

# Hidden in the Labyrinth: Visuo-spatial Attention Deficit in Children with Developmental Dyslexia

**Sandro Franceschini** (✉ [sandro.franceschini@unipd.it](mailto:sandro.franceschini@unipd.it))

University of Padua

**Sara Bertoni**

University of Bergamo

**Giovanna Puccio**

University of Padua

**Simone Gori**

University of Bergamo

**Cristiano Termine**

University of Insubria

**Andrea Facchetti**

University of Padua

---

## Article

**Keywords:** Orthographic processing, Reading disabilities, Focused attention, Distributed attention, Sensorimotor learning, Rapid automatized naming.

**Posted Date:** April 19th, 2022

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1558371/v1>

**License:**  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

---

# Abstract

Although developmental reading disorders (developmental dyslexia) have been mainly associated with auditory-phonological deficits, recent longitudinal and training studies have shown a possible causal role of visuo-attentional skills in reading acquisition. Indeed, visuo-attentional mechanisms could be involved in the orthographic processing of the letter string and the graphemic parsing that precede the grapheme-to-phoneme mapping. Here, we used a simple paper-and-pencil task composed of three labyrinths to measure visuo-spatial attention in a large sample of primary school children (n = 398). In comparison to visual search tasks requiring visual working memory, our labyrinth task mainly measures distributed and focused visuo-spatial attention, also controlling for sensorimotor learning. Compared to typical readers (n = 340), children with reading difficulties (n = 58) showed clear visuo-spatial attention impairments that appear not linked to motor coordination and procedural learning skills implicated in this paper and pencil task. Since visual attention is dysfunctional in about 40% of the children with reading difficulties, an efficient reading remediation program should integrate both auditory-phonological and visuo-attentional interventions.

## 1. Introduction

Developmental dyslexia is a specific reading disorder despite normal intelligence, teaching experience and absence of any manifest sensory deficit. The diagnostic and statistical manual for mental disorders (DSM-5) classifies developmental dyslexia as a possible outcome of a specific learning disorder. The diagnosis of a specific learning disorder is often accompanied or preceded by other diagnoses within the group of neurodevelopmental disorders, such as language disorder, attentional deficit and hyperactivity disorder, developmental coordination disorder and autism spectrum disorder<sup>1</sup>.

The phonological core deficit theory argues that reading difficulties (RD) in children with developmental dyslexia stems from deficits in the ability to identify and explicitly act upon sounds of spoken words, leading to difficulties in learning appropriate grapheme to phoneme mapping<sup>2,3</sup>. Thus, the left temporoparietal junction, involved in auditory-phonological processing and memory of the speech sounds<sup>4</sup>, could play a crucial role in the first phases of reading acquisition in which grapheme-to-phoneme mapping plays a pivotal role in the sub-lexical and lexical route development<sup>5</sup>.

The time required for a prereading child to quickly and accurately name an array of well-known visual stimuli, known as rapid automatized naming (RAN), is one of the best predictors of future reading skills<sup>6,7</sup>. Exactly as reading, RAN tasks require: (i) attention to the stimuli; (ii) visual processes that are responsible for initial feature detection, discrimination, and stimuli identification; (iii) integration of visual information with stored orthographic and phonological representations; (iv) lexical processes, including access and retrieval of phonological codes; and (v) organization of articulatory output<sup>8</sup>. Longitudinal studies have shown that phonological awareness and visuo-spatial working memory, as well as RAN, appear to be good predictors of future reading development<sup>2,7,9,10</sup>.

The fronto-parietal network, involved in visuo-attentional processing, could play a crucial role in the first phases of letters identification and orthographic development<sup>11,12</sup>. Efficient abilities in extraction and selection of the visual information through visuo-spatial attention allow to create stronger visual word form representations<sup>13</sup> (see<sup>14-17</sup> for reviews; see<sup>18</sup> for a meta-analysis). As reported by Grainger et al. (p. 171)<sup>17</sup>: “processing of orthographic information begins with scale-invariant gaze-centered letter detectors that conjunctively encode letter identity and letter location. Visual acuity, crowding, and spatial attention conjointly determine activity in these gaze-centered letter detectors”.

Combining signal-enhancing and noise-exclusion mechanisms, the right fronto-parietal network is involved in attentional shifting (i.e., disengagement of attentional focus) and scaling (zoom-in and zoom-out of attentional focus)<sup>19</sup>.

The presence of sluggish attentional shifting<sup>20-23</sup>, as well as an altered perceptual noise-exclusion mechanism<sup>24,25</sup>, could be at the basis of difficulties in rapid stimulus-sequence processing often observed in children with developmental dyslexia<sup>14</sup>. Several longitudinal studies have confirmed that visuo-spatial attention abilities are good predictors of future reading skills<sup>25-28</sup> (see<sup>18</sup> for a meta-analysis in pre-reading children), suggesting that graphemic parsing and letter-string processing demand: (i) rapid and accurate deployment of visual attention along the letter strings<sup>17,29,30</sup>; (ii) good abilities in global extraction and spatio-temporal integration of visual information<sup>31-33</sup>; (iii) a large visual-attention span and; (iv) a reduced visual crowding effect<sup>25,29</sup> (see<sup>34</sup> for a review). Crucially, visuo-attentional training appears to improve reading skills in children with and without developmental dyslexia<sup>25,32,33,35-41</sup> (see<sup>42</sup> for a review), confirming the causal role of the fronto-parietal attentional network in reading acquisition<sup>43</sup>.

