

# Eye Gaze as a Signal for Conveying User Attention in Contextual AI Systems

ETHAN WILSON, Meta Reality Labs Research, USA

NAVEEN SENDHILNATHAN, Meta Reality Labs Research, USA

CHARLIE S. BURLINGHAM, Meta Reality Labs Research, USA

YUSUF MANSOUR, Meta Reality Labs Research, USA

ROBERT CAVIN, Meta Reality Labs Research, USA

SAI DEEP TETALI, Meta Reality Labs, USA

AJOY SAVIO FERNANDES, Meta Reality Labs Research, USA

MICHAEL J. PROULX, Meta Reality Labs Research, USA

Advanced multimodal AI agents can now collaborate with users to solve challenges in the world. We explore eye tracking’s role in such interaction to convey a user’s attention relative to the physical environment. We hypothesize that this knowledge improves contextual understanding for AI agents. By observing hours of human-object interactions, we first measure the relationship between an eye tracker’s signal quality and its ability to reliably place gaze on nearby physical objects. We then conduct experiments which relay the user’s scanpath history as additional context querying multimodal agents. Our results show that eye tracking provides high value as a user attention signal and can convey information about the user’s current task and interests to the agent.

CCS Concepts: • **Human-centered computing** → **Natural language interfaces; Mixed / augmented reality**; • **Computing methodologies** → **Spatial and physical reasoning**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Eye tracking, user attention, scanpath, contextual AI, scene understanding

## 1 Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) agents have become more connected with users in daily life [Wienrich and Latoschik 2021], especially by observing context about the user’s prior actions or current world state [Zhang et al. 2024a]. New innovations, such as vision-language models (VLMs) [Li et al. 2024] and persistent interfaces, pave the way towards contextual AI agents which “see” the nearby physical world to better assist users. Current AI agent perception of image / video differs greatly from human understanding, so these models often misinterpret context and can respond inappropriately, conflicting with user intent.

Eye gaze is hypothesized as a valuable signal for conveying intent to agents [Ajanki et al. 2010; Burlingham et al. 2024b; Büschel et al. 2018; Zhang et al. 2024b]. Gaze communicates information about objects users are interested in, cognitive load, the task being performed, etc. [Mahanama et al. 2022], which can all improve models’ understanding. While eye tracking (ET) is being commonly used as a cursor in extended reality (XR) systems [Plopski et al. 2022], the use of ET in human-agent interactions has only been lightly explored [Sendhilkathan et al. 2024].

A primary benefit from ET is the ability to convey to an agent what the user is or has been interested in. Eye trackers are limited in their accuracy due to a number of factors (hardware / software, slippage, individual user differences, etc.) [Ehinger et al. 2019], constraining which fixated objects can be reliably identified. Objects with small visual area

---

Authors’ Contact Information: Ethan Wilson, Meta Reality Labs Research, USA, ethanwilson@meta.com; Naveen Sendhilkathan, Meta Reality Labs Research, USA, naveensn@meta.com; Charlie S. Burlingham, Meta Reality Labs Research, USA, cburlingham@meta.com; Yusuf Mansour, Meta Reality Labs Research, USA, ymans@meta.com; Robert Cavin, Meta Reality Labs Research, USA, robcavin@meta.com; Sai Deep Tetali, Meta Reality Labs, USA, saideep@meta.com; Ajoy Savio Fernandes, Meta Reality Labs Research, USA, ajoyferns@meta.com; Michael J. Proulx, Meta Reality Labs Research, USA, michaelproulx@meta.com.

require tighter gaze estimation, so could be unreliable to identify if ET accuracy is insufficient. This work presents a deeper analysis of the requirements and benefits of ET in wearable contextual AI. Using a dataset of egocentric recordings in natural scenarios, we quantify the expected ET accuracy thresholds for detecting physical objects. We then conduct a number of experiments supplying contextual information from ET to VLM queries, reinforcing ET’s value in this space.

**Privacy and ethics statement.** Our findings convey ET’s usefulness in human-agent interactions. Eye movements are known to convey personal information and user preferences [Bozkir et al. 2023], so any contextual AI system incorporating ET must be secure and privacy-preserving to avoid revealing user characteristics to others.

## 2 Related Literature

Eye tracking is being adopted heavily in XR, providing clear value in human-computer interaction (HCI) interfaces. As contextual AI emerges, new prototypes have explored eye gaze as a means to convey user attention. This section provides an overview of related literature, including the use of ET for selection, scene understanding, and ET in contextual AI.

