Assessing Cerebral Visual Impairment through passive responses: Development and validation of EchoCue™ [Registered Report, stage I]

Author

Edwige Smague[1, 2]

Affiliations:

[1]N.E.T.A: Neuronal Epileptotranscriptomic, Sydney, Australia

[2]Swedish Simulation Centre. Swedish Cherry Hill Campus, Seattle, USA

Contact:

edwige@netadiscovery.org

ORCID ID: 0009-0002-8182-7888

Abstract: This Stage 1 Registered Report outlines the protocol for a feasibility and preliminary validation study of EchoCue™, a novel passive assessment method for cerebral visual impairments (CVI) in children aged 2 to 6. The protocol is designed to minimise reliance on verbal instruction or active cooperation, making it suitable for populations traditionally considered difficult to assess. The method pairs auditory and visual stimuli with the recording of reflexive responses, such as gaze shifts, blinks, and startle reactions, using an integrated infrared eye-tracking system and optional EEG. The primary aim of this study is to evaluate the feasibility of data collection procedures and assess the preliminary

reliability of the protocol's core measures, in preparation for future large-scale validation.

Keywords: Cerebral visual impairment, screening tool, reflex response, autism differential diagnosis, passive responses

Introduction

Cerebral Visual Impairment (CVI) is a major cause of childhood disability in Australia and high-income countries. There are numerous tools available for screening for CVI, but these are predominantly task-based protocols that require active participation from the child and are inaccessible to the most severely affected children (1). The difficulty is compounded by the fact that the origin of these disorders is not ocular but neurological, involving damage to the visual pathways or the cortex, which requires specific evaluation methods (2). Current tools for CVI rely on the child's ability to follow instructions or perform tasks, excluding many of the most affected children from standardised assessment (3).

The assessment of Cerebral Visual Impairment (CVI) is a major clinical challenge, leading to a high risk of underdiagnosis and misdiagnosis. This difficulty is compounded by two key factors, a lack of suitable assessment tools for all children and a significant symptomatic overlap with other neurodevelopmental disorders such as autism spectrum disorders (ASD), including peculiarities

in eye contact, stereotypical behaviours, and atypical responses to sensory stimuli. This clinical overlap delays or even prevents the correct identification of visual impairments of cerebral origin, thus depriving these children of appropriate and early care (4). There is, therefore, an urgent clinical and scientific need for an evaluation methodology capable of passively testing the foundational sensory processes that underpin a child's perceptual abilities (5).

Such an approach must be able to dispense with the active participation of the child in order to provide objective markers of the integrity of their neurosensory system. It is important to note that EchoCue™ is designed as an objective screening and assessment tool to provide key evidence within a comprehensive clinical evaluation. It is in this context that EchoCue™ was conceived, a new methodological approach based on the integration of multimodal data such as visual (light, images), auditory (sounds, hertz frequencies, voices), vestibular (balance and movement), and proprioceptive (body position) for the screening of CVI. The protocol is based on the presentation of calibrated sensory stimuli (auditory and visual) and the synchronised capture of reflex responses (eye movements, blinks, startles) using an integrated eye tracking system and a motion sensor. While the primary goal of this protocol is to establish the

method's initial validity, a recognised limitation is that future work on larger cohorts will be necessary to establish normative data.

Method

EchoCue™ is an original screening framework designed by Edwige Smague in 2025 as part of a doctoral research initiative. The device is not yet commercialised and is currently under academic development for validation in Australia. The methodology presented in this article is based on the EchoCue™ conceptual framework, which enables the passive screening of reflexive and bottom-up neurovisual functions using strategically calibrated multimodal sensory stimuli. This section outlines the theoretical foundations of the approach, the standardised experimental protocol, the technological setup required, and the data quantification process.

Table 1. Hypotheses, Variables, Planned Analyses, and Success Criteria for Stage 1 Registered Report

Key hypothesis	Hypothesis	Key variables	Planned statistical analysis	Success criterion
H1a Exploratory	The CVI group will exhibit significantly longer saccadic reaction times (SRT) compared to the ASD and Typically Developing Groups (TD).	IV: Group (CVI, ASD, TD) DV: Saccadic Reaction Time (SRT).	A linear mixed-effects model (LMM) will be fitted to test for a main effect of Group on SRT.	A statistically significant main effect of Group on SRT ($p < .05$).
H1b Exploratory	The audiovisual enhancement of the startle reflex (Congruent Audiovisual vs. Auditory-only conditions) will be significantly smaller in the CVI group compared to the ASD and TD groups.	IV: Group (CVI, ASD, TD), Stimulus Condition (Auditory-only, Congruent Audiovisual) DV: Startle Amplitude.	A linear mixed-effects model (LMM) will test for a Group x Condition interaction. Follow-up planned contrasts will be used to test the specific directional hypothesis.	A statistically significant planned contrast showing that the audiovisual enhancement effect is smaller in the CVI group compared to the other groups ($p < .05$).
H2a Exploratory screening accuracy	The objective metrics measured will be able to	Predictors: SRT, Startle Amplitude.	A multi-step approach will be used: (1) feature selection (e.g.,	The primary outcome will be the estimated Area Under the Curve