The fronto-parietal network is involved not only in attentional deployment crucial for reading acquisition but also in multiple interactions with the environment, particularly in action recognition and action planning<sup>44</sup>. It is intriguing to note that children with developmental dyslexia show a rate of comorbidity from 16–70% with a developmental coordination disorder<sup>45,46</sup> and that this neurodevelopmental disorder is characterized by visuo-attentional deficits<sup>47</sup>. However, despite the evidence about the correlation between visuo-motor and reading and spelling skills achievement<sup>48,49</sup>, some longitudinal studies on the possible links between fine and gross motor skills and reading development have not shown consistent results<sup>2,28</sup>. Specifically, some studies linked manual dexterity to future reading skills when evaluated with writing tasks<sup>50</sup>. However, this correlation is sometimes better explained by attentional and working memory functions<sup>48,51</sup>, and sometimes manual dexterity does not appear to be related to future reading skills<sup>52</sup>. A possible explanation for these inconsistent results could be the different levels of engagement of visuo-attentional mechanisms involved in the specific experimental tasks<sup>53</sup>.

In children with developmental dyslexia, a sequential procedural learning (the ability to acquire a general task procedure) deficit has also been observed mainly in serial reaction time tasks<sup>54</sup>. Interestingly, in their meta-analysis, Lum and colleagues<sup>55</sup> showed that the observed deficit appears to be mainly linked to a

possible dysfunction in medial-temporal areas, involved in the attentional spatiotemporal sequence processing. Also, in tasks that strongly involve visuo-hand coordination, such as mirror drawing, children with developmental dyslexia show slower execution times<sup>54,56</sup>. Although visuo-motor coordination deficits and procedural learning disorders have been shown in developmental dyslexia, a basic visuo-attentional deficit could indirectly explain these motor and learning disorders<sup>14</sup>.

Thus, we supposed that a specific visuo-spatial attention deficit characterizes children with RD. The typical tasks used to index the pure visuo-spatial attention functioning in children with RD require complex behavioral<sup>21</sup> and psychophysics procedures<sup>20</sup> that are difficult to apply in a clinical setting. In addition, we tried to separate the role of visuo-attentional abilities from the possible effects of procedural learning and visuo-motor skills using a simple paper-and-pencil task composed of three labyrinths (see Fig. 1, panel A). Efficient execution of the Cs labyrinths task requires multiple attentional mechanisms. Children must be able to rapidly zoom-in and zoom-out<sup>19</sup> onto the different parts of the path, as well as disengage, move and engage their attentional focus<sup>16,21,22</sup>; see<sup>57</sup> for a review). A large attentional focus could allow the child to analyze multiple items (Cs) of the labyrinth simultaneously. However, this efficient attentional procedure could be used only if noise<sup>24</sup> or crowding of the peripheral stimuli<sup>25</sup> is not excessive and if the visual attention span is adequate<sup>30,58</sup>. At the same time, a fast attentional zoom-in will allow children to rapidly disentangle the direction that must be serially selected item by item. Later, a rapid orientation of visual attention<sup>21,35</sup> will allow quick analysis of subsequent path steps. We hypothesized that the execution of this task allows the detection of differences between children with and without RD. We assumed that children with RD would have shown difficulty performing the attentional task, regardless of the length of the labyrinth paths. However, the difficulties would have become less relevant if the path of the labyrinth had been the same of a labyrinth already solved. In this case, procedural learning would have played a more important role, than the visual-attentional abilities that would have been less engaged.

We tested this hypothesis in a large sample of primary school children (from the second to the fifth grade), administering word and pseudoword reading tasks and the three labyrinths composed by a series of Cs. We built the first and second labyrinths with different paths, whereas the first and third labyrinths were identical. Then, we measured the specific visuo-spatial attentional effect using the two labyrinths with different paths. Reducing the load on visuo-attentional skills by administering the first of the two labyrinths for a second time, we can control the effects linked not only to the procedural learning but also the visuo-motor coordination skills. Finally, our labyrinths task does not require a load of working memory processes, in contrast to the typical visual search tasks in which working memory of the target is highly involved.

## 2. Material And Methods

The entire investigation process was conducted according to the principles expressed in the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants provided written informed consent, and the Ethics Committee of the

## 2.1 Participants

Three hundred ninety-eight children (188 males and 210 females; 8% left-handed) took part in our study. The children, partially evaluated in schools in different regions of Italy, attended from the second to the fifth grade of primary school (see Table 1). Children had normal or corrected to normal vision. No hearing difficulties or neurological deficits were reported. Clinicians evaluated children’s reading abilities using standardized word and pseudoword reading tasks (see the “Word and pseudoword reading tasks”). Based on their performance in standardized word and pseudoword reading tasks, they were classified as typical readers (TRs) or children with RD. A child was classified in the RDs group if they showed at least two performance measures (speed and/or accuracy) in word and/or pseudoword reading tasks – 2 standard deviations (SDs) below the average scores calculated for a normative sample<sup>59</sup>. The other children were classified in the TRs group. A subgroup of children with RDs was recruited from clinical centers using the same criteria. A sample of 340 TRs (52% female) and 58 children with RDs (55% female) were tested (see Table 1).

Table 1

Sample size, chronological age (mean and standard deviation) and gender (number of males and females) characteristics of typical readers (TRs) and children with reading difficulties (RDs) in the different school grades.

School grades	Typical readers (TRs)			Children with reading difficulties (RDs)			t test
	Sample size	Age in years	Males/females	Sample size	Age in years	Males/females	
2	82	7.72 (.31)	49/33	6	7.85 (.40)	3/3	$t_{(86)}=-1.009$ $p = .316$
3	85	8.75 (.36)	39/46	21	8.75 (.46)	10/11	$t_{(104)} = .123$ $p = .903$
4	87	9.56 (.52)	39/48	18	9.7 (.37)	7/11	$t_{(103)} = 1.453$ $p = .149$
5	86	10.65 (.40)	35/51	13	10.75 (.25)	6/7	$t_{(97)}=-1.015$ $p = .313$
total	340	9.34 (1.00)	162/178	58	9.23 (1.14)	23/32	$t_{(396)}=-.851$ $p = .395$

## 2.2. Word and pseudoword reading tasks

Reading skills and phonological decoding abilities were measured using lists of standardized word and pseudoword reading tasks, respectively<sup>59</sup>. See Table 2 for the descriptive statistics of the reading tasks.

