# Detecting Readers with Dyslexia Using Machine Learning with Eye Tracking Measures

Luz Rello
Human-Computer Interaction Institute
School of Computer Science
Carnegie Mellon University

luzrello@cs.cmu.edu

Miguel Ballesteros
Natural Language Processing Group
Universitat Pompeu Fabra

miguel.ballesteros@upf.edu

## ABSTRACT

Worldwide, around 10% of the population has dyslexia, a specific learning disorder. Most of previous eye tracking experiments with people with and without dyslexia have found differences between populations suggesting that eye movements reflect the difficulties of individuals with dyslexia. In this paper, we present the first statistical model to predict readers with and without dyslexia using eye tracking measures. The model is trained and evaluated in a 10-fold cross experiment with a dataset composed of 1,135 readings of people with and without dyslexia that were recorded with an eye tracker. Our model, based on a Support Vector Machine binary classifier, reaches 80.18% accuracy using the most informative features. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that eye tracking measures are used to predict automatically readers with dyslexia using machine learning.

## Categories and Subject Descriptors

K.4.2 [**Computers and Society**]: Social Issues—*Assistive technologies for persons with disabilities*; I.2.1 [**Artificial Intelligence**]: Applications and Expert Systems—*Medicine and science.*

## Keywords

Dyslexia, eye tracking, eye movements, diagnosis, detection, prediction, machine learning, support vector machine.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Dyslexia is the most common neurological learning disability [24]. It affects from 10 to 17.5% of the population in the U.S.A. [23] and from 8.6 to 11% in Spain [6, 25] and has a considerable presence in web text [1]. Competitive reading and writing is required in our education system; therefore school failure is associated with dyslexia, even if dyslexia is not related to overall intelligence [24].

Dyslexia detection is crucial. When diagnosed, dyslexia can be treated avoiding its consequences such as high rates of academic failure. At the same time, diagnosing dyslexia is not a trivial task; it is expensive and it normally requires an expert. Also, dyslexia manifestations vary depending on the language. In fact, dyslexia is called a *hidden* disability due to the difficulty of its diagnosis in languages with shallow orthographies [72], as Spanish.

Previous eye tracking studies with people with dyslexia from psychology research have concluded that the eye movements of people with dyslexia are not the cause but the reflection of the difficulties they have while reading [21, 45, 49]. Although there are number of studies that presents how eye tracking measures show individual differences [12, 37, 40], most of the studies agree in finding significant differences among readers with and without dyslexia.

Human-computer interaction studies that use eye tracking with people with dyslexia have normally focused in finding the most accessible text presentations [55, 57]. Again, differences between people with and without dyslexia were found.

Even if eye tracking measures have already been used to predict where people tend to look [26] or to improve the interface design of search engines [17], among others; we believe this is the first effort to automatically detect dyslexia using eye tracking measures.

In this paper we present a statistical model to classify readers with and without dyslexia using a Support Vector Machine binary classifier. We trained the model with a dataset composed of 1,135 readings of Spanish speakers with and without dyslexia from 11 to 54 years old recorded with an eye tracker.

The contribution of this paper is:

– a statistical model to classify Spanish readers with and without dyslexia that achieves 80.18% accuracy in a 10-fold cross validation experiment.[1]

Next section focuses on dyslexia and its detection. Section 3 explains related work that have shown differences between populations using eye tracking. We present the dataset used in Section 4 and show the experiments with our statistical model in Section 5. We discussed the results in Section 6. Finally, we draw conclusions and future work in Section 7.

---

[1]This work is protected by a provisional patent application titled "Method to Detect Individuals with or at Risk of Neurodevelopmental Specific Learning Disorders using Human Computer Interaction" filed on March 20, 2015.

## 2. DYSLEXIA DETECTION

Dyslexia is defined as a specific learning disability with neurological origin. It is characterized by difficulties with accurate and/or fluent word recognition and by poor spelling and decoding abilities. These difficulties typically result as a deficit in the phonological component of language that is often unexpected in relation to other cognitive abilities. Secondary consequences may include problems in reading comprehension and reduced reading experience that can impede growth of vocabulary and background knowledge [24, 30].

Dyslexia detection is crucial since academic failure is associated with dyslexia when it is not detected and treated accordingly [14]. Diagnosing dyslexia and early detection of risk of dyslexia have been addressed from different fields, especially in psychology and neuroimaging.