	reliably differentiate between participants as CVI vs. non-CVI.	Outcome: Group Status (CVI / non-CVI)	LASSO regression) followed by (2) Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) analysis with bootstrapping.	(AUC) and its 95% confidence interval to provide a preliminary estimate of screening accuracy.

Note. AUC: Area Under the Curve; DV: Dependent Variable; H: Hypothesis; IV: Independent Variable; LMM: Linear Mixed-Effects Model; p: p-value; ROC: Receiver Operating Characteristic; SRT: Saccadic Reaction Time; TD: Typically Developing.

Sample Size Justification: The planned sample size (n=15/group) is based on recruitment feasibility for this initial proof-of-concept study. Although this study is exploratory, it is conceptualised to detect a large effect size (Cohen's $d \geq 0.8$), as a clinically useful screening tool must be sensitive to clear, robust differences in neurosensory function. Data from this study will provide effect size estimates to power future, larger-scale validation trials designed to meet stricter statistical thresholds (e.g., 90% power). The primary goal of this initial study is to establish the feasibility of the protocol and generate robust estimates of effect size and confidence intervals to inform a future larger-scale confirmatory trial.

Participants

A total of 45 participants focusing on a preschool age range, 2 to 6 years, will be recruited to ensure developmental homogeneity for this initial validation study. Participants will be divided into three age and sex-matched groups (n=15 per group): (1) children diagnosed with CVI; (2) a clinical control group with a diagnosis of ASD and no known visual impairment; and (3) a typically developing control group. All participants' adaptive functioning will be assessed and statistically controlled for (see Measures and Statistical Plan sections).

Power analysis and sample size justification

Given the novelty of the EchoCue™ method, no prior data are available to conduct a precise a priori power analysis for the proposed linear mixed models. The planned sample of 15 participants per group is justified primarily by recruitment feasibility for this initial proof-of-concept study.

To estimate the statistical power of this design, G*Power was used to conduct a sensitivity analysis. This analysis was based on a simplified between-group comparison (independent-samples t-test, two-tailed). With the planned sample size (n=15 per group) and a standard alpha of .05, the analysis indicates that the study will have approximately 56% power to detect a large effect size (Cohen's d = 0.8).

While this power level is below the conventional 80% target, it is deemed sufficient for the exploratory goals of this study, which are to establish feasibility and generate robust effect size estimates to power future, larger-scale validation.

Recruitment and inclusion/exclusion criteria

Participants will be recruited from key paediatric institutions and support networks in Brisbane, Australia, including the Queensland Children's Hospital (QCH), Mater Children's Private Brisbane, National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS), Vision Australia, Autism Cooperative Research Centre (Autism CRC), CVI Australia, Statewide Vision Impairment Services (via the Department of Education Queensland), Queensland University of Technology (QUT), and The University of Queensland (UQ).

Inclusion criteria for the CVI group will be: (1) a formal clinical diagnosis of CVI from a qualified professional (e.g., paediatric neurologist or ophthalmologist), confirming the visual impairment is of neurological origin; and (2) an age between 2 and 6 years.

Inclusion criteria for the ASD group will be: (1) a formal clinical diagnosis of autism spectrum disorder from a qualified professional (e.g., paediatrician, psychologist), based on established criteria such as the DSM-5; (2) no known or suspected visual impairment of either ocular or cerebral origin; and (3) an age between 2 and 6 years.

Inclusion criteria for the TD group will be: (1) no known developmental, neurological, or psychiatric diagnoses; (2) no parental or clinical concerns regarding vision, hearing, or general development; (3) born full-term with no significant perinatal complications; and (4) an age between 2 and 6 years.

Notably, there will be no exclusion criterion based on cognitive or intellectual level (e.g., IQ score <70). A key objective of this study is to validate a tool for the entire spectrum of children with CVI, including those with co-occurring intellectual disability.

Exclusion criteria for all groups will be: (1) the presence of a severe, uncorrected ocular pathology that could primarily account for visual deficits; (2) a diagnosed severe or profound hearing impairment that would prevent perception of the auditory stimuli; or (3) an unstable medical condition precluding participation in a 15-minute session.