Table 2

Reading performance (means and standard deviations in Z score) in typical readers (TRs), children with reading difficulties (RDs) and reading performance differences between the two groups.

	Sample size	Word reading speed (Z score)	Word reading accuracy (Z score)	Pseudoword reading speed (Z score)	Pseudoword reading accuracy (Z score)
Typical readers (TRs)	340	.018 (.92)	.06 (.92)	-.10 (1)	.02 (1.1)
Children with reading difficulties (RDs)	58	-4.18 (3.42)	-3.70 (3.54)	-3.61 (4)	-2.44 (1.75)
		$t_{(396)} = 19.067$ p < .001	$t_{(396)} = 16.671$ p < .001	$t_{(396)} = 13.903$ p < .001	$t_{(396)} = 14.388$ p < .001

## 2.3 Cs labyrinth task

The task consists of three sheets of labyrinths. On each sheet, there is a square grid (8x8) of Cs (2.2 cm in diameter; the opening part of the C is about .5 cm), oriented in four cardinal directions. A red C with a triangle inside indicates the starting point, whereas a yellow circle indicates the endpoint. The participant was asked to draw a solid line from the triangle to the final circle using the opening of the black C to reach the adjacent C (see Fig. 1, panel A). Before the test, the child was shown an example sheet, where the administrator showed how to carry out the test, and a second sheet, where the participant carried out a training trial him-/herself. Subsequently, the three labyrinths were always administered in the same order. The path of the first labyrinth was composed of 21 passages (12 direction changes; attentional shifting difficulty index measured as the ratio of total passages to the direction changes = 1.75), the second 36 passages (21 direction changes; attentional shifting difficulty index = 1.71) and the third 21 Cs passages. The first and third labyrinths had exactly the same structure (i.e., the path was identical).

For each of the three labyrinths, the execution time in seconds and the number of errors were measured. It was not necessary for the pencil line to pass precisely inside the opening of the C. Each time the participant made a mistake entering in the wrong adjacent C, she/he restarted from the last correct circle.

Trained psychologists individually administered the reading and visuo-spatial attention tasks.

## 3. Results

### 3.1 Visuo-spatial attentional differences between TRs and children with RDs: Analysis of (co)variance

Data analysis was performed using a 3x2 mixed analysis of variance (ANOVA) (3 labyrinths\*2 groups), where the three labyrinths are the repeated measures and the group is the between-subject factor. The dependent variable was the labyrinth execution times and errors (raw score).

### 3.1.1 Execution times

The first ANOVA on labyrinth execution times showed that the main effect of the labyrinth was significant:  $F_{(2,792)} = 143.619$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.266$ . Post hoc (Bonferroni correction) revealed that the execution times of the three labyrinths were significantly different from each other (all  $ps < 0.001$ ; execution time of labyrinth 1 mean = 34.77 sec, SD = 21.02; labyrinth 2 mean = 51.88 SD = 22.91; labyrinth 3 mean = 29.99, SD = 18.92). Also, the group's main effect was significant:  $F_{(1,396)} = 13.402$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.033$ . The mean execution time of TRs (37 sec, SD = 15.65) was shorter than that of children with RDs (45.29 sec, SD = 17.41). In children with RD the execution time was 22% slower in comparison to TRs. The labyrinths x group interaction was also significant:  $F_{(2,792)} = 8.684$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.021$ . Post hoc analysis (pairwise comparisons) showed that the TRs group (first labyrinth mean = 32.82, SD = 19.98; second labyrinth mean 50.29, SD = 22.09; third labyrinth mean = 27.92, SD = 19.87) performed both first ( $F_{(1,395)} = 21.056$   $p < 0.001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.05$ ) and second ( $F_{(1,395)} = 11.593$   $p = 0.001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.028$ ) labyrinths significantly faster, compared to the RD group (first labyrinth mean = 46.19, SD = 23.36; second labyrinth mean = 61.23, SD = 25.5; third labyrinth mean = 28.45, SD = 12.06). Performance was not statistically different in the third labyrinth ( $F_{(1,395)} = 0.039$   $p = 0.843$ , partial  $\eta^2 < 0.001$ ). Both TR ( $t_{(339)} = 3.318$ ,  $p = 0.001$  Cohen's  $d = .180$ ) and RD ( $t_{(57)} = 5.965$ ,  $p > 0.001$  Cohen's  $d = 0.649$ ) groups showed a significant improvement between the first and third labyrinth execution. Thus, children with RD were significantly slower only in the first and second labyrinth compared to TRs.

Considering that the participants were recruited from second to fifth grade of primary school, we decided to perform an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) with the same 3x2 (3 labyrinths\*2 groups) analysis, controlling for the possible effect of school grade. The main effect of school grade was significant:  $F_{(1,395)} = 14.383$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.035$ . Also, the main effect of labyrinths was significant:  $F_{(2,790)} = 34.301$ ,  $p < 0.001$  partial  $\eta^2 = 0.080$ . The differences between the three labyrinths were still significant (all  $ps < 0.001$ ). Labyrinth x school grade interaction was not significant:  $F_{(2,790)} = 1.877$ ,  $p = 0.154$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.005$ . The main effect of groups was significant:  $F_{(1,395)} = 15.085$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.037$ . Also, the labyrinths x group interaction was still significant:  $F_{(2,790)} = 8.770$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.022$ . Post hoc analysis (pairwise comparisons) confirm that also controlling for school grade in the TRs group performed both first ( $F_{(1,395)} = 22.084$   $p < 0.001$  partial  $\eta^2 = 0.053$ ) and second ( $F_{(1,395)} = 13.147$   $p = 0.001$  partial  $\eta^2 = 0.032$ ) labyrinths faster compared to the RDs group, whereas the execution times in the third labyrinth did not differ ( $F_{(1,395)} = 0.098$   $p = 0.754$ , partial  $\eta^2 < 0.001$ ; see Fig. 1). Thus, children with RD were significantly slower only in the first and second labyrinth compared to TRs independently of school grade.