In psychology, traditional paper based diagnosed of dyslexia such as *TALE* [70] for Spanish or *Diagnostischer Rechtschreibtest* [18] for German, analyze both reading and writing skills. Diagnoses of dyslexia are confirmed when the reading and the spelling performance of the child is significantly under the level expected due to her or his age and general intelligence.[2]

More recently, Lyytinen *et al.* [32] created the computer game *Literate*, later called *GraphoGame* [31],[3] which was developed to identify children at risk of having dyslexia before school age in Finland. Its exercises are aimed towards the connection of graphemes (letters) and phonemes (sounds). They conducted two user studies with 12 and 41 children between 6 and 7 years old with very promising results. Although these exercises were conceived as preventive training, children who used *Literate* improved their accuracy in grapheme-phoneme connections, reading words, and naming phonemes after playing for less than 4 hours.

On the other hand, neuroimaging with children with dyslexia has revealed relationships between brain responses at infancy and later reading performance. Molfese [36] reported that there are brain responses (event-related brain potentials) to speech sounds within 36 hours of birth that can be used to discriminate children who would become readers with dyslexia with 8 years old. The accuracy of this prediction is 81%.

## 3. EYE MOVEMENTS AND DYSLEXIA

Related work on diagnose and early detection of risk of dyslexia is very extensive and comes from different fields such as cognitive neuroscience, psychology or biology. In this related work we only focus on how eye tracking measures have been studied in relationship with dyslexia. These studies come from psychology and human-computer interaction research.

### 3.1 Psychology Research

Rayner [50] presents a review of the studies from the mid 70's to the 90's that have used eye movements to investigate cognitive processes. He demonstrates that eye movement measures can be used to infer moment-to-moment cognitive processes in reading. For instance, shorter fixations are associated with better readability while longer fixations can indicate that processing loads are greater. As a matter of fact, non impaired readers present longer fixations at low-frequency words than at high-frequency words [22, 27, 46, 51, 54, 59].

The eye movements of readers with dyslexia are different from regular readers. People with dyslexia as well as beginner readers, make longer fixations, more fixations, shorter saccades[4] and more regressions than readers without dyslexia [11, 35, 50].

During the 80's-90's it was discussed to which extent eye movements are the cause of reading problems. If eye movements were a causative factor, then dyslexia could easily be diagnosed with a simple eye movement test. There have been some studies concerning whether eye movements are the cause of dyslexia: erratic eye movements [41, 42, 43], instability during fixation [11], and selective attentional deficit [13, 15, 44]. However, the results presented in those experiments could not be later replicated by others (see [3, 5, 38, 39, 65, 66] for erratic eye movements; Raymond *et al.* [47] for instability during fixation; and [16, 28, 52, 53, 64] for selective attentional deficit). At the same time, Tinker [67, 68] and Rayner [48, 50] studies show how eye movements are generally not a cause of the reading disability but were a reflection of other underlying problems. More concretely, there are three studies that are consistent with the conclusion that eye movements reflect the difficulties that individuals with dyslexia have while reading and that are not the cause of the reading problem.

First, Hyöna and Olson [21] found that readers with dyslexia show the typical word frequency effect in which low-frequency words are fixated longer (fixation duration, number of fixations, and regressions) than high-frequency words.

Second, Pirozzolo and Rayner [45] and Olson *et al.* [39] found that when people with dyslexia were given a text appropriate for their reading level, their eye movements (fixations, saccades, and regressions) were much like those of regular readers at that particular age level.

Third, Rayner [49] showed that regular children's eye movements (fixation durations, saccade lengths, and the size of the perceptual span) shared the characteristics of readers with dyslexia when they were given a text that was too difficult for them.

Taking into account all these studies the evidence suggests that the vast majority of people with dyslexia have a language processing deficit and, that their eye movements simply reflect their difficulty processing language [50].

Later literature on eye tracking and dyslexia have focused on the effect of other factors, such as regular orthography [20], orthographic neighbors [33], or letter length and phoneme length [34].

### 3.2 Human-Computer Interaction

In her PhD thesis, Rello [55], performed twelve eye tracking experiments –and eleven sub experiments– to explore the impact of text presentation and text content on the readability and comprehension of people with dyslexia.

The text presentation parameters tested were typeface, font size, colors, character spacing, line spacing, paragraph spacing, different grey scales for text, and column width [61]. On the other hand, the text context parameters were word frequency and word length [59], different kind of numerical

---

[2]Other causes, like insufficient vision and hearing ability, brain injury or lack of opportunity to learn, have to be excluded first [10].

[3]https://graphogame.com/

[4]A rapid movement of the eye between fixation points.

representations [60], verbal paraphrases, graphical schemes, keywords, and different strategies of lexical simplification [58]. Each experiment had between 23 to 48 participants with dyslexia plus a control group. In all the experiments, except from one –where the participants had to read texts with orthographic errors [56]– there were found significant differences between participants with and without dyslexia regarding eye tracking measures.