Written informed consent will be obtained from the parents or legal guardians of all participants.

Measures

Developmental and adaptive functioning

To assess the developmental and adaptive functioning level of each participant, parents or legal guardians will complete the Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales, Third Edition, Vineland-3.

The Vineland-3 is a standardised assessment completed via parent or carer report that measures communication, daily living skills, socialisation, and motor skills. The Adaptive Behavior Composite score will be used as a measure of overall adaptive functioning and included as a covariate in statistical analyses to control for developmental differences.

Theoretical rationale using auditory probes to assess neurovisual function

The EchoCue™ protocol is based on a passive assessment method that tests the child's neurosensory functions without the need for the child to understand instructions or actively participate (6). The approach involves exposing the child to a series of finely calibrated auditory and visual stimuli while synchronously recording their involuntary reflex responses (7), such as blinks, micro-saccades, or startles, and visual orientation responses. A key element of this method is using a wide range of sound frequencies, from 20 to 8000 Hz. Each frequency range allows distinct neurological circuits, both subcortical and cortical, to be explored in order to better understand how the brain perceives, integrates, and responds to multisensory stimuli (8).

Low-frequency sounds (20—250 Hz) act as a subcortical marker. This range is particularly important for difficult-to-test children (9).

These frequencies are perceived by the human body as both vibrotactile stimulation and sound (10). They are transmitted partly by bone conduction, directly stimulating the cochlea and vestibular system, thus bypassing any disorders of the outer or middle ear (11). More important still, they are processed primarily by the archaic neural circuits of the brainstem due to their simple acoustic configuration and their strong ability to arouse sensory alert systems (12, 13). They are particularly effective at triggering involuntary reflexes managed by the brainstem, such as the stapedius reflex (an involuntary auditory reflex that protects the inner ear from loud sounds) and the startle reflex (14, 15). The use of these frequencies thus makes it possible to measure a basic neurological response, a sign of the integrity of the subcortical pathways, even before the information reaches the higher cortical areas. This approach is consistent with findings from auditory neuroscience showing that low-frequency auditory stimuli can promote autonomic regulation, including parasympathetic activation, through mechanisms such as vagal nerve modulation (Ahn et al., 2021; Porges, 2011). These effects have been associated with reduced anxiety and increased physiological markers of calm in both clinical and developmental populations (16, 17).

Beyond their function as a subcortical probe, the use of these low-frequency sounds is also informed by emerging research on their potential therapeutic effects (17). Studies have suggested that certain frequencies can have a regulating or calming effect on the nervous system (18), which may help in managing anxiety in paediatric populations, including children with ASD during stressful procedures (19). This dual function, as both an objective probe and a potentially regulating stimulus, is a key feature of the EchoCue™ protocol's design to maximise participant comfort.

Medium to high frequencies (250—8000 Hz) are used for cortical analysis. This range is essential for assessing the classical auditory pathway and higher cognitive functions (20, 21). It is necessary for multisensory integration tasks, where the brain has to compare and merge auditory information with visual information (22). Difficulty processing these sounds or integrating them correctly with a visual stimulus may reveal dysfunction in associative cortical areas (e.g., the temporoparietal junction), which are often involved in CVI (23).

To establish a reliable baseline of involuntary orienting behaviour, the EchoCue™ protocol begins with an auditory-only condition (Block 1) using lateralised, high-intensity sounds (24). This condition is not intended to elicit voluntary saccadic eye movements alone, but rather to evoke a multimodal orienting

reflex that includes head turning (25), postural adjustment, and, in some cases, eye movement (26). This reflex is mediated by the superior colliculus (27), a subcortical structure that integrates spatial auditory and visual inputs and directs attention and movement toward salient stimuli (28), even in complete darkness (King, 2004; Stein & Meredith, 1993; Wallace & Stein, 1997). The orienting response to sound occurs early in development and does not rely on cortical-level processing or explicit behavioural intention (29). The measurement system is specifically designed to capture this multimodal response. The TrueDepth facial tracking system (iPad Pro) captures subtle gaze and head movements, while a millimetre-wave (mmWave) radar device tracks full-body posture and micro-adjustments in real time. Together, these technologies provide a robust, non-invasive index of the brain's responsiveness to lateralised sound. The degree to which a simultaneous visual stimulus (Block 3: Congruent Audiovisual condition) enhances or fails to enhance this auditory-driven orienting response provides an indirect measure of functional visual processing, which is particularly valuable in populations such as CVI where behavioural reports are unreliable or unavailable.

