The Development and Validation of EchoCue™, a novel tool for assessing Cortical Visual Impairment in uncooperative children [Registered Report - stage I]

Author: Edwige Smague, edwige@netadiscovery.org +14252293045, ORCID ID: 0009-0002-8182-7888

Department: Neuroscience

Institution: N.E.T.A: Neuronal Epileptotranscriptomic, Sydney, Australia

Abstract: This Stage 1 Registered Report presents EchoCue™, an innovative tool designed to detect cortical visual impairments in uncooperative children aged 0 to 18, without requiring verbal instruction or active participation. The protocol delivers extreme-frequency auditory stimuli (very low and high), paired with directional visual flashes. Reflexive responses, such as eye blinks, gaze shifts, pupil dilation, and startle reactions, are recorded using an eye-tracking system and a flexible frontal EEG device. The assessment is entirely passive, standardised, and suitable for children who are otherwise difficult to evaluate using conventional methods.

Keywords: Cortical visual impairment, screening tool, reflex response, autism differential diagnosis, uncooperative children.

Introduction

Cortical Visual Impairment (CVI) is a major cause of childhood disability in Australia and high-income countries. There are many tools available for screening CVI, but none of them are suitable for uncooperative 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). This methodological impasse leads to a high risk of underdiagnosis and misdiagnosis. Indeed, there is significant symptomatic overlap between CVI and 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 cortical 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 children'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 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 synchronized 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 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.

Participants

A total of 45 participants will be recruited, 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.

Power analysis and sample size justification

Given the novelty of the EchoCue™ method, no prior data is available to conduct a precise a priori power analysis. Therefore, the sample size for this initial proof-of-concept study is justified based on two principles: feasibility and the detection of a clinically meaningful effect size as informed by the existing literature. To align with the high standards of top-tier journals such as Cortex, our ultimate goal is to power studies to detect a large effect size (Cohen's $d \geq 0.8$)(6) with 90% power at a strict alpha level of .025. A formal power calculation based on these parameters indicates that a sample of 33 participants per group would be required to achieve this.
Our currently planned target of 15 participants per group is based on recruitment feasibility for this initial study. We acknowledge this sample provides approximately 80% power at a standard alpha of .05. The primary goal of this first stage is therefore to establish

the viability of the protocol, refine the methodology, and generate robust effect size estimates from our data. These estimates will be used to power future, larger-scale validation trials designed to meet the stricter 90% power threshold required for confirmatory research.

Recruitment and inclusion/exclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria for the CVI group will include: (1) a formal clinical diagnosis of CVI from a paediatric neurologist or ophthalmologist; (2) neurological origin of visual impairment; and (3) age between 0 and 18 years.

The inclusion criteria for the CVI group will be: (1) a formal clinical diagnosis of Cortical Visual Impairment from a qualified professional (e.g., pediatric neurologist or ophthalmologist); (2) evidence that the visual impairment is of neurological origin and not primarily explained by a significant ocular pathology; and (3) an age between 0 and 18 years. Exclusion criteria include uncorrected ocular pathology, severe hearing loss preventing auditory perception, or unstable medical conditions. Written informed consent will be obtained from all participants' parents or legal guardians.

Theoretical basis: the link between audition and vision in CVI screening

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 (7). The approach involves exposing the child to a series of finely calibrated auditory and visual stimuli while synchronously recording their involuntary reflex responses (8)(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 (9).

Low-frequency sounds (20,250 Hz) act as a subcortical marker. This range is particularly important for uncooperative children (10). These frequencies are perceived by the human body as both vibrotactile stimulation and sound (11). They are transmitted partly by bone conduction, directly stimulating the cochlea and vestibular system, thus bypassing any disorders of the outer or middle ear (12). 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 (13) (14). 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 (15, 16). 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 (17).

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 (18) (19). It is necessary for multisensory integration tasks, where the brain has to compare and merge auditory information with visual information (20). 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(21).

The use of an audio method for screening CVI is based on the brain's multisensory integration function (8) (22). Since CVI is a brain disorder that affects visual processing and not an eye condition, we can use a powerful auditory stimulus to establish a reliable baseline response. The way a simultaneous visual stimulus alters, or fails to alter, this baseline response can be used to objectively quantify the brain's capacity to process visual

information (23). This is an indirect method of testing brain visual function without ever asking the child, "Did you see that?"

The standardised screening protocol

The test session is brief, lasting between 12 and 15 minutes. It is structured in five sequential blocks, each targeting a distinct aspect of sensory or neurological processing (24). 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 (25) (26).

Table 1. 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 (infrabasse), 500 Hz (grave), 2000 Hz (médium), 8000 Hz	Directional sounds (L/R)	Explore subcortical (low-frequency) and cortical (high-frequency) auditory pathways, 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 (audio and visual cues aligned in spatial direction)	Synchronized sound and flash 500 Hz and 2000 Hz	In the same hemifield (e.g., L + L)	Measure harmonious multisensory integration (aligned and congruent)	Enhanced reflex response, rapid and smooth orientation
4.	Incongruent audiovisual stimuli (audio and visual cues presented in conflicting directions)	Sound and flash 1000 Hz to 3000 Hz	Presented in opposite hemifields (e.g., L + R), Sound (L) vs Flash (R) and vice versa	Evaluate sensory processing capacity under cross-modal conflict	Increased reaction time, hesitation or absence of response
5.	naturalistic stimulu	Familiar voices, animal sounds 250-4000 Hz synchronized with animated images	Familiar voices, animal sounds, synchronized with an animated image	Probe social attention and semantic recognition. Simulate ecological situations to capture spontaneous attention	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 (17). The use of frequencies such as 125 Hz, 500 Hz, and 2000 Hz aligns with standard clinical audiometric testing (27) (28). Block 3 evaluates the capacity for harmonious multisensory integration through spatially congruent audiovisual stimuli, a hallmark of intact sensory convergence (20). 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 (29). 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 (30) (31). 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 Data Acquisition