## 3.3 What is missing?

Previous literature on eye movements and dyslexia have found pattens, correlations, individual differences, and significant differences between populations. However, to the best of our knowledge, none of them have applied machine learning to classify people with and without dyslexia, that is, to detect readers with dyslexia.

What is missing is the connection of two points that were not previously joined: eye tracking measures and machine learning techniques to predict readers with dyslexia automatically.

## 4. DATASET

We used a dataset derived from an eye tracking experiment with 97 subjects with normal or corrected-to-normal vision; 48 of then with diagnosed dyslexia. The participants with dyslexia (22 female, 26 male) presented a confirmed diagnosis of dyslexia. Their ages ranged from 11 to 50 ($\bar{x}$ = 20.96, $s$ = 9.98). Except from 3 participants, all of the participants were attending school or high school (26 participants), or they were studying or had already finished university degrees (19 participants). The group of participants without dyslexia was composed of 49 people (28 female, 21 male). Their ages ranged from 11 to 54 ($\bar{x}$ = 29.30, $s$ = 9.03). Except from 5 participants, the rest were either attending or had finished school or high school (17 participants) or university (27 participants).

This dataset was derived from a within-subject design experiment. Each participant read 12 different texts with 12 different typefaces. The texts and the fonts were counter-balanced to avoid sequence effects. Therefore, the data with respect to text-font combinations was evenly distributed.

The twelve fonts were: *Arial*, *Arial Italic*, *Times* and *Times Italic* – the most common fonts used on screen and printed texts, respectively [8]–; *OpenDyslexic* and *OpenDyslexic Italic* – designed specifically for people with dyslexia–[5]; *Verdana*, recommended by the British Dyslexia Association [4]; *Courier* – the most common example of monospaced font [8]–; *Helvetica* and *Myriad* – broadly used in graphic design and typeface of choice of Microsoft and Apple, respectively –; *Garamond* – for its strong legibility for printed materials [8]– and *CMU* –widely used in scientific publishing, as is the default of the typesetting program TeX, as well as a free typeface supporting many languages [29].

The readings of each text were recorded using eye tracking, the user preferences towards the fonts were gathered using questionnaires with five-point Likert scales. Comprehension questions were presented at the end of each text as a control variable.

The text used in the experiments met comparability requirements. They were extracted from the same book, *Impostores ('Impostors')*,[6] by Lucas Sánchez [62]. They all had the same genre and same style; the same number of words (60 words); similar word length, with an average length ranging from 4.92 to 5.87 letters; absence of numerical expressions, acronyms, and foreign words, because people with dyslexia especially encounter problems with such words [9]. An example of a text read by the participants is given in the Appendix.

The text presentation was also controlled, except from the typeface. All the texts were left-justified, using a 14 points font size, and the column width did not exceeded 70 characters/column, as recommended by the British Dyslexia Association [4]. The color used was the most frequently used in the Web for text: black text on white background.

The equipment used was the eye tracker Tobii 1750 [69], which has a 17-inch TFT monitor with a resolution of 1,024×768 pixels. The time measurements of the eye tracker have a precision of 0.02 seconds. Hence, all time values are presented in the dataset with an accuracy of two decimals. The eye tracker was calibrated individually for each participant and the light focus was always in the same position. The distance between the participant and the eye tracker was constant (approximately 60 cm. or 24 in.) and controlled by using a fixed chair.

For more details about the experimental design on how these readings were collected, please refer to [55].

Therefore, our dataset is composed of readings marked as D if the participant has dyslexia and N if not, there are 12 readings per participant, that is 1,164 readings; 29 of these readings were not properly recorded with not a number values. Hence, we removed those readings from the dataset having a final dataset containing 1,135 readings. From the dataset we extracted the following features:

- **Age of the participant**: ranging from 11 to 54 years old.

- **Typeface**: One of the 12 typefaces used for the text.

- **Italic**: This is a binary feature with two values, *italic* when the text had an italic type and *roman* when the text had a roman type.

- **Serif**: This is a binary feature with two values, *sans serif* when the font of the text had an typeface without serif -*Arial*, *Helvetica*, *Myriad*, and *Verdana*–, and *serif* when the text had typefaces with serif –*CMU*, *Garamond*, and *Times*–.

- **Typeface designed for dyslexia**: A binary feature that shows when the font in the text had a typeface specifically designed for people with dyslexia.

- **Typeface preference of the participant**: Value given to a typeface by the participant using a five-point Likert scale.

- **Number of visits**: Total number of visits to the area of interest.