The standardised screening protocol

The test session is brief, lasting between 12 and 15 minutes. It is structured in five sequential blocks (see table 2), each targeting a distinct aspect of sensory or neurological processing (30). The specific pure tones used in the protocol (e.g., 125 Hz, 500 Hz, 2000 Hz) are aligned with standard audiometric test frequencies, ensuring compatibility with established clinical practices (31, 32). While the broader EchoCue™ framework is designed to assess responses across a 20—8000Hz range, this initial study uses this key subset of frequencies to test the pre-registered hypothesis.

Safety and distress protocol

Participant safety and comfort are paramount. All auditory stimuli will be calibrated and will not exceed a maximum intensity of 70 dB SPL, a level considered safe for brief exposures in paediatric populations (33).

Throughout the session, the researcher will continuously monitor the child for any signs of distress (e.g., crying, agitation, prolonged gaze aversion). The protocol includes flexible breaks between blocks. The session will be terminated immediately if the child shows clear signs of distress that cannot be easily soothed, or if the parent/guardian requests to stop.

Table 2. Structured sequence of the EchoCue™ multisensory screening protocol

Block	Stimulation method	Frequencies / Modalities	Parameters	Clinical goal	Key markers to measure
1.	Auditory-only condition	125 Hz, 500 Hz, 2000 Hz, 8000 Hz pure tones	Directional sounds (L/R), 100 ms duration, 70 dB SPL	Explore subcortical (low frequency) and cortical auditory pathways (high frequency), detect startle reflexes and lateralised orientation	Startle reflex, micro eye movements, orientation response towards sound
2.	Visual-only condition	LED flash (40 ms)	Unilateral hemifield L/R Without sound	Assess the primary visual pathway and visual attentional orientation	Pupillary reflex, head or eye movement towards the flash
3.	Congruent audiovisual stimuli	Synchronised 500 Hz & 2000 Hz tones with LED flash (40ms)	In the same hemifield (e.g., L+L), sounds at 100 ms duration, 70 dB SPL	Measure harmonious multisensory integration (aligned and congruent)	Enhanced reflex response, rapid and smooth orientation
4.	Incongruent audiovisual	Sound and flash (1000 Hz to 3000	Presented in opposite hemifields	Evaluate sensory processing capacity under	Increased reaction time, hesitation or absence of

	stimuli	Hz)	(e.g., L + R)	cross-modal conflict	response
5.	Naturalistic stimuli	Familiar voices, animal sounds (250-4000 Hz) synchronised with animated images	Familiar voices, animal sounds, synchronised with an animated image	Probe social attention and semantic recognition.	Prolonged fixation, smiling, vocalisation, motor imitation

Note. L/R = left/right hemifield; Hz = Hertz. Each block presents a specific sensory configuration to evaluate reflexive and orienting responses across auditory, visual, and multisensory conditions. Block 5 introduces ecologically valid stimuli to assess spontaneous social and semantic attention.

The EchoCue™ protocol is structured as a progressive sequence of assessments, beginning with unimodal conditions to establish baseline responses and progressing towards increasingly complex multisensory integrations. Blocks 1 and 2 independently assess the integrity of subcortical and cortical auditory and visual pathways, establishing reference markers for reflexive and orienting responses (16). The use of frequencies such as 125 Hz, 500 Hz, and 2000 Hz aligns with standard clinical audiometric testing (34, 35). Block 3 evaluates the capacity for harmonious multisensory integration through spatially congruent audiovisual stimuli, a hallmark of intact sensory convergence (22). In contrast, Block 4 introduces spatial incongruence between auditory and visual inputs to probe the child's ability to resolve cross-modal conflict, a process often impaired in neurodevelopmental disorders (35). Block 1, in particular, leverages low-frequency tones that can stimulate vestibular and cochlear structures via bone conduction and trigger reflexes such as the auditory startle response (36, 37). Finally, Block 5 incorporates ecologically valid, semantically rich stimuli (e.g., familiar voices and animals) to assess social attention and semantic processing, thereby maintaining engagement while enabling the detection of higher-order cognitive markers. This design ensures the protocol’s clinical relevance, even in children without verbal or behavioural responsiveness.

System architecture and measurement parameters

The implementation of this protocol requires a simple, accessible, and non-invasive technological platform capable of fulfilling three essential functions: stimulus generation, eye-tracking, and motion detection.

Stimulus Generation and Primary Device

A central unit, an iPad Pro (model 2021 or later), generates the protocol's audio-visual stimuli. Stimulus presentation and data acquisition are managed by a custom-built application developed in Swift using Apple's ARKit API (version 5 or later)(38).