### 2.1 Eye tracking for selection in extended reality

In recent years, eye gaze has gained popularity as a key signal for HCI in XR systems [Plopski et al. 2022]. Eye gaze has comparable usability to controllers [Fernandes et al. 2024; Luro and Sundstedt 2019; Zhang et al. 2019] while freeing the hands for other tasks and being preferable to users [Piening et al. 2021]. While ET is prone to a *midas touch* fallacy, where false selections are made during ambient fixations [Jacob 1995], novel HCI methodologies [Khamis et al. 2018] overcome this and make ET an ideal signal for interface navigation. While ET’s value is proven for explicit selection, our work explores its value in contextual AI agent interaction, particularly the ability to implicitly convey a user’s attention and intent [Sendhilnathan et al. 2024]. This concept is only lightly explored with AI agents, though eye gaze has been used to facilitate automatic contextual displays [Toyama et al. 2012].

### 2.2 Eye gaze encodes scene understanding

Eye gaze and eye movements indicate a viewer’s internal processing of a scene [Yarbus 1967], reflecting cognitive state and attentional focus as one interprets new visual stimuli [Eckstein et al. 2017; Langton et al. 2000]. The sequence of gaze fixations (i.e., scanpath) encodes contextual cues as to future objects of interest [Burlingham et al. 2024a; Itti and Koch 2001]; a number of works have leveraged scanpath history for short-term gaze prediction / anticipation [D’Amelio et al. 2024; David-John et al. 2021; Hu et al. 2021; Huang et al. 2018]. Burlingham et al. found that temporal dependencies in scanpaths last for 4-5 fixations on average, and vary substantially among task contexts [Burlingham et al. 2024b]. Contextual AI models may be able to leverage this rich, multiscale structure in scanpaths (analogous to how large language models (LLMs) leverage multiscale structure in language), enabling implicit inferences about user intent.

Insights about cognitive encoding of nearby objects can inform our expectations for eye movements in contextual AI [Tatler et al. 2011]. For example, humans would tend to look at a coffee mug just before grasping, as the location and orientation of the handle must be encoded before successfully picking up. Objects are prioritized relative to egocentric positions around the viewer, with greater affordances given to objects which are close and candidates for interaction [Costantini et al. 2010; Tatler et al. 2011]. The visual system elicits responses to reachable 3D objects, even when there is no intent to interact [Iachini et al. 2014, 2023]. So, by analyzing eye gaze fixations on near-field objects, we are able to register a list of possible interactable objects noticed by the viewer.

### 2.3 Eye tracking in contextual AI

Information from the physical world can greatly improve user interactions with AI agents [Zhang et al. 2024a]. Emerging products, such as the Ray-Ban Meta<sup>1</sup> and Google’s Ask Photos<sup>2</sup>, use image context to improve user interaction. Eye gaze could be fundamental for narrowing the scope of information presented to contextual agents [Ajanki et al. 2010; Büschel et al. 2018], enhancing contextual understanding and avoiding hallucination [Cui et al. 2023; Leng et al. 2024].

Some wearable contextual AI prototypes have been proposed, using eye gaze in different ways to facilitate better querying [Zhang et al. 2024b]. For example, the GazeGPT system projects 2D gaze onto an image capture, cropping image contents before interfacing with a VLM. They show gaze-based querying to be faster, more accurate, and more natural than head-mounted and smart-phone-like baselines [Konrad et al. 2024]. G-VOILA interfaces with a textual LLM, using gaze-generated saliency maps for object detection. Derived object information is spliced into the query, increasing robustness against ambiguity and increasing participants’ confidence in the system [Wang et al. 2024]. These prototypes show clear value from the inclusion of ET for point-in-time querying.

### 2.4 Our contributions

Our work further investigates ET’s role in contextual AI. We model the ET accuracy requirements to reliably detect objects, which is a prerequisite for agent understanding of the physical world. We also reveal added benefits when using historical gaze information to improve a contextual AI agent’s understanding of current context.

This work presents two key contributions: **First**, we estimate ET accuracy requirements needed for accurate gaze placement on physical objects. This investigation provides insights about the ET signal quality needed to robustly indicate user attention in the physical world. The usefulness of ET-informed contextual agents is limited not only by ET accuracy, however, but also by how information is conveyed to AI agents and how effectively the agents make use of this information. So **secondly**, we investigate the impact of including scanpath information as context for end-to-end contextual AI tasks. We supplement VLM queries with context sourced from the current and prior ET signals, augmenting agentic ability to understand user attention and current actions.

## 3 Methodology

To better understand ET’s role in future contextual AI systems, we first estimate the ET signal quality needed for accurate gaze-based selection of physical objects. Next, to measure the ability of AI agents to incorporate ET context, we experiment with end-to-end contextual AI tasks. We supplement VLM queries with contextual cues about current and prior ET signals, improving the model’s ability to understand user attention and current actions.

### 3.1 Eye tracking requirements for registering nearby objects

Contextual AI models will require knowledge of users’ real-world interests. ET is a primary signal to capture the user’s attention at a point in time. We hypothesize that the visual angle subtended by objects that users “look at” defines a lower bound on ET signal accuracy, and that such a system will require sufficient ET accuracy to consistently track the user’s point of focus. This lower bound is a prerequisite to then convey user attention to AI agents.