- **Mean of visit**: Duration of each individual visit within the area of interest (the text).

---

[5]http://opendyslexic.org/ In this typeface the letters are more differentiated compared to regular fonts. For example, the shape of the letter 'b' is not a mirror image of 'd'.

---

[6]http://www.impostores.es/#/Impostores

– **Sum of visits (in the following, reading time)**: Sum of all the visits. This is equivalent to the reading time of the whole text.

– **Mean of fixation**: When reading a text, the eye does not move contiguously over text, but alternates saccades and visual fixations, that is, jumps in short steps and rests over pieces of text. It denotes how long the eye rests still on a single spot of the text.

– **Number of fixations**: Total number of fixations while reading a text per visit.

– **Sum of fixations**: Sum of all fixations.

Some of the features have numeric (real or integer) values, so we established some ranges for each of them to discretize the data. For instance, the age of the participants is divided in 3 different groups: (1) younger than 14 years old, (2) from 14 to 19 years old, and (3) from 20 to 54 years old.

## 5. EXPERIMENTS

In order to find out whether it is feasible to detect readings of users with dyslexia, we set up a machine learning experiment. Machine learning is the scientific discipline that studies algorithms that can learn from data and make predictions. The output of a machine learning algorithm is called a model which is capable of making predictions given unseen data (normally for evaluation).

We carried out an experiment with a binary classifier of LIBSVM [7] in the polynomial Support Vector Machine (SVM) set-up. An SVM is a method for supervised learning that analyzes data and recognize patterns for classification. Given a set of training examples, each marked as belonging to a category, an SVM training algorithm builds a model that assigns new examples into the categories. It represents the examples as points in space and classifies them according to hyperplanes. When there is an input for the classifier it tries to assign a hyperplane to the input and then this is the classification output. Our SVM is trained on datasets as the one described in Section 4, and it is able to perform predictions on new readings.

We performed a 10-fold cross validation experiment by dividing the data in 10 different roughly equal subsets (10% of the data in each subset). Then we trained a statistical model on the rest of the data (90%) and tested on the corresponding fold by iterating 10 times, at the end we had all the data tested independently. We randomized the data and we did stratified sampling to ensure a similar distribution of data in all folds. We also kept all readings by the same user in the same fold, meaning that we had, in each fold, a similar number of readings marked as participants with and without dyslexia, and that a user does not serve for training a model that will predict readings of the same user. The idea is to see how the results of the statistical analysis will generalize on an independent dataset, in our case: new readings. We used 10-fold cross validation because it is normally recommended for smaller datasets when a single train-development test split might not be informative enough [2].

Table 1 shows the accuracy of the SVM models for each of the folds. This result suggests that the model is able to predict readings of users with dyslexia quite accurately with a final result of 80.18% by using the most informative

| Dataset | Accuracy | |
|---|---|---|
| Fold-1 | 83.62% | (97/116) |
| Fold-2 | 96.26% | (103/107) |
| Fold-3 | 69.90% | (72/103) |
| Fold-4 | 89.74% | (105/117) |
| Fold-5 | 86.48% | (96/111) |
| Fold-6 | 73.15% | (79/108) |
| Fold-7 | 61.21% | (71/116) |
| Fold-8 | 82.41% | (89/108) |
| Fold-9 | 85.47% | (100/117) |
| Fold-10 | 74.24% | (98/132) |
| **All** | **80.18%** | (910/1,135) |

Table 1: **Accuracy of the classifiers in the 10-fold cross validation experiment.**

features (reading time, mean of fixations and age of the participants),[7] meaning that the statistical models are able to make a correct prediction in 910 of the 1,135 readings.

The features that we found useful for classification were: (1) reading time, (2) mean of fixations, and (3) age of the participant. Some features that were useful standing alone, such as (1) number of visits or (2) number of fixations were not useful when they are used jointly with the features listed above, due to redundancy as they express very similar information. Other features, such as typeface, italic or serif do not affect at all in the predictions, which is also expected, and good news, because they are independent from the participant. This means that we are able of detecting users with dyslexia without taking into account the typeface.

## 6. DISCUSSION

First, it is worth noting that the age of the participants range from 11 to 54 years old, and the users with dyslexia tend to improve their reading skills with age. In order to test whether this was affecting the final result we run the same experiment (with the same folds), as in Section 5, by removing the age of the participant as a feature. Table 2 shows the results of the SVM models without considering the age of the participants. The final result is 76.38 of final accuracy (losing 3.8 points). This indicates that the age of the users shows clearer differences in their reading performance. Nonetheless, in the dataset, the age average of the participants with dyslexia is 20.96, with a standard deviation of 9.98 while the age average of the participants without dyslexia is 29.20 with a standard deviation of 9.03 [55]. If the ages of both groups were perfectly matched, we could expect to have more homogenous results between folds. Nonetheless, we had more participants without dyslexia without higher education (5) than participants with dyslexia (3) [55].