Eye-Tracking and Saccadic Reaction Time (SRT) Measurement

To ensure reliable data capture, the protocol uses the iPad's integrated infrared TrueDepth camera system. This system operates at a 60 Hz frame rate, providing a temporal resolution of 16.7 ms, which is considered sufficient for reliably measuring saccadic reaction times. Furthermore, it is coupled with the ARKit API, which offers the significant advantage of simultaneous head and face tracking, allowing for the automatic correction of gaze for head movements.

Gaze data is used to calculate Saccadic Reaction Time (SRT), defined as the time elapsed between the onset of a visual target and the onset of the saccade towards it (39).

- Saccade Definition: A saccade is detected using a velocity-based algorithm. An eye movement is classified as a saccade when its angular velocity exceeds a threshold of 30° per second and is considered complete when the velocity drops below this threshold. This distinguishes saccades from slower movements like ocular drift.
- Onset Definition: The onset of the saccade is the first video frame at which the eye's angular velocity exceeds the 30°/s threshold.
- Valid Timeframe: For an SRT calculation, a saccade's onset must occur between 150 ms and 700 ms after the visual target appears.

Motion Detection and Startle Amplitude Measurement

A single, external mmWave radar sensor (e.g., Acconeer XM122) is used to quantify fine motor responses from a distance of at least 60 cm (40). Given the novelty of this technique in a paediatric clinical context, this measure is considered exploratory.

The radar signal is used to measure the Startle Amplitude, which is operationally defined as a rapid, involuntary flinch in response to an auditory stimulus.

- Measurement: The radar provides a continuous measure of motion energy. The Startle Amplitude for a given trial is the peak motion energy recorded within a pre-specified time window.
- Timeframe: The analysis window for detecting a startle is from 40 ms to 200 ms following stimulus onset.
- Units and Normalisation: The value is in arbitrary units (a.u.) of motion energy. It is normalised by dividing it by the standard deviation of the motion energy recorded during a 100 ms silent baseline period immediately preceding the stimulus.
- Threshold: A response is classified as a valid startle reflex only if its peak amplitude exceeds three standard deviations above the mean of the pre-stimulus baseline energy.

Neural Activity Monitoring (Optional)

A flexible, front-mounted EEG headband may be integrated to record electrophysiological signals. For this proof-of-concept study, EEG is optional to ensure that a child's refusal to wear the headband does not become a barrier to participation. Any collected EEG data will be analysed descriptively to inform future studies.

The most critical function of the system is to ensure the perfect synchronisation of all data streams (stimuli, ocular data, motion data) on a single timeline.

Stimulus Presentation Protocol

The pre-registered hypotheses are tested using data from Blocks 1, 2, and 3 (see Table 2). The details for these blocks are as follows:

- General Parameters: Auditory stimuli will be presented via the iPad's internal stereo speakers, calibrated to deliver a peak intensity of 70 dB SPL at the participant's head position. Visual stimuli are a white LED flash (40 ms duration) presented on the left or right side of the screen. Each trial begins with a 500 ms central fixation point, and the inter-trial interval will vary randomly between 1500 ms and 2500 ms.
- Block 1 (Auditory-only): Consists of 20 trials (10 left, 10 right). For the hypothesis testing trial, a subset of the available frequencies (500 Hz and 2000 Hz) will be presented in a randomised order.
- Block 2 (Visual-only): Consists of 20 trials (10 left, 10 right), presented in a randomised order.
- Block 3 (Congruent Audiovisual): Consists of 20 trials (10 left, 10 right). The auditory frequency (500 Hz or 2000 Hz) and location will be randomised. The visual flash will always be presented at the same location as the sound.

Data quantification and analysis

In line with the system's philosophy, the EchoCue™ software does not provide an interpretation or diagnosis. Its role is to act as a quantification engine that applies signal processing algorithms to

transform raw data from the various sensors into the objective metrics required for hypothesis testing, as detailed in the System architecture and measurement parameters section. These quantified data are then compiled into a clinical report, allowing the practitioner to base their evaluation on objective and reproducible evidence (41).

The pre-registered hypotheses detailed in Table 1 are directly linked to specific blocks of the EchoCue™ protocol.

Hypothesis H1a will be tested using data from Block 2 and Block 3. Hypothesis H1b will be tested by comparing data from Block 1 and Block 3. Data from Block 4 and Block 5 are collected for future exploratory analyses that are beyond the scope of the current study.

Data-based exclusion criteria

Pre-specified criteria will be applied to ensure data quality.

- **Trial-level exclusion:** Individual trials will be excluded from analysis if: (a) eye-tracking data quality is poor (e.g., the tracker loses the pupil for more than 50% of the trial duration), or (b) excessive head motion is detected by the mmWave radar during stimulus presentation. These thresholds are chosen to ensure that any analysed trial contains sufficient and valid data to reliably compute the outcome metrics.