To investigate accuracy requirements, we analyze objects nearby in the user’s field of view (FOV) during natural tasks, relating the object size statistics to ET signal quality requirements. Individuals are far more likely to look at or

<sup>1</sup><https://www.meta.com/smart-glasses>

<sup>2</sup><https://blog.google/products/photos/ask-photos-google-io-2024/>




Fig. 1. Illustration of eye tracking spatial error and object visual size measurements. As an average case measurement, object segmentation region can be considered a circular region, with the radius reflecting the eye tracking accuracy requirement (**thin bars**). Alternatively,  $1/2$  minor axis span  $L_{min}$  (**thick bars**) represents a lower bound which considers non-uniform objects.

interact with objects in the immediate vicinity [Ballendat et al. 2010], so we constrain our analysis to objects which are nearby candidates for interaction.

**3.1.1 Dataset.** For our analyses, we use a subset of the Aria Digital Twins (ADT) dataset [Pan et al. 2023]. The ADT dataset contains egocentric recordings of daily-life tasks. We analyze single-participant recordings in the fully furnished apartment scene (93 recordings), totaling  $\sim 3$  hours of footage. Designed to model real-world household scenarios, these recordings span the following tasks: decorating, cooking, working, cleaning, and object examination.

In addition to the ET signal (median error =  $1.5^\circ$ ) provided by Project Aria glasses [Engel et al. 2023], the ADT dataset contains additional ground-truth information about physical objects in the scene. With motion capture markers and digitally twinned objects, each object’s position, orientation, bounding box, and segmentation area is computed and available at all points in time, with median tracking error of 5mm. This ground-truth information uniquely enables us to analyze object visual statistics at a fine scale, detect human-object interactions, and accurately place gaze on objects. 396 household objects are present across the dataset, with varying presence across different tasks and recordings.

**3.1.2 Object visual size in relation to eye tracking error.** There is a relationship between an eye tracker’s spatial accuracy and the size of physical objects which can be reliably tracked, as is the case with virtual objects [Feit et al. 2017]. At the same time, an objects’ visual size occupied within an image capture is inversely proportional to its distance from the user. Object visual size is the visual angle spanned by the object relative to the user’s FOV. To jointly account for distance and object physical size, we use the object’s visual size as a metric to predict ET accuracy needs.

ET spatial error is the measured bias between the ground truth and estimated gaze positions, persistent following error-reducing techniques such as ET calibration and fixation detection. We measure spatial error as an angular offset from the user’s true gaze point. We approximate object visual size by measuring the total segmentation region of an object in a linear camera model (measuring in degrees). We can equate the ET error requirement  $err_{ET}$  to the **radius** of the object, considering the segmentation area  $A_{seg}$  as a circular region:  $err_{ET} \leq \sqrt{A_{seg}/\pi}$ . This inequality approximates the **average case** requirement, where objects have roughly equivalent dimensions and the user’s true gaze is near the center of the object. To account for non-uniform objects, we measure a more **conservative** ET error as  $1/2$  the **minor axis** span  $L_{min}$  of the object’s segmentation region:  $err_{ET\ low} \leq 1/2 L_{min}$ . Figure 1 illustrates the relationship between ET error requirements and object visual size.

**3.1.3 Protocol.** Using object segmentation information from the ADT dataset, we approximate the ET requirements in natural tasks / household environments by measuring the overall distribution of object visual spans. To better inform various contextual AI applications, we specify the ET requirements across different interaction spaces, namely:

- (1) **Near-field objects:** all objects within 1 meter of the participants.
- (2) **Mid-field objects:** all objects between 1 - 2 meters of the participants.
- (3) **Interacted objects:** all objects being physically interacted with (held, pressed, pushed, etc.) by the participants, with an additional start / stop padding of 1 second.
- (4) **Fixated objects:** all objects within 2 meters fixated on by participants' gaze as they navigate the scenes.


### 3.2 Contextualizing vision-language model queries with eye tracking information

To showcase the value that ET signals provide in contextual AI systems, we model experiments which reflect potential end-to-end contextual AI systems. In these experiments, we construct historical context from past fixations on physical objects, measuring the impact of including such context in VLM queries.

We use the Meta Llama 3.2 90B VLM<sup>3</sup> [Grattafiori et al. 2024] as our contextual AI agent. We supply context with an egocentric image and additional prompting. In both experiments, the agent is constrained via JSON response to output one currently visible object, as we are operating under the pretense that in a full system, an object recognition / scene understanding model would be available. For each prior fixation point being supplied as context, we inform the model which object was being gazed at. Note that this VLM is not fine-tuned, and that a model tuned for egocentric image understanding and / or for a specific task would see improved results. Yet, these experiments show the added value when incorporating ET contextual information.