## 3.1.2 Errors

A second (3 labyrinths\*2 groups) mixed ANOVA, which considered the labyrinth error numbers as a dependent measure, was executed. The main effect of the labyrinth was significant:  $F_{(2,792)} = 21.642$ ,  $p < 0.001$  partial  $\eta^2 = 0.052$ . The number of errors was not different between the first (mean = 0.6, SD = 1.03) and second labyrinth (mean = 0.59, SD = 1,  $F_{(1,396)} = .677$ ,  $p = 0.411$  partial  $\eta^2 = 0.002$ ), whereas the error numbers in both the first ( $F_{(1,396)} = 31.4$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.073$ ) and second labyrinth ( $F_{(1,396)} = 41.965$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.096$ ) were significantly different from the third labyrinth (mean = .22, SD = 0.65). The main effect of the group was not significant:  $F_{(1,396)} = 0.103$ ,  $p = 0.748$ , partial  $\eta^2 < 0.001$ . The group x labyrinth interaction was not significant:  $F_{(2,792)} = 1.112$ ,  $p = 0.329$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.003$ .

The ANCOVA with the same design (3 labyrinths\*2 groups), in which school grade was the covariate, showed that the main effect of school grade was not significant ( $F_{(1,395)} = 1.625$ ,  $p = 0.203$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.004$ ). The school grade x labyrinth interaction was not significant ( $F_{(2,790)} = 0.197$ ,  $p = 0.822$ , partial  $\eta^2 < 0.001$ ). The main effect of the labyrinth was significant ( $F_{(2,790)} = 4.692$ ,  $p = 0.009$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.012$ ), whereas the main effect of the group ( $F_{(1,395)} = 0.142$ ,  $p = 0.707$ , partial  $\eta^2 < 0.001$ ), as well as the group x labyrinth interaction, were not significant ( $F_{(2,790)} = 1.122$ ,  $p = 0.326$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.003$ ). Thus, children with RD were not significantly different to TRs when the errors in the labyrinth task were considered (see Table 3).

The same results on execution times and errors dependent variables were obtained conducting the same analysis on two groups, selecting 58 TRs (from the entire sample of 340) matched for chronological age, school grade and gender to the 58 children with RD.

Table 3  
Number of errors (mean and standard deviation) in the three labyrinths of children without (TR) and with reading difficulties (RD).

	Labyrinth 1 Errors	Labyrinth 2 Errors	Labyrinth 3 Errors
TR group	0.57 (0.96)	0.59 (1.01)	0.23 (0.69)
RD group	0.72 (1.37)	0.60 (0.94)	0.16 (0.41)

## 3.2 Relationship between visuo-spatial attention and reading: Partial correlation analysis

Besides investigating differences in visuo-spatial processing between children with and without RDs, we further investigated the correlation between individual visuo-spatial attentional abilities and reading skills, across our entire sample of children ( $n = 398$ ).

We carried out partial correlations between the execution time in the Cs labyrinths and reading speed (syllables for second) and errors, controlling for school grade. Significant correlations were found between the mean execution time in the first and second labyrinths and the mean of word and pseudoword reading speeds ( $r=-0.28$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and errors ( $r = 0.26$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). In contrast, no significant correlation was found between the execution time of the third labyrinth and the mean of word and pseudoword reading speeds ( $r=-0.08$   $p = 0.113$ ) and errors ( $r=-0.03$   $p = 0.621$ ).

A significant correlation was also found between the mean of errors in the first and second labyrinths with the mean of word and pseudoword reading errors ( $r = 0.19$   $p < 0.001$ ), but not with speed ( $r=-0.08$ ,  $p = 0.113$ ). No significant correlation was found between the number of errors in the third labyrinth and the mean of word and pseudoword reading speeds ( $r < 0.001$ ,  $p = 0.994$ ) and errors ( $r=-0.016$   $p = 0.746$ ).

### 3.3 Visuo-spatial attention deficit in children with RDs: Individual data and odds ratio analysis

In the labyrinths 1 and 2, 34.5% (20/58) of children with RDs showed a visuo-spatial attention performance below one SD in comparison to the mean execution time of TRs (see Table 4 for normative data in TRs).

Table 4

Mean execution time (in seconds) and errors (mean and standard deviation) in labyrinth one and two of the typical reader sample divided by school grade.

	2° grade (n = 82)	3° grade (n = 85)	4° grade (n = 87)	5° grade (n = 86)
time (seconds)	44.11 (18.77)	44.64 (20.19)	37.42 (16.17)	38.3 (17.64)
errors (number)	.62 (.76)	.69 (.87)	.51 (.82)	.51 (.80)

The odds ratio was 3.13 (95% confidence interval between 1.68 and 5.81), indicating a moderate connection between the presence of RDs and a pure visuo-spatial attention deficit.

## 4. Discussion

A visuo-spatial attention dysfunction play a pivotal role in the development of reading abilities hampering orthographic processing<sup>16,17,25,27,28</sup>; see<sup>18</sup> for a meta-analysis). We found a significant difference between children with and without RDs in visuo-attentional skills using a simple paper-and-pencil task in which no auditory-phonological abilities were involved.

Computational models of reading assume a form of graphemic parsing to achieve the level of representation on which the grapheme-to-phoneme conversion mechanism operates. Visual input is segmented into single letters that are serially and individually processed<sup>61</sup>. Other models assume segmentation into sublexical units that are assigned to specific slots according to their position in the syllable<sup>62</sup>.

Regardless of how graphemic parsing is conceived, it requires primarily an efficient distributed visuo-spatial attention on entire letter-string, and then a focusing of visuo-spatial attention on each sublexical unit (single letter or letter cluster), inhibiting the flanking units<sup>63</sup>; see<sup>18</sup> for a meta-analysis).