Fleshing out a bit more the results, we also observe that some folds achieved higher results than others, being 96.26% the highest and 61.21% the lowest, even though we performed stratified sampling we encountered this outcome. This means that some of the readings are difficult to predict. For instance, a participant with dyslexia who is 50

---

[7]It is worth noting that we did not perform an in-depth feature selection experiment; we just tested the features one by one and in combination and we tested the same configuration for all the folds, but we plan to perform more experiments in this direction. However, we would need a bigger dataset to do so.

| Dataset | Accuracy | |
|---|---|---|
| Fold-1 | 83.62% | (97/116) |
| Fold-2 | 85.98% | (92/107) |
| Fold-3 | 65.05% | (67/103) |
| Fold-4 | 84.62% | (99/117) |
| Fold-5 | 74.77% | (83/111) |
| Fold-6 | 72.22% | (78/108) |
| Fold-7 | 56.03% | (65/116) |
| Fold-8 | 82.41% | (89/108) |
| Fold-9 | 85.47% | (100/117) |
| Fold-10 | 73.48% | (97/132) |
| **All** | **76.39%** | **(867/1,135)** |

Table 2: Accuracy of the classifiers in the 10-fold cross validation experiment without considering the age of the participant as a feature.

years old and might have already overcome most of its reading issues, would be ideally classified as a participant with dyslexia, however our model fails and classifies it as a participant without dyslexia. We believe that the main problem is the size of the dataset, since having more input data would lead our model to generalize better in those cases. Therefore, in order to improve our results, we plan to increase the dataset by carrying out more eye tracking experiments. Moreover, the age of the participants is also playing a role in this issue, since we have participants that range from 11 to 54 years old, we also believe that having different datasets depending on the age of the participants will also lead to a proper classification of the readings, since our model is general and a first attempt trying to predict dyslexia based on eye tracking measures.

As we mention above, the features related with the typeface were not useful for classification. Even that previous work has shown that typeface have a significant impact on the readability of people with and without dyslexia, this fact does not have an impact to differentiate their readings. The fonts that improve the readability of people without dyslexia are also beneficial for the readability of people with dyslexia [55]. This can explain why typeface is not an informative feature for classification, similarly of the font related features, such as, serif, italic, and fonts designed for people with dyslexia.

Even if the results of this experiment are only valid for Spanish language, previous literature on eye tracking has found significant differences on eye movements for languages with deeper orthographies such as English [21], German [20] or Bulgarian [19] as well as it was reported for Spanish [35]. Therefore we believe that dyslexia prediction in other languages using eye tracking measures is feasible, especially in languages with shallow orthographies where reading speed is a strong indicator for diagnosing dyslexia, such as Spanish [63] or Italian [71].

## 7. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

The eye movements of readers with dyslexia are different from regular readers. People with dyslexia have longer reading times, make longer fixations, and make more fixations than readers without dyslexia. In this paper we have shown how these characteristics can be used to train a machine learning model.

We have presented a method that predicts readings of people with dyslexia with 80.18% of accuracy. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first attempt to build a statistical model to predict automatically readers with dyslexia using eye tracking measures. The model uses common eye tracking features such as reading time, mean of fixation, as well as the age of the participant. However, note that these are only seminal results on this topic and that the dataset was intended for other purposes.

Dyslexia is called a *hidden* disability because it is hard to diagnose. Diagnosing dyslexia is crucial to address this condition but estimations of dyslexia are much higher than the actual diagnosed population. Our model is just the first attempt on predicting dyslexia by using a machine learning approach with eye tracking measures. However, we believe it has a great potential impact.

This study suggests that eye tracking measures have the potential to be used to diagnose dyslexia in the future. Eye trackers are becoming more and more affordable and reading a text in silence is less intrusive than being exposed to the tests needed in current diagnoses. Moreover, there are other human-computer interaction measures that were found to be related to eye tracking measures, such as mouse tracking, that are yet to be explored. Their potential applications go from diagnosing to user modelling via their interaction with the computer.

For future work we plan to enlarge the dataset by carrying out more eye tracking experiments in different languages. Then, we also plan to try with other kind of classifiers, such as perceptron learning, recursive neural networks, or conditional random fields. Currently, we are exploring other human-computer interaction measures to detect dyslexia in collaboration with schools.