**3.2.1 E1: "What am I looking at?" with historical context.** In this experiment, we pose the question "what am I looking at?" This experiment serves as a benchmark for the effect that prior eye gaze context serves in improving image understanding. We first detect and localize fixations on objects (using velocity-thresholding at 100° per second [Salvucci and Goldberg 2000], and only considering fixations  $\geq 150$  ms), then perform uniform random sampling across each

<sup>3</sup><https://ai.meta.com/blog/llama-3-2-connect-2024-vision-edge-mobile-devices/>



**System message:** You will see an image from the user's point of view. Your task is to guess what the user is currently looking at by inferring context from the image contents. The user may give info about previous fixations (objects gazed at in the past). Fixations are typically 0.15 - 0.5 seconds in duration, and recently fixated objects help inform what the user could be currently looking at.

Here is a list of currently visible objects to choose from: Vinyl holder, Thermostat, <list shortened for brevity>, Record player, Speaker, Game, Picture frame, Vinyl holder, Textbook, TV.

**User message:** What am I fixating on? *The past 8 objects I have fixated on, in order from most recent to least recent, are: Dinosaur, Dinosaur, Dinosaur, Frisbee, Bird house, Coffee table, Coffee canister, Chopping board.*

**Ground truth:** Dinosaur

**Response:** Dinosaur

Fig. 2. An example query to the VLM for E1. The additional context from fixation history is highlighted in red; this context is adjusted, evaluating the model's ability to leverage various amounts of gaze context.

clip in the ADT dataset to analyze 919 image frames which each contain at least 10 prior fixations. At each sample, we make multiple queries, varying the number of prior fixations supplied as context to the VLM, between 0 - 10. An example prompt set can be seen in Figure 2.

**3.2.2 E2: "What am I going to interact with?" with historical context.** We query the VLM "what am I going to interact with?" while again varying historical gaze information from prior fixations. In this experiment, we supply the image from a current fixation in which a physical interaction is guaranteed to occur within the next second (N=237). The vast majority of interactions in ADT are grasping, pushing, and pulling with hands. This task models the use of ET as supporting context for user action understanding and prediction.

## 4 Results

### 4.1 Eye tracking accuracy requirements

Objects which form a smaller image on the camera sensor require more accurate ET. To estimate ET accuracy requirements, we present the entire distribution of object visual sizes recorded in camera projection space. To place gaze on an object of average (projected) size 50% of the time, we measure at the distribution's 50% mark; for more stringent coverage, a target further along the distribution may be chosen. The distributions for each interaction scenario are seen in Figure 3.

The **near-field** ( $\leq 1$  meter) and **mid-field** (1 - 2 meters) measurements reflect the visual FOV occupied by *every* object in the environment within the distance threshold. Alternatively, the **interacted** measurement considers only the objects being manually interacted with by the user, including picking up, pushing, pressing, etc. **Fixation** measurements consider the objects within 2 meters at the time of fixation. Considering ADT's natural scenarios and environment, the **interacted** and **fixation** categories reflect the distribution of objects likely to be of interest during daily tasks.

Recall that we use angular **radius** measurements to represent **average case** ET requirements, and **minor axis** span to represent a more **conservative** measurement. The accuracy of wearable ET devices is known to suffer in




Fig. 3. Eye tracking accuracy requirements in order to place gaze accurately onto the objects present in the ADT dataset, where users performed household actions in an indoor environment. Near-field and mid-field measurements consider all objects within the user's field of view, where interacted objects are being actively manipulated by the user, and fixated objects consider those being directly gazed upon.

natural, dynamic conditions [Onkhar et al. 2023], yet recent devices remain quite accurate in unconstrained settings<sup>45</sup>. Assuming a device with  $\leq 3^\circ$  accuracy during daily wear, our results indicate that the majority of fixated objects (radius average= $4.07^\circ$ ; minor axis= $3.12^\circ$ ), the majority of objects in the near-field (radius= $5.88^\circ$ ; minor axis= $4.69^\circ$ ), and nearly all interacted objects (radius= $10.81^\circ$ ; minor axis= $9.10^\circ$ ) are reliable for placing gaze on the correct object. Conversely, objects in the mid-field (radius= $3.3^\circ$ ; minor axis= $2.54^\circ$ ) will be somewhat unreliable at this signal quality, where half of objects are not able to be detected.

### 4.2 Contextualized vision-language model queries

We constrain the VLM model to respond with a selection from the list of all currently visible objects, making these experiments classification tasks where  $accuracy = \text{correct selections} / \text{all trials}$ . Cases where the VLM response failed to return parseable JSON (<1% of trials) were discarded.