Distributed and focused visuo-spatial attention are implicated also in visual search tasks<sup>64</sup> (Eimer, 2014). Indeed, it has been demonstrated that visual search abilities - without involving any phonological skills - are good predictors of future reading skills both in shallow and deep orthographies<sup>25-28, 33,65</sup> (e.g., Ferretti et al., 2008; Franceschini et al., 2012; Carroll et al., 2016; Gori et al., 2016; Bertoni et al., 2019; Nguyen et al., 2021), and visuo-spatial attention training by using action video games improves both visual search efficiency and reading skills in children with and without dyslexia<sup>41,43</sup>.

However, visual search tasks require not only distributed and focused visuo-spatial attention but also working memory for the visual target as well as a correct matching between the specific target and the focused candidate item (see<sup>64</sup> for a review). Visual working memory is impaired in children with dyslexia<sup>66</sup>. Importantly, in the labyrinth task all elements (Cs) that compose the visual paths are sequential targets that should be processed without the involvement of working memory, minimizing the possible effect of visual working memory deficits in our visual task. Thus, our findings show that pure visuo-spatial attention difficulties - regardless of visual working memory skills - seem to characterize children with RD.

The possible causal relationship between visuo-spatial attention and reading acquisition has been critically discussed by Goswami<sup>67</sup>, because reading experience could directly affect visuo-spatial attention development. However, the absence of exclusive left-to-right attentional shifting in the Cs labyrinth task excluded the possibility that this difference could be due to a simple practice effect linked to the habitual left-to-right attentional shifting trained during reading acquisition and consolidation<sup>68</sup>.

The selective difference in execution times between the two groups in the first and second labyrinth shows the importance of good visuo-spatial attention abilities, rather than a general speed of processing deficit. Indeed, in the first two labyrinths, participants were forced – for each C, or each chunk of Cs – to shift their visuo-spatial attention focus rapidly. Note that although the second labyrinth required a larger number of passages than the first (as indicated by slower execution times), the difference between the two groups was similar. It seems that the number of passages is not sensitive to the visuo-spatial attention impairment shown in children with RD. However, a more sensitive index of attentional shifting difficulty could be measured considering the ratio between the total number of passages and the number of passages that require a change in attentional shifting. The two labyrinths were similar in this attentional shifting difficulty index. These data could explain why the performance difference between the two groups was not different in labyrinths 1 and 2. To test this possible interpretation, we could increase the attentional shifting difficulty index in the Cs labyrinth task to improve the visuo-spatial attention sensitivity in the embedded visual condition<sup>25,60,69</sup>.

Independent from the group analysis, in which we chose a critical cutoff to divide children with and without RD, the results of the partial correlation analyses confirmed the relationship between visuo-spatial attentional processing and reading skills. Correlations between the execution times of the labyrinth task, word and pseudoword reading speeds and errors were significant only for the first two labyrinths that requested a higher level of visuo-spatial attentional abilities, confirming the specific link between fronto-parietal visuo-spatial attention and specialized occipito-temporal visual word form area<sup>70</sup>. Finally, individual data analysis showed that about 40% of children with RD are impaired in visuo-spatial attentional mechanisms measured by labyrinths 1 and 2, indicating the presence of attentional dysfunction in children with RD. It should be noted that the sensitivity of our labyrinth task to visuo-spatial attentional disorder could be improved with regard to increasing lateral visual noise and stressing the specific orienting and zooming attentional mechanisms required during this simple paper-and-pencil task. Thus, the labyrinth task appears to be a good tool to detect the presence of visuo-spatial attentional deficits in primary school children with RD and in children with other neurodevelopmental disorders associated with RD<sup>1</sup>.

In the third labyrinth, performance was not different in the two groups. Although they were not directly informed that this labyrinth was identical to the first one, children with RD were able to improve their performance (i.e., take advantage of their previous experience), as seen in the TRs group. This result suggests that our sample of children with RD, in this task, shows adequate procedural learning skills and that the visuo-motor skills did not play a critical role in the determination of between-group differences found in the first two labyrinths. We cannot exclude that in other tasks, children with RD should show a procedural learning deficit<sup>54</sup>. It should be noted that difficulties in procedural learning that involve motor abilities seem to characterize children with language impairments rather than children with RD<sup>71</sup>. It could be speculated that developmental coordination and language disorders share impairments in procedural learning that could be associated with additional cerebellar or motor cortex deficits<sup>49</sup>. However, further studies are necessary to test this specific prediction.

We could not consider the observed visuo-attentional deficit to be causally linked to the RD because of the cross-sectional design of this research<sup>67</sup>. However, a large overlap between the brain networks associated with the dynamic pattern of executing both reading and visuo-spatial attentional tasks has been observed<sup>12,70,72</sup>. Importantly, the structural connectivity networks associated with different aspects of skilled reading showed that interconnectivity between left hemisphere language and right hemisphere attentional areas underlies both lexical and sublexical reading<sup>12</sup>. Moreover, both training<sup>25,32,33,35-40</sup>; see<sup>42</sup> for a recent review) and longitudinal<sup>25,27,28,32,33,58</sup> studies have previously demonstrated the causal links between visuo-attentional deficits and RD.

Another limitation of this study is the absence of additional tasks that measured other possible neurocognitive deficits associated with RD in developmental dyslexia. Nevertheless, both training<sup>32,35,36,73</sup> and longitudinal studies<sup>25,27,32,33,58,26</sup> have previously demonstrated that the link

between visuo-attentional disorders and RD was present also controlling for other neurocognitive (e.g., RAN and auditory-phonological) deficits typically associated with developmental dyslexia.

Since visuo-spatial attention is relevant for reading acquisition, and it is frequently dysfunctional in children with RD, its clinical evaluation is crucial for the correct identification of a specific training designed to improve RD in neurodevelopmental disorders. Considering that different visuo-spatial attention interventions can improve reading skills in children with RD<sup>33,35,37,38,40,73–76</sup>; see<sup>42</sup> for a review), an efficient reading remediation program should integrate auditory-phonological and visuo-attentional interventions.