## Acknowledgments

## 8. REFERENCES

[1] R. Baeza-Yates and L. Rello. Estimating dyslexia in the Web. In *Proc. W4A '11)*, Hyderabad, India, 2011. ACM Press.

[2] M. Ballesteros and J. Nivre. Maltoptimizer: A system for maltparser optimization. In *Proceedings of the Eight International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'12)*. European Language Resources Association (ELRA), may 2012.

[3] J. L. Black, D. W. K. Collins, J. N. De Roach, and S. Zubrick. A detailed study of sequential saccadic eye movements for normal-and poor-reading children. *Perceptual and motor skills*, 59(2):423–434, 1984.

[4] British Dyslexia Association. Dyslexia style guide, January 2012. http://www.bdadyslexia.org.uk/.

[5] B. Brown, G. Haegerstrom-Portnoy, C. Yingling, J. Herron, D. Galin, and M. Marcus. Tracking eye movements are normal in dyslexic children. *American journal of optometry and physiological optics*, 60(5):376, 1983.

[6] M. S. Carrillo, J. Alegría, P. Miranda, and N. Sánchez. Evaluación de la dislexia en la escuela primaria: Prevalencia en español (Evaluation of dyslexia in

primary school: The prevalence in Spanish). *Escritos de Psicología (Psychology Writings)*, 4(2):35–44, 2011.

[7] C.-C. Chang and C.-J. Lin. LIBSVM: A library for support vector machines. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 2:27:1–27:27, 2011. Software available at http://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw/~cjlin/libsvm.

[8] C. Chapman. The most popular fonts used by designers, 2011. http://www.webdesignerdepot.com/2011/08/the-most-popular-fonts-used-by-designers/.

[9] F. Cuetos and F. Valle. Modelos de lectura y dislexias (Reading models and dyslexias). *Infancia y Aprendizaje (Infancy and Learning)*, 44:3–19, 1988.

[10] H. Dilling. *Internationale Klassifikation psychischer Störungen: ICD-10 Kapitel V (F): klinisch-diagnostische Leitlinien*. Huber, Bern, 8., überarb. aufl. unter berücksichtigung der änderungen entsprechend icd-10-gm edition, 2011.

[11] G. F. Eden, J. F. Stein, H. M. Wood, and F. B. Wood. Differences in eye movements and reading problems in dyslexic and normal children. *Vision Research*, 34(10):1345–1358, 1994.

[12] J. Everatt, M. F. Bradshaw, and P. B. Hibbard. Individual differences in reading and eye movement control. *Eye guidance in reading and scene perception*, pages 223–242, 1998.

[13] M. E. Farmer and R. M. Klein. The evidence for a temporal processing deficit linked to dyslexia: A review. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 2(4):460–493, 1995.

[14] J. D. Gabrieli. Dyslexia: a new synergy between education and cognitive neuroscience. *Science*, 325(5938):280–283, 2009.

[15] G. Geiger and J. Y. Lettvin. Peripheral vision in persons with dyslexia. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 316(20):1238–1243, 1987.

[16] P. Goolkasian and J. King. Letter identification and lateral masking in dyslexic and average readers. *The American journal of psychology*, 1990.

[17] L. A. Granka, T. Joachims, and G. Gay. Eye-tracking analysis of user behavior in WWW search. In *Proc. SIGIR '04*, pages 478–479. ACM, 2004.

[18] M. Grund, C. L. Naumann, and G. Haug. *Diagnostischer Rechtschreibtest für 5. Klassen: DRT 5; Manual*. Deutsche Schultests. Beltz Test, Göttingen, 2., aktual. aufl. in neuer rechtschreibung edition, 2004.

[19] E. Hristova, A. Gerganov, E. Todorova, and S. Georgieva. Eye-movements of dyslexic children reading in regular orthography: Exploring word frequency and length effects.

[20] F. Hutzler and H. Wimmer. Eye movements of dyslexic children when reading in a regular orthography. *Brain and Language*, 89(1):235–242, 2004.

[21] J. Hyönä and R. K. Olson. Eye fixation patterns among dyslexic and normal readers: Effects of word length and word frequency. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 21(6):1430, 1995.

[22] A. W. Inhoff and K. Rayner. Parafoveal word processing during eye fixations in reading: Effects of word frequency. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 40(6):431–439, 1986.

[23] Interagency Commission on Learning Disabilities. *Learning Disabilities: A Report to the U.S. Congress*. Government Printing Office, Washington DC, 1987.

[24] International Dyslexia Association. Frequently Asked Questions About Dyslexia, 2011. http://www.interdys.org/.