We also construct a number of baselines for comparison against the VLM selection accuracy. These baselines implement simple heuristics which select one object out of a number of visible objects and/or fixated objects. The lowest performing baseline is random guessing among all visible objects. We also model random guesses from the list of previously fixated objects, and a greedy strategy which always chooses the most fixated object from a sequence of previously fixated objects. With a single prior fixation, our random guessing baseline instead represents always predicting the subject of the prior fixation.

4.2.1 E1: "What am I looking at?". When querying the VLM without supplying any additional context, the model successfully predicts the current fixated object 10.3% (95% CI = [8.3%, 12.3%]) of the time (see Figure 4 (left)). While this surpasses random guessing from visible objects, it is quite low. The model does not surpass a greedy baseline which always returns the immediately preceding fixation (left tail of Random (prior fixations) in Figure 4). VLMs are not expected to excel at this task; they are known to misinterpret context and are prone to multimodal hallucination [Cui et al. 2023; Leng et al. 2024]; this task’s specificity is better accomplished from saliency prediction [Kroner et al. 2020; Wang et al. 2024]. However, including context from prior gaze greatly improves the model’s ability to predict the

<sup>4</sup><https://www.tobii.com/products/eye-trackers/wearables/tobii-pro-glasses-3>

<sup>5</sup><https://pupil-labs.com/products/neon>



Fig. 4. Experiments where prior gaze fixation contents are supplied to a VLM along with egocentric images. When many fixations are considered, the model synthesizes image / gaze context to outperform a greedy baseline, which only considers contents from the prompt. Error surfaces in light blue represent 95% confidence intervals.

current fixation, with a peak accuracy of 24.8% (CI = [22.1%, 27.7%]) at 6 prior fixations. Context-based baselines slightly outperform the VLM with one or few prior fixations, reinforcing that current gaze is contingent on scanpath history [Burlingham et al. 2024a,b]. With more context (6+ fixations), the model outperforms baselines, indicating that prior context and image contents are being synthesized, and the combination of contextual cues increase the model’s performance.

4.2.2 *E2: “What am I going to interact with?”* E2 sees similar trends to E1; however, the more contextually-grounded task to predict the object of physical interaction sees greater benefit from the inclusion of ET context. Clearly, prior eye gaze is a strong indicator for interaction, and by supplying preceding gaze context, we can greatly improve the VLM’s ability to understand the user’s actions. We see a peak accuracy of 49.5% (CI = [43%, 56.1%]). As evident by this and the stronger baseline performances, gaze is tightly coupled with the onset of interaction. Note that we query only at positive examples where an interaction does take place, and the inclusion of a null case could have led to the model raising false positives / negatives.

## 5 Discussion

In this work, we explored the future role of eye tracking in wearable contextual AI systems: as the main signal to convey user attention relative to the physical world. Analyzing household tasks in a digitally twinned environment, we benchmarked the ET signal quality requirements for a contextual AI system to accurately and reliably sense objects. We then referenced gaze data alongside object labels to convey a user’s scanpath history to a VLM, prototyping ET’s role in aggregating contextual cues. Our experiments show that prior gaze fixations (scanpath history) enhance the VLM’s understanding of image contents, and are a strong prior signal for human object interaction.

Contextual cues from ET provide clear benefits, as evident in subsection 4.2. We expect ET’s value to become more prominent in future models which are trained specifically for egocentric understanding and / or with eye gaze as a direct input [Koorathota et al. 2023]. Our findings build on prior works [Burlingham et al. 2024b; Toyama et al. 2012], making it evident that human actions and gaze patterns display temporal dependencies contingent on prior gaze / actions, similar to the dependencies in written language. If we can effectively convey previous context, VLMs may become able to better infer current / future context based on the patterns present in prior behavior.

In our ET signal quality benchmark, we found that nearby objects tend to be within the visual size requirements for current wearable ET devices to effectively sense them. Yet, current systems may struggle to detect edge cases (physically small or far away objects), as shown by the tail end of our distributions (95% coverage of fixated and mid-field objects being  $\sim 1.15^\circ$  for radius and  $\sim 0.66^\circ$  for minor axis). In the future, it could be possible to supplement ET accuracy in the future, possibly with contextual cues [Bi and Zhai 2013] for error correction, additional sensors [Wei et al. 2023], or abstracting eye gaze alongside language [team et al. 2024] to improve wearable ET for contextual AI applications.

### 5.1 Conclusion

Eye tracking improves agent understanding of the physical world and aligns this understanding with users. Our results suggest that for close by scenarios, such as active grabbing / touching of objects and gaze selection, current ET systems can consistently place fixations on objects and convey relevant information to VLM agents. We showcased direct benefits when supplying scanpath history, greatly improving VLM understanding of the physical space when using gaze-contingent context from the nearby past. With ET context, future contextual agents will have a greater understanding about the world and about the users’ attentive state and intents.