In sum, we show that children with RD, compared to those with typical reading skills, appear to be characterized by a visual attentional deficit independent of visual working memory and motor procedural learning. In particular, visual spatial attentional deficits captured by our labyrinth task highlight that both distributed and focused spatial attention could be impaired in children with RD. These visual attentional mechanisms are fundamental for both lexical and sublexical reading pathways development<sup>12,70,77</sup>.

## Declarations

### Funding Information

This work was funded by a grant from MIUR (Dipartimenti di Eccellenza DM 11/05/2017 n.262) to the Department of General Psychology, University of Padua to S.F., the CARIPARO Foundation (Borse di Dottorato CARIPARO 2015, to S.B.), Progetto MIUR Dipartimenti di Eccellenza (DM 11/05/2017 n. 262) “Use-Inspired Basic Research - Un modello innovativo per la ricerca e la formazione In Psicologia” CUP: C96C18000450005 to S.B., and Ateneo Research Project STaRs (Supporting Talented Researchers) azione 1 assegni di ricerca anno 2020 CUP F54I19000980001 a budget dell’Ateneo to S.B.

### Competing interest

The authors declare no competing interests.

### Availability of data and material

Data will be share on request

### Code availability

Not applicable

## References

1. American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (DSM-5®)*. American Psychiatric Pub.

2. Snowling, M. J., Lervåg, A., Nash, H. M., & Hulme, C. (2019). Longitudinal relationships between speech perception, phonological skills and reading in children at high-risk of dyslexia. *Developmental Science*, 22(1), e12723.
3. Melby-Lervåg, M.; Lyster, S.A.; Hulme, C. (2012). Phonological skills and their role in learning to read: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138, 322–352.
4. Richlan, F. (2012). Developmental dyslexia: Dysfunction of a left hemisphere reading network. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.*, 6, 120.
5. Share, D. L. (1995). Phonological recoding and self-teaching: Sine qua non of reading acquisition. *Cognition*, 55(2), 151-218.
6. Denckla, M. B., & Rudel, R. G. (1976). Rapid “automatized” naming (RAN): Dyslexia differentiated from other learning disabilities. *Neuropsychologia*, 14(4), 471-479.
7. Araújo, S., & Faísca, L. (2019). A meta-analytic review of naming-speed deficits in developmental dyslexia. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 23(5), 349-368.
8. Wolf, M., & Bowers, P. G. (1999). The double-deficit hypothesis for the developmental dyslexias. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91(3), 415.
9. Nevo, E., & Bar-Kochva, I. (2015). The relations between early working memory abilities and later developing reading skills: A longitudinal study from kindergarten to fifth grade. *Mind, Brain, and Education*, 9(3), 154-163.
10. Nation, K., & Hulme, C. (2011). Learning to read changes children’s phonological skills: Evidence from a latent variable longitudinal study of reading and nonword repetition. *Developmental science*, 14(4), 649-659.
11. Taran, N., Farah, R., DiFrancesco, M., Altaye, M., Vannest, J., Holland, S., ... & Horowitz-Kraus, T. (2022). The role of visual attention in dyslexia: Behavioral and neurobiological evidence. *Human Brain Mapping*. doi: 10.1002/hbm.25753.
12. Ekstrand, C., Neudorf, J., Kress, S., & Borowsky, R. (2020). Structural connectivity predicts functional activation during lexical and sublexical reading. *NeuroImage*, 218, 117008.
13. Finn, E. S., Shen, X., Holahan, J. M., Scheinost, D., Lacadie, C., Papademetris, X., ... & Constable, R. T. (2014). Disruption of functional networks in dyslexia: a whole-brain, data-driven analysis of connectivity. *Biological Psychiatry*, 76(5), 397-404.
14. Hari, R., & Renvall, H. (2001). Impaired processing of rapid stimulus sequences in dyslexia. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 5(12), 525-532.
15. McCandliss, B. D., Cohen, L., & Dehaene, S. (2003). The visual word form area: expertise for reading in the fusiform gyrus. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 7(7), 293-299.
16. Vidyasagar, T. R., & Pammer, K. (2010). Dyslexia: a deficit in visuo-spatial attention, not in phonological processing. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 14(2), 57-63.
17. Grainger, J., Dufau, S., & Ziegler, J. C. (2016). A vision of reading. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 20(3), 171-179.

18. Gavril, L., Roşan, A., & Szamosközi, Ş. (2021). The role of visual-spatial attention in reading development: a meta-analysis. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 38(6), 387-407.
19. Ronconi, L., Basso, D., Gori, S., & Facoetti, A. (2014). TMS on right frontal eye fields induces an inflexible focus of attention. *Cerebral Cortex*, 24(2), 396-402.
20. Roach, N. W., & Hogben, J. H. (2007). Impaired filtering of behaviourally irrelevant visual information in dyslexia. *Brain*, 130(3), 771-785.
21. Facoetti, A., Trussardi, A. N., Ruffino, M., Lorusso, M. L., Cattaneo, C., Galli, R., ... & Zorzi, M. (2010). Multisensory spatial attention deficits are predictive of phonological decoding skills in developmental dyslexia. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 22(5), 1011-1025.
22. Franceschini, S., Mascheretti, S., Bertoni, S., Trezzi, V., Andreola, C., Gori, S., & Facoetti, A. (2018). Sluggish dorsally-driven inhibition of return during orthographic processing in adults with dyslexia. *Brain and Language*, 179, 1-10.
23. Lallier, M., Tainturier, M. J., Dering, B., Donnadieu, S., Valdois, S., & Thierry, G. (2010). Behavioral and ERP evidence for amodal sluggish attentional shifting in developmental dyslexia. *Neuropsychologia*, 48(14), 4125-4135.
24. White, A. L., Boynton, G. M., & Yeatman, J. D. (2019). The link between reading ability and visual spatial attention across development. *Cortex*, 121, 44-59.
25. Sperling, A. J., Lu, Z. L., Manis, F. R., & Seidenberg, M. S. (2005). Deficits in perceptual noise exclusion in developmental dyslexia. *Nature Neuroscience*, 8(7), 862-863.
26. Bertoni, S., Franceschini, S., Ronconi, L., Gori, S., & Facoetti, A. (2019). Is excessive visual crowding causally linked to developmental dyslexia?. *Neuropsychologia*, 130, 107-117.
27. Ferretti, G., Mazzotti, S., & Brizzolara, D. (2008). Visual scanning and reading ability in normal and dyslexic children. *Behavioural Neurology*, 19(1-2), 87-92.
28. Franceschini, S., Gori, S., Ruffino, M., Pedrolli, K., & Facoetti, A. (2012). A causal link between visual spatial attention and reading acquisition. *Current Biology*, 22(9), 814-819.
29. Carroll, J. M., Solity, J., & Shapiro, L. R. (2016). Predicting dyslexia using prereading skills: the role of sensorimotor and cognitive abilities. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 57(6), 750-758.
30. Ramamurthy, M., White, A.L., Chou, C. et al. (2021). Spatial attention in encoding letter combinations. *Scientific Reports* 11, 24179 (2021).
31. Valdois, S., Lassus-Sangosse, D., & Lobier, M. (2012). Impaired letter-string processing in developmental dyslexia: What visual-to-phonology code mapping disorder?. *Dyslexia*, 18(2), 77-93.
32. Franceschini, S., Lulli, M., Bertoni, S., Gori, S., Angrilli, A., Mancarella, M., ... & Facoetti, A. (2020a). Caffeine improves text reading and global perception. *Journal of Psychopharmacology*, 34(3), 315-325.
33. Franceschini, S., Bertoni, S., Gianesini, T., Gori, S., & Facoetti, A. (2017a). A different vision of dyslexia: Local precedence on global perception. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), 1-10.

