34] Gowrisankaran S, Nahar NK, Hayes JR, Sheedy JE. Asthenopia and Blink Rate Under Visual
563 and Cognitive Loads. *Optom Vis Sci.* 2012;89:97-104.
- 564 [35] Rodriguez JD, Lane KJ, Ousler GW, 3rd, Angjeli E, Smith LM, Abelson MB. Blink:
565 Characteristics, Controls, and Relation to Dry Eyes. *Curr Eye Res.* 2018;43:52-66.
- 566 [36] Tucker KA. Ten tiny breaths. [Stouffville, Ont.]: Papoti Books; 2012.
- 567 [37] Good Calculators. Flesch Kincaid Calculator. <https://goodcalculators.com/flesch-kincaid-calculator/> Accessed 12 September 2019. 2019.
- 568
569 [38] The Legacy of David Foster Wallace: University of Iowa Press; 2012.
- 570 [39] Gill K, Mao A, Powell AM, Sheidow T. Digital reader vs print media: the role of digital
571 technology in reading accuracy in age-related macular degeneration. *Eye.* 2013;27:639-43.
- 572 [40] Sanchez CA, Goolsbee JZ. Character size and reading to remember from small displays.
573 *Computers & Education.* 2010;55:1056-62.

- 574 [41] Jasper. 100 Awesome Conversation Starters - Be The Fun Guy At Every Party.
575 <https://www.mantelligence.com/conversation-starters/> Accessed 12 September 2019. 2017.
- 576 [42] Boga A, Stapleton F, Briggs N, Golebiowski B. Daily fluctuations in ocular surface
577 symptoms during the normal menstrual cycle and with the use of oral contraceptives. *Ocul*
578 *Surf.* 2019;17:763-70.
- 579 [43] Chalmers RL, Begley CG, Caffery B. Validation of the 5-Item Dry Eye Questionnaire (DEQ-
580 5): Discrimination across self-assessed severity and aqueous tear deficient dry eye diagnoses.
581 *Cont Lens Anterior Eye.* 2010;33:55-60.
- 582 [44] Schaumberg DA, Gulati A, Mathers WD, Clinch T, Lemp MA, Nelson JD, et al. Development
583 and Validation of a Short Global Dry Eye Symptom Index. *Ocul Surf.* 2007;5:50-7.
- 584 [45] Schiffman RM, Christianson M, Jacobsen G, Hirsch JD, Reis BL. Reliability and validity of
585 the ocular surface disease index. *Arch Ophthalmol.* 2000;118:615-21.
- 586 [46] Eom Y, Lee J-S, Kang S-Y, Kim HM, Song J-S. Correlation Between Quantitative
587 Measurements of Tear Film Lipid Layer Thickness and Meibomian Gland Loss in Patients With
588 Obstructive Meibomian Gland Dysfunction and Normal Controls. *Am J Ophthalmol.*
589 2013;155:1104-10.e2.
- 590 [47] Baek J, Doh SH, Chung SK. Comparison of Tear Meniscus Height Measurements Obtained
591 With the Keratograph and Fourier Domain Optical Coherence Tomography in Dry Eye. *Cornea.*
592 2015;34:1209-13.
- 593 [48] Hong J, Sun X, Wei A, Cui X, Li Y, Qian T, et al. Assessment of tear film stability in dry eye
594 with a newly developed keratograph. *Cornea.* 2013;32:716-21.
- 595 [49] Bron AJ, Abelson MB, Ousler G, Pearce E, Tomlinson A, Yokoi N, et al. Methodologies to
596 diagnose and monitor dry eye disease: report of the Diagnostic Methodology Subcommittee
597 of the International Dry Eye WorkShop (2007). *Ocular Surface.* 2007;5:108-52.
- 598 [50] Wolffsohn JS, Arita R, Chalmers R, Djalilian A, Dogru M, Dumbleton K, et al. TFOS DEWS
599 II Diagnostic Methodology report. *Ocul Surf.* 2017;15:539-74.
- 600 [51] Nichols JJ, Nichols KK, Puent B, Saracino M, Mitchell GL. Evaluation of tear film
601 interference patterns and measures of tear break-up time. *Optom Vis Sci.* 2002;79:363-9.
- 602 [52] Bron AJ, Evans VE, Smith JA. Grading Of Corneal and Conjunctival Staining in the Context
603 of Other Dry Eye Tests. *Cornea.* 2003;22:640-50.
- 604 [53] Delaveris A, Stahl U, Madigan M, Jalbert I. Comparative performance of lissamine green
605 stains. *Cont Lens Anterior Eye.* 2018;41:23-7.
- 606 [54] Foulks GN, Bron AJ. Meibomian gland dysfunction: a clinical scheme for description,
607 diagnosis, classification, and grading. *Ocul Surf.* 2003;1:107-26.
- 608 [55] Pult H, Riede-Pult B. Comparison of subjective grading and objective assessment in
609 meibography. *Cont Lens Anterior Eye.* 2013;36:22-7.
- 610 [56] Tomlinson A, Bron AJ, Korb DR, Amano S, Paugh JR, Ian Pearce E, et al. The international
611 workshop on meibomian gland dysfunction: Report of the diagnosis subcommittee. *Invest*
612 *Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2011;52:2006-49.
- 613 [57] Kim JS, Wang MTM, Craig JP. Exploring the Asian ethnic predisposition to dry eye disease
614 in a pediatric population. *Ocul Surf.* 2019;17:70-7.
- 615 [58] PupilLabs. Pupil Docs - Master. [https://docs.pupil-labs.com/core/software/pupil-](https://docs.pupil-labs.com/core/software/pupil-capture/#blink-detection)
616 [capture/#blink-detection](https://docs.pupil-labs.com/core/software/pupil-capture/#blink-detection) Accessed 20 August 2021.
- 617 [59] Zaman ML, Doughty MJ. Some methodological issues in the assessment of the
618 spontaneous eyeblink frequency in man. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt.* 1997;17:421-32.
- 619 [60] Barbato G, Ficca G, Muscettola G, Fichelle M, Beatrice M, Rinaldi F. Diurnal variation in
620 spontaneous eye-blink rate. *Psychiatry Res.* 2000;93:145-51.