## References

- A. Ajanki, M. Billinghurst, T. Järvenpää, M. Kandemir, S. Kaski, M. Koskela, M. Kurimo, J. Laaksonen, K. Puolamäki, T. Ruokolainen, and T. Tossavainen. 2010. Contextual information access with Augmented Reality. In *2010 IEEE International Workshop on Machine Learning for Signal Processing*. 95–100. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MLSP.2010.5589228>
- Till Ballendat, Nicolai Marquardt, and Saul Greenberg. 2010. Proxemic interaction: designing for a proximity and orientation-aware environment. In *ACM International Conference on Interactive Tabletops and Surfaces (Saarbrücken, Germany) (ITS '10)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 121–130. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1936652.1936676>
- Xiaojun Bi and Shumin Zhai. 2013. Bayesian touch: a statistical criterion of target selection with finger touch. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (St. Andrews, Scotland, United Kingdom) (UIST '13)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 51–60. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2501988.2502058>
- Efe Bozkir, Süleyman Özdel, Mengdi Wang, Brendan David-John, Hong Gao, Kevin Butler, Eakta Jain, and Enkelejda Kasneci. 2023. Eye-tracked Virtual Reality: A Comprehensive Survey on Methods and Privacy Challenges. arXiv:2305.14080 [cs.HC]
- Charlie S. Burlingham, Naveen Sendhilnathan, Oleg Komogortsev, T. Scott Murdison, and Michael J. Proulx. 2024a. Motor “laziness” constrains fixation selection in real-world tasks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 121, 12 (2024), e2302239121. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2302239121>
- Charlie S. Burlingham, Naveen Sendhilnathan, Xiuyun Wu, T. Scott Murdison, and Michael J. Proulx. 2024b. Real-World Scanpaths Exhibit Long-Term Temporal Dependencies: Considerations for Contextual AI for AR Applications. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Symposium on Eye Tracking Research and Applications (Glasgow, United Kingdom) (ETRA '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 89, 7 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3649902.3656352>
- Wolfgang Büschel, Annett Mitschick, and Raimund Dachselt. 2018. Here and Now: Reality-Based Information Retrieval: Perspective Paper. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Human Information Interaction & Retrieval (New Brunswick, NJ, USA) (CHIIR '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 171–180. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3176349.3176384>
- Marcello Costantini, Ettore Ambrosini, Gaetano Tieri, Corrado Sinigaglia, and Giorgia Comitteri. 2010. Where Does an Object Trigger an Action? An Investigation About Affordance in Space. *Experimental brain research. Experimentelle Hirnforschung. Expérimentation cérébrale* 207 (10 2010), 95–103. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-010-2435-8>
- Chenhang Cui, Yiyang Zhou, Xinyu Yang, Shirley Wu, Linjun Zhang, James Zou, and Huaxiu Yao. 2023. Holistic Analysis of Hallucination in GPT-4V(ision): Bias and Interference Challenges. arXiv:2311.03287 [cs.LG]
- Alessandro D’Amelio, Giuseppe Cartella, Vittorio Cuculo, Manuele Lucchi, Marcella Cornia, Rita Cucchiara, and Giuseppe Boccignone. 2024. TPP-Gaze: Modelling Gaze Dynamics in Space and Time with Neural Temporal Point Processes. arXiv:2410.23409 [cs.CV]
- Brendan David-John, Candace Peacock, Ting Zhang, T. Scott Murdison, Hrvoje Benko, and Tanya R. Jonker. 2021. Towards gaze-based prediction of the intent to interact in virtual reality. In *ACM Symposium on Eye Tracking Research and Applications (Virtual Event, Germany) (ETRA '21 Short Papers)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 2, 7 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3448018.3458008>
- Maria K. Eckstein, Belén Guerra-Carrillo, Alison T. Miller Singley, and Silvia A. Bunge. 2017. Beyond eye gaze: What else can eyetracking reveal about cognition and cognitive development? *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience* 25 (2017), 69–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2016.11.001>
- Benedikt V Ehinger, Katharina Groß, Inga Ibs, and Peter König. 2019. A new comprehensive eye-tracking test battery concurrently evaluating the Pupil Labs glasses and the EyeLink 1000. *PeerJ* 7 (2019), e7086.
- Jakob Engel, Kiran Somasundaram, Michael Goesele, Albert Sun, Alexander Gamino, Andrew Turner, Arjang Talattof, Arnie Yuan, Bilal Souti, Brighid Meredith, Cheng Peng, Chris Sweeney, Cole Wilson, Dan Barnes, Daniel DeTone, et al. 2023. Project Aria: A New Tool for Egocentric Multi-Modal AI Research. arXiv:2308.13561 [cs.HC]
- Anna Maria Feit, Shane Williams, Arturo Toledo, Ann Paradiso, Harish Kulkarni, Shaun Kane, and Meredith Ringel Morris. 2017. Toward everyday gaze input: Accuracy and precision of eye tracking and implications for design. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1118–1130.
- Ajoy Savio Fernandes, T. Scott Murdison, Immo Schuetz, Oleg Komogortsev, and Michael J. Proulx. 2024. The Effect of Degraded Eye Tracking Accuracy on Interactions in VR. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Symposium on Eye Tracking Research and Applications*. 1–7.
- Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, et al. 2024. The Llama 3 Herd of Models. arXiv:2407.21783 [cs.AI]
- Zhiming Hu, Andreas Bulling, Sheng Li, and Guoping Wang. 2021. FixationNet: Forecasting Eye Fixations in Task-Oriented Virtual Environments. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 27 (2021), 2681–2690.
- Yifei Huang, Minjie Cai, Zhenqiang Li, and Yoichi Sato. 2018. Predicting Gaze in Egocentric Video by Learning Task-dependent Attention Transition. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*.
- Tina Iachini, Gennaro Ruggiero, Francesco Ruotolo, and Michela Vinciguerra. 2014. Motor resources in peripersonal space are intrinsic to spatial encoding: Evidence from motor interference. *Acta Psychologica* 153 (2014), 20–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2014.09.001>
- Tina Iachini, Francesco Ruotolo, Mariachiara Rapuano, Filomena Leonela Sbordone, and Gennaro Ruggiero. 2023. The Role of Temporal Order in Egocentric and Allocentric Spatial Representations. *Journal of Clinical Medicine* 12, 3 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm12031132>
- Laurent Itti and Christof Koch. 2001. Computational modelling of visual attention. *Nature reviews neuroscience* 2, 3 (2001), 194–203. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35058500>