- **Participant-level exclusion:** A participant's entire dataset will be excluded if fewer than 60% of their total trials are deemed valid after trial-level cleaning. This threshold is set to ensure that each participant provides enough data for their individual performance to be a stable and meaningful estimate, while balancing the challenges of data collection in this population. A participant's data will also be excluded in the event of a significant equipment malfunction (e.g., radar failure) that prevents the recording of a primary outcome for a majority of the protocol.

  These thresholds are consistent with common standards in developmental eye-tracking research, where a minimum of 50% usable data per trial is often required to ensure the interpretability of gaze-based metrics (42). The 60% threshold at the participant level reflects a pragmatic trade-off between data quality and participant retention and is in line with prior studies involving young or clinical populations, where strict thresholds would otherwise lead to substantial data loss (43).

Statistical plan

All analyses will be conducted in R using the lme4 package for mixed models. The Vineland-3 Adaptive Behaviour Composite score will be included as a covariate in all models to control for

developmental differences. The significance level for all hypothesis tests is set at $\alpha = .05$.

Hypothesis H1a: Group Differences in Saccadic Reaction Time

- Design: Between-subjects factor: Group (CVI, ASD, TD).
- Dependent Variable: Saccadic Reaction Time (SRT).
- Analysis: A Linear Mixed-Effects Model (LMM) will be fitted to test for a main effect of Group. The model will include a random intercept for each participant to account for individual differences.

Hypothesis H1b: Group Differences in Startle Reflex Modulation

- Design: Within-subjects factor: Stimulus Condition (Auditory-only vs. Congruent Audiovisual), Between-subjects factor: Group (CVI, ASD, TD).
- Dependent Variable: Startle Amplitude.
- Analysis: An LMM will be fitted to test for a Group × Condition interaction, with a random intercept for each participant.
- Follow-up: If the interaction is significant, planned contrasts will be conducted to test if the audiovisual enhancement of the startle reflex is significantly smaller in the CVI group compared to the other two groups combined.

Hypothesis H2a: Screening Accuracy

- Goal: To provide a preliminary estimate of the protocol's accuracy in differentiating the CVI group from non-CVI participants (ASD and TD combined).
- Predictor Variables: Measures such as SRT, Startle Amplitude, etc.
- Outcome Variable: Group status (CVI vs. non-CVI).
- Analysis: A multi-step approach will be used:

1. Feature Selection: A principled method (e.g., LASSO regression) will be used to build a parsimonious predictive model and handle potential collinearity.
2. ROC Analysis: The performance of the final model will be assessed using Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) analysis. The primary outcome will be the Area Under the Curve (AUC) and its 95% confidence interval, derived via bootstrapping (1,000 resamples).

Limitations and future directions

This study has several limitations inherent to its exploratory proof-of-concept nature. First, the sample size is small and focused on a narrow age range, meaning that the results will mainly serve to generate effect size estimates for future larger-scale trials. Second, the protocol relies on consumer-grade hardware, the built-in infrared camera of an iPad, for eye tracking. While this approach greatly improves accessibility, its precision for capturing subtle

saccades and pupillary metrics at a typical clinical distance (e.g., 60-100 cm) in a challenging paediatric population is not yet well established in the scientific literature. Therefore, a key secondary objective of this study is to assess the feasibility of this technology. The results will provide important preliminary data on the viability of using this accessible hardware for clinical research. Future work should aim to validate these measures by comparing them to research-grade eye tracking systems.

Similarly, the use of mmWave radar to quantify startle reflex amplitude is an innovative but emerging technique for which specific validation in paediatric neurology is lacking. Therefore, a key secondary aim of this study is to provide crucial preliminary data on the feasibility, reliability, and sensitivity of this method for capturing non-contact neurological reflexes in children.

Participants will be primarily recruited from specialist clinical services, which may introduce selection bias toward more severe or complex CVI cases. As a result, the sample may not fully represent the broader heterogeneity of children with CVI encountered in community or educational settings. Future studies will aim to expand recruitment to more diverse populations to improve generalisability.

The current study relies on prior CVI diagnoses provided by referring clinicians. While this reflects real-world diagnostic

pathways, it introduces the risk of misclassification due to variability in diagnostic standards. This limitation is acknowledged, and future studies will include standardised diagnostic assessments and independent verification procedures to improve diagnostic reliability.

Finally, while the protocol now controls for developmental level, other factors such as socio-economic status and differences in non-visual sensory processing (e.g., auditory hypersensitivity in the ASD group) are not being matched or measured. These variables could potentially influence the results, and their absence represents a limitation of this study. Future research should aim to characterise these variables more thoroughly.