- 621 [61] Patel P, Henderson R, Bradley L, Galloway B, Hunter L. Effect of visual display unit use on
622 blink rate and tear stability. *Optom Vis Sci.* 1991;68:888-92.
- 623 [62] Freudenthaler N, Neuf H, Kadner G, Schlote T. Characteristics of spontaneous eyeblink
624 activity during video display terminal use in healthy volunteers. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp*
625 *Ophthalmol.* 2003;241:914-20.
- 626 [63] Talens-Estarellles C, García-Marqués JV, Cervino A, García-Lázaro S. Use of digital displays
627 and ocular surface alterations: A review. *Ocul Surf.* 2021;19:252-65.
- 628 [64] Stern JA, Walrath LC, Goldstein R. The endogenous eyeblink. *Psychophysiology.*
629 1984;21:22-33.
- 630 [65] Cho P, Sheng C, Chan C, Lee R, Tam J. Baseline blink rates and the effect of visual task
631 difficulty and position of gaze. *Curr Eye Res.* 2000;20:64-70.
- 632 [66] Mantelli F, Tiberi E, Micera A, Lambiase A, Visintini F, Bonini S. MUC5AC overexpression
633 in tear film of neonates. *Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol.* 2007;245:1377-81.
- 634 [67] Zaman M, Doughty M, Button N. The exposed ocular surface and its relationship to
635 spontaneous eyeblink rate in elderly caucasians. *Exp Eye Res.* 1998;67:681-6.
- 636 [68] Ranti C, Jones W, Klin A, Shultz S. Blink Rate patterns provide a Reliable Measure of
637 individual engagement with Scene content. *Sci Rep.* 2020;10:1-10.
- 638 [69] Jansen ME, Begley CG, Himebaugh NH, Port NL. Effect of Contact Lens Wear and a Near
639 Task on Tear Film Break-Up. *Optom Vis Sci.* 2010;87.
- 640 [70] Fu HH, White KA, Collings RDJPCJoPR. The Effects of Conversation Arousal Level on
641 Attention Processes. 2020;25.
- 642 [71] Chu C, Rosenfield M, Portello J. Computer vision syndrome: blink rate and dry eye during
643 hard copy or computer viewing. *Investig Ophthalmology Vis Sci.* 2010;51:951.
- 644 [72] Hue JE, Rosenfield M, Saá G. Reading from electronic devices versus hardcopy text. *Work.*
645 2014;47:303-7.
- 646 [73] Benedetto S, Carbone A, Draï-Zerbib V, Pedrotti M, Baccino T. Effects of luminance and
647 illuminance on visual fatigue and arousal during digital reading. *Comput Human Behav.*
648 2014;41:112-9.
- 649 [74] Bertalmío M. Chapter 4 - Adaptation and efficient coding. In: Bertalmío M, editor. *Vision*
650 *Models for High Dynamic Range and Wide Colour Gamut Imaging: Academic Press; 2020. p.*
651 *65-93.*
- 652 [75] Tsubota K, Nakamori K. Effects of Ocular Surface Area and Blink Rate on Tear Dynamics.
653 *Arch Ophthalmol.* 1995;113:155-8.
- 654 [76] Park JS, Choi MJ, Ma JE, Moon JH, Moon HJ. Influence of Cellular Phone Videos and Games
655 on Dry Eye Syndrome in University Students. *J Korean Acad Community Health Nurs.*
656 2014;25:12-23.
- 657 [77] Golebiowski B, Long J, Harrison K, Lee A, Chidi-Egboka N, Asper L. Smartphone Use and
658 Effects on Tear Film, Blinking and Binocular Vision. *Curr Eye Res.* 2020;45:428-34.
- 659 [78] Rosenfield M. Computer vision syndrome: a review of ocular causes and potential
660 treatments. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt.* 2011;31:502-15.
- 661 [79] Braun RJ, King-Smith PE, Begley CG, Li L, Gewecke NR. Dynamics and function of the tear
662 film in relation to the blink cycle. *Prog Retin Eye Res.* 2015;45:132-64.
- 663 [80] Pult H, Riede-Pult BH, Murphy PJ. The Relation Between Blinking and Conjunctival Folds
664 and Dry Eye Symptoms. *Optom Vis Sci.* 2013;90.
- 665 [81] Pult H, Murphy P, Riede-Pult B. Velocity of upper lid spontaneous complete blinks and
666 dry eye. *Cont Lens Anterior Eye.* 2015;38:e10-e1.

667 [82] Soleimanloo SS, Wilkinson VE, Cori JM, Westlake J, Stevens B, Downey LA, et al. Eye-Blink
668 Parameters Detect On-Road Track-Driving Impairment Following Severe Sleep Deprivation.
669 2019;15:1271-84.