

I appreciate the opportunity to read this article. Once I read the title I was interested. I expected a theoretical manuscript in which different models of orthographic processing are depicted and some kind of reflections for educational purposes are proposed based on this theoretical background. It was fine as I think that educators and clinicians would benefit from this kind of job. However, this is only partly what the manuscript offers and, I have to admit, I am a little bit confused about the text. I do not exactly follow the rationale and therefore the goal of the paper.

It takes 2 pages to describe a large number of models, from the logogen to more sophisticated, actual, ones. This is to me clearly insufficient. It is not possible to understand these models if one does not know them beforehand. Then, when I got to epigraph with the limitations of the models, I thought it was impossible to understand these limitations because the models were not sufficiently described. One can only read it and believe in what the authors say. I honestly think that if professionals read the theoretical part of the manuscript they will not understand it, and if scholars read it I hesitate they will learn new content. Therefore I think that the theoretical background should be re-written thinking on the benefit for professionals (or scholars, if the authors find it more interesting).

The next part of the manuscript is devoted to the experimental evidence that should support educational praxis. The crowding effect, the potential role of colors... are relevant aspects as they are many other issues. To my understanding, this is again a very shallow approach to the issue. I really do not think educators will learn much about how to proceed with struggled children based on the paper. I believe the authors are really experts not only in the theoretical part of the manuscript but also in this applied one, so I can not understand why the paper does not go much deeper to offer useful information to professional.

Lastly, there are some reflections about the linear mixed models, and I can subscribe all of them, but I do not understand why it is there. After the reflections for educators I am sorry not to understand the reasons for the epigraph concerning statistical analyses. I am confused because I do not understand the goal or the rationale of the paper.

I am afraid I cannot recommend publication in *Psicologica*.