

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, MPH<sup>1</sup>  
5 2. Isabelle Jalbert, OD, MPH, PhD<sup>1</sup>  
6 3. Jiaying Chen BSc, MOptom<sup>1</sup>  
7 4. Nancy E. Briggs PhD<sup>1,2</sup>  
8 5. Blanka Golebiowski, BOptom, PhD<sup>1</sup>

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29 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**  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 ( $\alpha$ ) 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  $380 \text{ cd/m}^2$  (Konica Minolta CS-100A) for two tasks and reduced to half during from the  
164 smartphone at 50% brightness task (measured luminance  $121 \text{ cd/m}^2$ ). The laptop screen and  
165 smart TV were also set at maximum screen brightness, measured luminance  $316 \text{ cd/m}^2$  and  $316$   
166  $\text{cd/m}^2$  respectively. The measured luminance for the printed text reading was  $77 \text{ cd/m}^2$ .

### 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  $28.6 \pm 6.3$  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 ( $\rho$  -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
<b>Ocular surface symptoms</b> (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)
<b>Tear film</b>	
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)
<b>Cornea white light staining</b> (grade)	
	0 (0 – 0)
<b>Meibomian gland evaluation</b> (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)
<b>Cornea staining - fluorescein</b> (0 – 15)	
	0 (0 – 0)
<b>Conjunctival staining - Lissamine green</b> (0 – 15)	
	0 (0 – 2)
<b>Meibography</b>	
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  $10.7 \pm 9.7$  blinks/min) and conversation  
363 ( $32.4 \pm 12.4$  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  $7.9 \pm 3.3$  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 ( $1.5 \pm 0.6$ s) is shorter compared  
375 to the only previously reported value of  $6 \pm 3$ 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  $\pm 12.4$  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  $\leq 10$  blinks/min (CoR:  $\pm 5.4$  blinks/min) but less  
436 reliable above 10 blinks/min (CoR:  $\pm 18.8$  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  $\pm 3.9$ s) and poorer for longer interblink interval values (CoR:  $\pm 29.6$ 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.