- Robert J K Jacob. 1995. Eye Tracking in Advanced Interface Design. In *Virtual Environments and Advanced Interface Design*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195075557.003.0015>
- Mohamed Khamis, Carl Oechsner, Florian Alt, and Andreas Bulling. 2018. VRpursuits: interaction in virtual reality using smooth pursuit eye movements. In *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Advanced Visual Interfaces (Castiglione della Pescaia, Grosseto, Italy) (AVI '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 18, 8 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3206505.3206522>
- Robert Konrad, Nitish Padmanaban, J. Gabriel Buckmaster, Kevin C. Boyle, and Gordon Wetzstein. 2024. GazeGPT: Augmenting Human Capabilities using Gaze-contingent Contextual AI for Smart Eyewear. arXiv:2401.17217 [cs.HC]
- Sharath Koorathota, Nikolas Papadopoulos, Jia Li Ma, Shruti Kumar, Xiaoxiao Sun, Arunesh Mittal, Patrick Adelman, and Paul Sajda. 2023. Fixating on Attention: Integrating Human Eye Tracking into Vision Transformers. arXiv:2308.13969 [cs.CV]
- Alexander Kroner, Mario Senden, Kurt Driessens, and Rainer Goebel. 2020. Contextual encoder-decoder network for visual saliency prediction. *Neural Networks* 129 (2020), 261–270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2020.05.004>
- Stephen R.H. Langton, Roger J. Watt, and Vicki Bruce. 2000. Do the eyes have it? Cues to the direction of social attention. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 4, 2 (2000), 50–59. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(99\)01436-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(99)01436-9)
- Sicong Leng, Hang Zhang, Guanzheng Chen, Xin Li, Shijian Lu, Chunyan Miao, and Lidong Bing. 2024. Mitigating Object Hallucinations in Large Vision-Language Models through Visual Contrastive Decoding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 13872–13882.
- Chunyu Li, Zhe Gan, Zhengyuan Yang, Jianwei Yang, Linjie Li, Lijuan Wang, and Jianfeng Gao. 2024. Multimodal Foundation Models: From Specialists to General-Purpose Assistants. *Foundations and Trends in Computer Graphics and Vision* 16, 1-2 (2024), 1–214. <https://doi.org/10.1561/0600000110>
- Francisco Lopez Luro and Veronica Sundstedt. 2019. A comparative study of eye tracking and hand controller for aiming tasks in virtual reality. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Symposium on Eye Tracking Research & Applications (Denver, Colorado) (ETRA '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 68, 9 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3317956.3318153>
- Bhanuka Mahanama, Yasith Jayawardana, Sundararaman Rengarajan, Gavindya Jayawardena, Leanne Chukoskie, Joseph Snider, and Sampath Jayarathna. 2022. Eye movement and pupil measures: A review. *frontiers in Computer Science* 3 (2022), 733531.
- V. Onkhar, D. Dodou, and J.C.F. de Winter. 2023. Evaluating the Tobii Pro Glasses 2 and 3 in static and dynamic conditions. *Behavior Research Methods* 56 (2024), 5 (2023), 4221–4238. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-023-02173-7>
- Xiaqing Pan, Nicholas Charron, Yongqian Yang, Scott Peters, Thomas Whelan, Chen Kong, Omkar Parkhi, Richard Newcombe, and Yuheng (Carl) Ren. 2023. Aria Digital Twin: A New Benchmark Dataset for Egocentric 3D Machine Perception. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. 20133–20143.
- Robin Piening, Ken Pfeuffer, Augusto Esteves, Tim Mittermeier, Sarah Prange, Philippe Schröder, and Florian Alt. 2021. Looking for Info: Evaluation of Gaze Based Information Retrieval in Augmented Reality. In *Human-Computer Interaction – INTERACT 2021*, Carmelo Ardito, Rosa Lanzilotti, Alessio Malizia, Helen Petrie, Antonio Piccinno, Giuseppe Desolda, and Kori Inkpen (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 544–565.