34. Gori, S., Seitz, A. R., Ronconi, L., Franceschini, S., & Facoetti, A. (2016). Multiple causal links between magnocellular–dorsal pathway deficit and developmental dyslexia. *Cerebral Cortex*, *26*(11), 4356-4369.
35. Gori, S., & Facoetti, A. (2015). How the visual aspects can be crucial in reading acquisition: The intriguing case of crowding and developmental dyslexia. *Journal of Vision*, *15*(1), 8-8.
36. Franceschini, S., Gori, S., Ruffino, M., Viola, S., Molteni, M., & Facoetti, A. (2013). Action video games make dyslexic children read better. *Current Biology*, *23*(6), 462-466.
37. Franceschini, S., Trevisan, P., Ronconi, L., Bertoni, S., Colmar, S., Double, K., ... & Gori, S. (2017b). Action video games improve reading abilities and visual-to-auditory attentional shifting in English-speaking children with dyslexia. *Scientific Reports*, *7*(1), 1-12.
38. Facoetti, A., Lorusso, M. L., Paganoni, P., Umiltà, C., & Mascetti, G. G. (2003). The role of visuospatial attention in developmental dyslexia: evidence from a rehabilitation study. *Cognitive Brain Research*, *15*(2), 154-164.
39. Breznitz, Z., Shaul, S., Horowitz-Kraus, T., Sela, I., Nevat, M., & Karni, A. (2013). Enhanced reading by training with imposed time constraints in typical and dyslexic adults. *Nature communications*, *4*(1), 1-6.
40. Pecini, C., Spoglianti, S., Bonetti, S., Di Lieto, M. C., Guaran, F., Martinelli, A., ... & Salvadorini, R. (2019). Training RAN or reading? A telerehabilitation study on developmental dyslexia. *Dyslexia*, *25*(3), 318-331.
41. Peters, J. L., Crewther, S.G., Murphy, M.J. et al. (2021) Action video game training improves text reading accuracy, rate and comprehension in children with dyslexia: a randomized controlled trial. *Scientific Reports*, *11*, 18584.
42. Pasqualotto, A., Altarelli, I., De Angeli, A., Menestrina, Z., Bavelier, D., & Venuti, P. (2022). Enhancing reading skills through a video game mixing action mechanics and cognitive training. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1-10.
43. Peters, J. L., De Losa, L., Bavin, E. L., & Crewther, S. G. (2019). Efficacy of dynamic visuo-attentional interventions for reading in dyslexic and neurotypical children: A systematic review. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *100*, 58-76.
44. Bertoni, S., Franceschini, S., Puccio, G., Mancarella, M., Gori, S., & Facoetti, A. (2021). Action video games enhance attentional control and phonological decoding in children with developmental dyslexia. *Brain Sciences*, *11*(2), 171.
45. Goodale, M. A. (1993). Visual pathways supporting perception and action in the primate cerebral cortex. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, *3*(4), 578-585.
46. Iversen, S., Berg, K., Ellertsen, B., & Tønnessen, F. E. (2005). Motor coordination difficulties in a municipality group and in a clinical sample of poor readers. *Dyslexia*, *11*(3), 217-231.
47. Kaplan, B. J., Dewey, D. M., Crawford, S. G., & Wilson, B. N. (2001). The term comorbidity is of questionable value in reference to developmental disorders: data and theory. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *34*(6), 555-565.