Pre-registration

This study protocol has been pre-registered on the Open Science Framework (OSF). The final, time-stamped registration will be made public upon acceptance in principle. A private, anonymised view-only link to the project repository, containing the protocol, analysis scripts, and study materials, has been provided to the recommender.

Declarations

Ethics Statement: This research protocol has been developed in preparation for a future doctoral project. Formal ethics approval will be sought from the responsible Human Research Ethics

Committee (HREC) at the author's host institution prior to the commencement of any research activities involving human participants.

Data and materials availability

In accordance with TOP guidelines, all processed anonymised data, analysis scripts, and digital study materials required to reproduce the study's findings will be made publicly available on a repository such as the Open Science Framework (OSF). The EchoCue™ software script developed for stimulus delivery in this non-commercial, academic research project will be included in this public deposition.

References

1. Smague E. Literature Review of the Influence of Neurovisual Disorders on the Diagnosis of Autism in Australian Children. Current Developmental Disorders Reports. 2025;12(1):3.
2. Chokron S, Dutton GN. From vision to cognition: potential contributions of cerebral visual impairment to neurodevelopmental disorders. Journal of Neural Transmission. 2023;130(3):409–24.
3. McConnell EL, Saunders KJ, Little J-A. What assessments are currently used to investigate and diagnose cerebral visual impairment (CVI) in children? A systematic review. Ophthalmic & physiological optics : the journal of the British College of Ophthalmic Opticians (Optometrists). 2021;41(2):224–44.
4. Gordon S, Kerr A, Wiggs C, Chiang MF. What Is Cerebral/Cortical Visual Impairment and Why Do We Need a New Definition? Ophthalmology. 2024;131(12):1357–8.
5. Chang MY, Borchert MS. Methods of visual assessment in children with cortical visual impairment. Current Opinion in Neurology. 2021;34(1):89–96.
6. Esmail H, Arblaster G, Haslam L. The Assessment of Vision in Children with Severe Learning Difficulties: A Systematic Review. Br Ir Orthopt J. 2024;20(1):94–104.
7. Gruters KG, Groh JM. Sounds and beyond: multisensory and other non-auditory signals in the inferior colliculus. Front Neural Circuits. 2012;6:96.
8. Xiong Y, Zhang Y, Yan J. The neurobiology of sound-specific auditory plasticity: A core neural circuit. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews. 2009;33(8):1178–84.

9. Werner LA. The development of auditory behavior (or what the anatomists and physiologists have to explain). Ear Hear. 1996;17(5):438–46.
10. Moerel M, De Martino F, Uğurbil K, Yacoub E, Formisano E. Processing of frequency and location in human subcortical auditory structures. Scientific Reports. 2015;5(1):17048.
11. Brandt JP, Winters R. Bone Conduction Evaluation. StatPearls. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing
Copyright © 2025, StatPearls Publishing LLC.; 2025.
12. Felix RA, 2nd, Gourévitch B, Portfors CV. Subcortical pathways: Towards a better understanding of auditory disorders. Hear Res. 2018;362:48–60.
13. Kraus N, Nicol T. Brainstem origins for cortical 'what' and 'where' pathways in the auditory system. Trends Neurosci. 2005;28(4):176–81.
14. Lauer AM, Behrens D, Klump G. Acoustic startle modification as a tool for evaluating auditory function of the mouse: Progress, pitfalls, and potential. Neurosci Biobehav Rev. 2017;77:194–208.
15. Borg E. On the neuronal organization of the acoustic middle ear reflex. A physiological and anatomical study. Brain Res. 1973;49(1):101–23.
16. Yeomans JS, Frankland PW. The acoustic startle reflex: neurons and connections. Brain Res Brain Res Rev. 1995;21(3):301–14.
17. Chaieb L, Wilpert EC, Reber TP, Fell J. Auditory beat stimulation and its effects on cognition and mood States. Front Psychiatry. 2015;6:70.
18. Nakajima Y, Tanaka N, Mima T, Izumi SI. Stress Recovery Effects of High- and Low-Frequency Amplified Music on Heart Rate Variability. Behav Neurol. 2016;2016:5965894.
19. Park Y, Guzick AG, Schneider SC, Fuselier M, Wood JJ, Kerns CM, et al. Dental Anxiety in Children With Autism Spectrum Disorder: Understanding Frequency and Associated Variables. Front Psychiatry. 2022;13:838557.
20. Zatorre RJ, Belin P, Penhune VB. Structure and function of auditory cortex: music and speech. Trends in Cognitive Sciences. 2002;6(1):37–46.
21. Näätänen R, Kujala T, Escera C, Baldeweg T, Kreegipuu K, Carlson S, et al. The mismatch negativity (MMN) – A unique window to disturbed central auditory processing in ageing and different clinical conditions. Clinical Neurophysiology. 2012;123(3):424–58.
22. Stein BE, Stanford TR. Multisensory integration: current issues from the perspective of the single neuron. Nature Reviews Neuroscience. 2008;9(4):255–66.
23. Silva PR, Farias T, Cascio F, Dos Santos L, Peixoto V, Crespo E, et al. Neuroplasticity in visual impairments. Neurol Int. 2018;10(4):7326.
24. Rule SJ, Nickolaychuk BR. Lateralization of high frequency sounds as a function of interaural amplitude disparity. Can J Exp Psychol. 1995;49(3):368–75.
25. Gerdfeldter B, Greičiūtė M, Wiens S. Examining experienced lateralization of sounds over headphones with electroencephalography. Neuropsychologia. 2025;207:109064.
26. Reznik D, Henkin Y, Schadel N, Mukamel R. Lateralized enhancement of auditory cortex activity and increased sensitivity to self-generated sounds. Nat Commun. 2014;5:4059.
27. Middlebrooks JC, Knudsen EI. Changes in external ear position modify the spatial tuning of auditory units in the cat's superior colliculus. J Neurophysiol. 1987;57(3):672–87.
28. Novembre G, Pawar VM, Bufacchi RJ, Kilintari M, Srinivasan M, Rothwell JC, et al. Saliency Detection as a Reactive Process: Unexpected Sensory Events Evoke Corticomuscular Coupling. J Neurosci. 2018;38(9):2385–97.
29. Litovsky R. Development of the auditory system. Handb Clin Neurol. 2015;129:55–72.