- Alexander Plopski, Teresa Hirzle, Nahal Norouzi, Long Qian, Gerd Bruder, and Tobias Langlotz. 2022. The Eye in Extended Reality: A Survey on Gaze Interaction and Eye Tracking in Head-worn Extended Reality. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 55, 3, Article 53 (March 2022), 39 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491207>
- Dario D. Salvucci and Joseph H. Goldberg. 2000. Identifying fixations and saccades in eye-tracking protocols. In *Proceedings of the 2000 Symposium on Eye Tracking Research & Applications (Palm Beach Gardens, Florida, USA) (ETRA '00)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 71–78. <https://doi.org/10.1145/355017.355028>
- Naveen Sendhilnathan, Ajoy S. Fernandes, Michael J. Proulx, and Tanya R. Jonker. 2024. Implicit gaze research for XR systems. arXiv:2405.13878 [cs.HC]
- Benjamin W Tatler, Mary M. Hayhoe, Michael Francis Land, and Dana H. Ballard. 2011. Eye guidance in natural vision: reinterpreting salience. *Journal of vision* 11 5 (2011), 5.
- LCM team, Loïc Barrault, Paul-Ambroise Duquenne, Maha Elbayad, Artyom Kozhevnikov, Belen Alastruey, Pierre Andrews, Mariano Coria, Guillaume Couairon, Marta R. Costa-jussà, David Dale, Hady Elsahar, Kevin Heffernan, João Maria Janeiro, Tuan Tran, et al. 2024. Large Concept Models: Language Modeling in a Sentence Representation Space. arXiv:2412.08821 [cs.CL]
- Takumi Toyama, Thomas Kieninger, Faisal Shafait, and Andreas Dengel. 2012. Gaze guided object recognition using a head-mounted eye tracker. In *Proceedings of the Symposium on Eye Tracking Research and Applications (Santa Barbara, California) (ETRA '12)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 91–98. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2168556.2168570>
- Zeyu Wang, Yuanchun Shi, Yuntao Wang, Yuchen Yao, Kun Yan, Yuhan Wang, Lei Ji, Xuhai Xu, and Chun Yu. 2024. G-VOILA: Gaze-Facilitated Information Querying in Daily Scenarios. *Proc. ACM Interact. Mob. Wearable Ubiquitous Technol.* 8, 2, Article 78 (May 2024), 33 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3659623>
- Yushi Wei, Rongkai Shi, Difeng Yu, Yihong Wang, Yue Li, Lingyun Yu, and Hai-Ning Liang. 2023. Predicting Gaze-based Target Selection in Augmented Reality Headsets based on Eye and Head Endpoint Distributions. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Hamburg, Germany) (CHI '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 283, 14 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3581042>
- Carolin Wienrich and Marc Erich Latoschik. 2021. extended artificial intelligence: New prospects of human-ai interaction research. *Frontiers in Virtual Reality* 2 (2021), 686783.
- Alfred L. Yarbus. 1967. *Eye Movements During Perception of Complex Objects*. Springer US, Boston, MA, 171–211. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-5379-7\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-5379-7_8)

- Dell Zhang, Yongxiang Li, Zhongjiang He, and Xuelong Li. 2024b. Empowering Smart Glasses with Large Language Models: Towards Ubiquitous AGI. In *Companion of the 2024 on ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing (Melbourne VIC, Australia) (UbiComp '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 631–633. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3675094.3678992>
- Guangtao Zhang, John Paulin Hansen, and Katsumi Minakata. 2019. Hand- and gaze-control of telepresence robots. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Symposium on Eye Tracking Research & Applications (Denver, Colorado) (ETRA '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 70, 8 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3317956.3318149>
- Jingyi Zhang, Jiaying Huang, Sheng Jin, and Shijian Lu. 2024a. Vision-Language Models for Vision Tasks: A Survey. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 46, 8 (2024), 5625–5644. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2024.3369699>