[25] J. E. Jiménez, R. Guzmán, C. Rodríguez, and C. Artiles. Prevalencia de las dificultades específicas de aprendizaje: La dislexia en español (The prevalence of specific learning difficulties: Dyslexia in Spanish). *Anales de Psicología (Annals of Psychology)*, 25(1):78–85, 2009.

[26] T. Judd, K. Ehinger, F. Durand, and A. Torralba. Learning to predict where humans look. In *Computer Vision, 2009 IEEE 12th international conference on*, pages 2106–2113. IEEE, 2009.

[27] M. A. Just and P. A. Carpenter. A theory of reading: From eye fixations to comprehension. *Psychological review*, 87:329–354, 1980.

[28] R. Klein, G. Berry, K. Briand, B. D'Entremont, and M. Farmer. Letter identification declines with increasing retinal eccentricity at the same rate for normal and dyslexic readers. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 47(6):601–606, 1990.

[29] D. E. Knuth. *The Computer Modern Fonts, Volume E of Computers and Typesetting*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts, 1986.

[30] G. R. Lyon, S. E. Shaywitz, and B. A. Shaywitz. A definition of dyslexia. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 53(1):1–14, 2003.

[31] H. Lyytinen, J. Erskine, J. Kujala, E. Ojanen, and U. Richardson. In search of a science-based application: A learning tool for reading acquisition. *Scandinavian journal of psychology*, 50(6):668–675, 2009.

[32] H. Lyytinen, M. Ronimus, A. Alanko, A.-M. Poikkeus, and M. Taanila. Early identification of dyslexia and the use of computer game-based practice to support reading acquisition. *Nordic Psychology*, 59(2):109, 2007.

[33] E. Marinus and P. F. de Jong. Size does not matter, frequency does: Sensitivity to orthographic neighbors in normal and dyslexic readers. *Journal of experimental child psychology*, 106(2):129–144, 2010.

[34] E. Marinus and P. F. de Jong. Variability in the word-reading performance of dyslexic readers: Effects of letter length, phoneme length and digraph presence. *Cortex*, 46(10):1259–1271, 2010.

[35] F. J. Martos and J. Vila. Differences in eye movements control among dyslexic, retarded and normal readers in the Spanish population. *Reading and Writing*, 2(2):175–188, 1990.

[36] D. L. Molfese. Predicting dyslexia at 8 years of age using neonatal brain responses. *Brain and language*, 72(3):238–245, 2000.

[37] K. Nation, C. M. Marshall, and G. Altmann. Investigating individual differences in childrens real-time sentence comprehension using language-mediated eye movements. *Journal of*

*Experimental Child Psychology*, 86(4):314–329, 2003.

[38] R. K. Olson, F. A. Conners, and J. P. Rack. Eye movements in dyslexic and normal readers. *Vision and visual dyslexia*, pages 243–250, 1991.

[39] R. K. Olson, R. Kliegl, and B. J. Davidson. Dyslexic and normal readers' eye movements. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 9(5):816, 1983.

[40] R. K. Olson, R. Kliegl, B. J. Davidson, and G. Foltz. Individual and developmental differences in reading disability. *Reading research: Advances in theory and practice*, 4:1–64, 1985.

[41] G. T. Pavlidis. Do eye movements hold the key to dyslexia? *Neuropsychologia*, 19(1):57–64, 1981.

[42] G. T. Pavlidis. The "dyslexia syndrome" and its objective diagnosis by erratic eye movements. *Eye movements in reading: Perceptual and language processes*, pages 441–466, 1983.

[43] G. T. Pavlidis. Diagnostic significance and relationship between dyslexia and erratic eye movements. *Vision and visual dyslexia*, pages 263–270, 1991.

[44] A. R. Perry, W. N. Dember, J. S. Warm, and J. G. Sacks. Letter identification in normal and dyslexic readers: A verification. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 27(5):445–448, 1989.

[45] F. J. Pirozzolo and K. Rayner. The neural control of eye movements in acquired and developmental reading disorders. *Studies in Neurolinguistics*, 4:1–27, 1978.

[46] G. E. Raney and K. Rayner. Word frequency effects and eye movements during two readings of a text. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 49(2):151, 1995.

[47] J. E. Raymond, N. A. Ogden, J. E. Fagan, and B. J. Kaplan. Fixational instability in dyslexic children. *American Journal of Optometry and Physiological Optics*, 65:174–181, 1988.

[48] K. Rayner. The role of eye movements in learning to read and reading disability. *Remedial and Special Education*, 6(6):53–60, 1985.