30. Moore JK, and Linthicum Jr FH. The human auditory system: A timeline of development. International Journal of Audiology. 2007;46(9):460–78.
31. Luo Q, Shen Y, Chen T, Zheng Z, Shi H, Feng Y, et al. Effects of SoundBite Bone Conduction Hearing Aids on Speech Recognition and Quality of Life in Patients with Single-Sided Deafness. Neural Plast. 2020;2020:4106949.
32. Musiek FE, Baran JA. The auditory system : anatomy, physiology, and clinical correlates. Second edition. ed. San Diego, CA: Plural Publishing; 2020.
33. Davidson LS. Effects of stimulus level on the speech perception abilities of children using cochlear implants or digital hearing aids. Ear Hear. 2006;27(5):493–507.
34. Guidelines for manual pure-tone threshold audiometry. Asha. 1978;20(4):297–301.
35. Kawakami S, Uono S, Otsuka S, Yoshimura S, Zhao S, Toichi M. Atypical Multisensory Integration and the Temporal Binding Window in Autism Spectrum Disorder. Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders. 2020;50(11):3944–56.
36. Jones GP, Lukashkina VA, Russell IJ, Lukashkin AN. The vestibular system mediates sensation of low-frequency sounds in mice. J Assoc Res Otolaryngol. 2010;11(4):725–32.
37. Anne Small S, and Richard Stapells D. Maturation of bone conduction multiple auditory steady-state responses. International Journal of Audiology. 2008;47(8):476–88.
38. Marin-Campos R, Dalmau J, Compte A, Linares D. StimuliApp: Psychophysical tests on mobile devices. Behavior Research Methods. 2021;53(3):1301–7.
39. Nissen L, Hübner J, Klinker J, Kapsecker M, Leube A, Schneckenburger M, et al. Towards Preventing Gaps in Health Care Systems through Smartphone Use: Analysis of ARKit for Accurate Measurement of Facial Distances in Different Angles. Sensors (Basel). 2023;23(9).
40. Gao Z, Ali L, Wang C, Liu R, Wang C, Qian C, et al. Real-Time Non-Contact Millimeter Wave Radar-Based Vital Sign Detection. Sensors (Basel). 2022;22(19).
41. Bossuyt PM, Reitsma JB, Bruns DE, Gatsonis CA, Glasziou PP, Irwig LM, et al. Towards complete and accurate reporting of studies of diagnostic accuracy: the STARD initiative. Standards for Reporting of Diagnostic Accuracy. Clin Chem. 2003;49(1):1–6.
42. Hessels RS, Hooge ITC. Eye tracking in developmental cognitive neuroscience – The good, the bad and the ugly. Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience. 2019;40:100710.
43. Franchak JM, Kretch KS, Soska KC, Adolph KE. Head-mounted eye tracking: a new method to describe infant looking. Child Dev. 2011;82(6):1738–50.