48. Wilson, P. H., & McKenzie, B. E. (1998). Information processing deficits associated with developmental coordination disorder: A meta-analysis of research findings. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 39(6), 829-840.
49. Macdonald, K., Milne, N., Orr, R., & Pope, R. (2018). Relationships between motor proficiency and academic performance in mathematics and reading in school-aged children and adolescents: a systematic review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(8), 1603.
50. Franceschini, S., Bertoni, S., & Facoetti, A. (2021a). Manual dexterity predicts phonological decoding speed in typical reading adults. *Psychological Research*, 85(8):2882-2891.
51. Dinehart, L., & Manfra, L. (2013). Associations between low-income children's fine motor skills in preschool and academic performance in second grade. *Early Education & Development*, 24(2), 138-161.
52. Röthlisberger, M., Neuenschwander, R., Cimeli, P., & Roebbers, C. (2013). Executive functions in 5-to 8-year olds: Developmental changes and relationship to academic achievement. *Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, 3(2), 153-167.
53. Manfra, L., Squires, C., Dinehart, L. H., Bleiker, C., Hartman, S. C., & Winsler, A. (2017). Preschool writing and premathematics predict grade 3 achievement for low-income, ethnically diverse children. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 110(5), 528-537.
54. Lê, M., Quémart, P., Potocki, A., Gimenes, M., Chesnet, D., & Lambert, E. (2021). Modeling the influence of motor skills on literacy in third grade: Contributions of executive functions and handwriting. *Plos one*, 16(11), e0259016.
55. Vicari, S., Finzi, A., Menghini, D., Marotta, L., Baldi, S., & Petrosini, L. (2005). Do children with developmental dyslexia have an implicit learning deficit?. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, 76(10), 1392-1397.
56. Lum, J. A., Ullman, M. T., & Conti-Ramsden, G. (2013). Procedural learning is impaired in dyslexia: Evidence from a meta-analysis of serial reaction time studies. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 34(10), 3460-3476.
57. Hikosaka, O., Nakahara, H., Rand, M. K., Sakai, K., Lu, X., Nakamura, K., ... & Doya, K. (1999). Parallel neural networks for learning sequential procedures. *Trends in Neurosciences*, 22(10), 464-471.
58. Franceschini, S., Bertoni, S., Ronconi, L., Molteni, M., Gori, S., & Facoetti, A. (2015). "Shall we play a game?": Improving reading through action video games in developmental dyslexia. *Current Developmental Disorders Reports*, 2(4), 318-329.
59. Valdois, S., Roulin, J. L., & Bosse, M. L. (2019). Visual attention modulates reading acquisition. *Vision research*, 165, 152-161.
60. Franceschini, S., Bertoni, S., Ronconi, L., Molteni, M., Gori, S., & Facoetti, A. (2016). Batteria De. Co. Ne. per la lettura. Strumenti per la valutazione delle abilità di lettura nelle scuole primarie. 13(3) doi:[10.14605/DIS1331605](https://doi.org/10.14605/DIS1331605)
61. Zorzi, M., Barbiero, C., Facoetti, A., Lonciari, I., Carrozzi, M., Montico, M., ... & Ziegler, J. C. (2012). Extra-large letter spacing improves reading in dyslexia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*

- Sciences*, 109(28), 11455-11459.
62. Coltheart, M., Rastle, K., Perry, C., Langdon, R., & Ziegler, J. (2001). DRC: a dual route cascaded model of visual word recognition and reading aloud. *Psychological Review*, 108(1), 204.
  63. Plaut, D. C., McClelland, J. L., Seidenberg, M. S., & Patterson, K. (1996). Understanding normal and impaired word reading: computational principles in quasi-regular domains. *Psychological Review*, 103(1), 56.
  64. Whitney, C., & Cornelissen, P. (2005). Letter-position encoding and dyslexia. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 28(3), 274-301.
  65. Eimer, M. (2014). The neural basis of attentional control in visual search. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 18(10), 526-535.
  66. Nguyen, B. N., Kolbe, S. C., Verghese, A., Nearchou, C., McKendrick, A. M., Egan, G. F., & Vidyasagar, T. R. (2021). Visual search efficiency and functional visual cortical size in children with and without dyslexia. *Neuropsychologia*, 155, 107819.
  67. Menghini, D., Finzi, A., Carlesimo, G. A., & Vicari, S. (2011). Working memory impairment in children with developmental dyslexia: is it just a phonological deficit?. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, 36(2), 199-213.
  68. Goswami, U. (2015). Sensory theories of developmental dyslexia: three challenges for research. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 16(1), 43-54.
  69. Kermani, M., Verghese, A., & Vidyasagar, T. R. (2018). Attentional asymmetry between visual hemifields is related to habitual direction of reading and its implications for debate on cause and effects of dyslexia. *Dyslexia*, 24(1), 33-43.
  70. Petersen, S. E., & Posner, M. I. (2012). The attention system of the human brain: 20 years after. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 35, 73-89.
  71. Chen, L., Wassermann, D., Abrams, D. A., Kochalka, J., Gallardo-Diez, G., & Menon, V. (2019). The visual word form area (VWFA) is part of both language and attention circuitry. *Nature communications*, 10(1), 1-12.
  72. Brookman, A., McDonald, S., McDonald, D., & Bishop, D. V. (2013). Fine motor deficits in reading disability and language impairment: same or different?. *PeerJ*, 1, e217.
  73. Vogel, A. C., Miezin, F. M., Petersen, S. E., & Schlaggar, B. L. (2012). The putative visual word form area is functionally connected to the dorsal attention network. *Cerebral cortex*, 22(3), 537-549.
  74. Lawton, T. (2016). Improving dorsal stream function in dyslexics by training figure/ground motion discrimination improves attention, reading fluency, and working memory. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 10, 397.
  75. Ebrahimi, L., Pouretmad, H., Khatibi, A., & Stein, J. (2019). Magnocellular based visual motion training improves reading in Persian. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1), 1-10.
  76. Franceschini, S., & Bertoni, S. (2019). Improving action video games abilities increases the phonological decoding speed and phonological short-term memory in children with developmental


dyslexia. *Neuropsychologia*, 130, 100-106.

77. Franceschini, S., Bertoni, S., Lulli, M. et al. (2021b) Short-Term Effects of Video-Games on Cognitive Enhancement: the Role of Positive Emotions. *Journal of Cognitive Enhancement*.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s41465-021-00220-9>

78. Franceschini, S., Bertoni, S., Puccio, G., Mancarella, M., Gori, S., & Facchetti, A. (2021). Local perception impairs the lexical reading route. *Psychological research*, 85(4), 1748-1756.

## Figures



**Figure 1**

Panel A: Representation of the three labyrinths that compose the visuo-spatial attention task. In the first labyrinth, an example of correct execution is represented; panel B: Execution times (mean in seconds) in typical readers (TRs) and children with reading difficulties (RDs) in the three labyrinths. Error bars represent standard errors of the mean.