[49] K. Rayner. Eye movements and the perceptual span in beginning and skilled readers. *Journal of experimental child psychology*, 41(2):211–236, 1986.

[50] K. Rayner. Eye movements in reading and information processing: 20 years of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124:372–422, 1998.

[51] K. Rayner and S. A. Duffy. Lexical complexity and fixation times in reading: Effects of word frequency, verb complexity, and lexical ambiguity. *Memory & Cognition*, 14(3):191–201, 1986.

[52] K. Rayner, L. A. Murphy, J. M. Henderson, and A. Pollatsek. Selective attentional dyslexia. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 6(4):357–378, 1989.

[53] K. Rayner, A. Pollatsek, and A. B. Bilsky. Can a temporal processing deficit account for dyslexia? *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 2(4):501–507, 1995.

[54] K. Rayner and G. E. Raney. Eye movement control in reading and visual search: Effects of word frequency. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 3(2):245–248, 1996.

[55] L. Rello. *DysWebxia. A Text Accessibility Model for People with Dyslexia*. PhD thesis, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 2014.

[56] L. Rello and R. Baeza-Yates. Lexical quality as a proxy for web text understandability (poster). In *Proc. WWW '12*, pages 591–592, Lyon, France, 2012.

[57] L. Rello and R. Baeza-Yates. Good fonts for dyslexia. In *Proc. ASSETS'13*, Bellevue, Washington, USA, 2013. ACM Press.

[58] L. Rello, R. Baeza-Yates, S. Bott, and H. Saggion. Simplify or help? Text simplification strategies for people with dyslexia. In *Proc. W4A '13*, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 2013.

[59] L. Rello, R. Baeza-Yates, L. Dempere, and H. Saggion. Frequent words improve readability and short words improve understandability for people with dyslexia. In *Proc. INTERACT '13*, Cape Town, South Africa, 2013.

[60] L. Rello, S. Bautista, R. Baeza-Yates, P. Gervás, R. Hervás, and H. Saggion. One half or 50%? An eye-tracking study of number representation readability. In *Proc. INTERACT '13*, Cape Town, South Africa, 2013.

[61] L. Rello, M. Pielot, M. C. Marcos, and R. Carlini. Size matters (spacing not): 18 points for a dyslexic-friendly Wikipedia. In *Proc. W4A '13*, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 2013.

[62] L. Sánchez Sampedro. *Impostores (Impostors)*. Crowdfunding, Madrid, Spain, 2012. http://www.impostores.es.

[63] F. Serrano and S. Defior. Dyslexia speed problems in a transparent orthography. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 58(1):81–95, 2008.

[64] W. Slaghuis, W. Lovegrove, and J. Freestun. Letter recognition in peripheral vision and metacontrast making in dyslexic and normal readers. *Clinical vision sciences*, 7(1):53–65, 1992.

[65] G. Stanley. *Eye movements in reading*, chapter Eye movements in dyslexic and normal children, pages 261–271. Pergamon Press, Oxford, England, 1994.

[66] G. Stanley, G. A. Smith, and E. A. Howell. Eye-movements and sequential tracking in dyslexic and control children. *British Journal of Psychology*, 74(2):181–187, 1983.

[67] M. A. Tinker. The study of eye movements in reading. *Psychological Bulletin*, 43(2):93, 1946.

[68] M. A. Tinker. Recent studies of eye movements in reading. *Psychological Bulletin*, 55(4):215, 1958.

[69] Tobii Technology. Product description of Tobii 50 Series, 2005.

[70] J. Toro and M. Cervera. *TALE: Test de Análisis de Lectoescritura (TALE: Literacy Analysis Test)*. Visor, Madrid, 1984.

[71] P. E. Tressoldi, G. Stella, and M. Faggella. The development of reading speed in Italians with dyslexia a longitudinal study. *Journal of learning disabilities*, 34(5):414–417, 2001.

[72] F. R. Vellutino, J. M. Fletcher, M. J. Snowling, and D. M. Scanlon. Specific reading disability (dyslexia): What have we learned in the past four decades? *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 45(1):2–40, 2004.

## APPENDIX

Vuelve a insertar nuevamente el billete de metro y de nuevo suena un pitido y se enciende una luz roja. Vuelve el error y lo vuelve a intentar; señal del daño que ha hecho la informática. La ciencia del apagar y encender hasta que funcione. La ciencia de no perder la esperanza pero no hacer nada para cambiar las cosas.

*'Once again he inserts the metro ticket and once again the machine beeps and a red light flashes. The same action and the same error a sign of the damage computers have done. The science of turning something off and on again until it works. The science of remaining hopeful, but not actually doing anything to rectify the situation.'*