The implementation of this protocol requires a simple, accessible, and non-invasive technological platform capable of fulfilling three essential functions:

- **Stimulus Generation:** A central unit, such as an iPad Pro-type digital tablet, generates the protocol's audio-visual stimuli with precise temporal synchronisation (32).
- **Eye-Tracking:** The tablet's integrated infrared camera captures gaze dynamics (saccades, blinks, pupillary reflex) through software APIs (e.g., ARKit). This method removes the necessity for costly external hardware (33).
- **Motion Detection:** A single, external wireless sensor is necessary to quantify the fine motor responses that the tablet cannot measure. A millimetre-wave (mmWave) radar is used to accurately detect micro-movements, startle reflexes, and variations in respiratory rate from a distance of at least 60 cm (34).
- **Neural Activity Monitoring (optional):** A flexible, front-mounted EEG headband may be integrated to record low-density electrophysiological signals. This setup enables the detection of auditory and visual evoked potentials (e.g., MMN, P300), providing an additional objective layer of cortical response data (35, 36) (37). A critical requirement is the precise temporal

synchronisation of all data streams (stimuli, ocular responses, motion data, EEG signals) within a unified timeline (38).

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

Data quantification and analysis

In line with the system's philosophy, the EchoCue™ OS 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 into objective metrics. These metrics are then presented factually to the clinician (39).

The main calculated metrics are:

- The average saccadic reaction time (in ms) (40).
- The success rate of visual target tracking (41) (42).
- The amplitude of the startle reflex (as measured by radar) (43).
- The average respiratory rate and its variations during the blocks (44).
- The percentage of sensory dominance (visual vs. auditory) during conflicting trials (45).

To ensure technical rigour, metrics are defined operationally. For instance, the startle reflex is identified as a sharp increase in motion energy exceeding a predefined threshold within 200 ms of the stimulus (43), distinguishing it from slower, ambient

movements. Sensory dominance is calculated as the percentage of trials in the conflicting block where the initial saccade was directed towards the auditory versus the visual stimulus (45). These quantified data are compiled into a clinical report, allowing the practitioner to base their evaluation on objective and reproducible evidence (40).

Statistical Plan

To test for group differences in performance, we will use a mixed-effects model with Group (CVI, ASD, Control) as a between-subjects factor and Stimulus Location (Left, Right) as a within-subjects factor. The dependent variables will be Saccadic Reaction Time (SRT), pupil response magnitude, and startle reflex amplitude.

Diagnostic Accuracy

Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) analysis will be used to determine the ability of our measured variables to classify participants correctly into the CVI vs. non-CVI groups. The Area Under the Curve (AUC) will be the primary metric.

Criteria for Success

This validation study will be considered successful if the following criteria are met: (1) The group difference in the primary dependent variable (SRT) is statistically significant ($p < .025$), and (2) the AUC for the ROC analysis is greater than 0.75, indicating strong diagnostic performance.

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.

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. Piasta SB, Justice LM. Encyclopedia of Research Design.
7. 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.
8. Gruters KG, Groh JM. Sounds and beyond: multisensory and other non-auditory signals in the inferior colliculus. Front Neural Circuits. 2012;6:96.
9. 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.
10. Werner LA. The development of auditory behavior (or what the anatomists and physiologists have to explain). Ear Hear. 1996;17(5):438–46.
11. 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.
12. Brandt JP, Winters R. Bone Conduction Evaluation. StatPearls. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing

Copyright © 2025, StatPearls Publishing LLC.; 2025.
13. Felix RA, 2nd, Gourévitch B, Portfors CV. Subcortical pathways: Towards a better understanding of auditory disorders. Hear Res. 2018;362:48–60.
14. Kraus N, Nicol T. Brainstem origins for cortical 'what' and 'where' pathways in the auditory system. Trends Neurosci. 2005;28(4):176–81.
15. 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.
16. Borg E. On the neuronal organization of the acoustic middle ear reflex. A physiological and anatomical study. Brain Res. 1973;49(1):101–23.
17. Yeomans JS, Frankland PW. The acoustic startle reflex: neurons and connections. Brain Res Brain Res Rev. 1995;21(3):301–14.
18. Zatorre RJ, Belin P, Penhune VB. Structure and function of auditory cortex: music and speech. Trends in Cognitive Sciences. 2002;6(1):37–46.
19. 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.
20. Stein BE, Stanford TR. Multisensory integration: current issues from the perspective of the single neuron. Nature Reviews Neuroscience. 2008;9(4):255–66.
21. 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.
22. Wallace MT, Stevenson RA. The construct of the multisensory temporal binding window and its dysregulation in developmental disabilities. Neuropsychologia. 2014;64:105–23.
23. van Atteveldt N, Formisano E, Goebel R, Blomert L. Integration of Letters and Speech Sounds in the Human Brain. Neuron. 2004;43(2):271–82.
24. Moore JK, and Linthicum Jr FH. The human auditory system: A timeline of development. International Journal of Audiology. 2007;46(9):460–78.
25. 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.
26. Musiek FE, Baran JA. The auditory system : anatomy, physiology, and clinical correlates. Second edition. ed. San Diego, CA: Plural Publishing; 2020.
27. Guidelines for manual pure-tone threshold audiometry. Asha. 1978;20(4):297–301.
28. Lee SY, Seo HW, Jung SM, Lee SH, Chung JH. Assessing the accuracy and reliability of application-based audiometry for hearing evaluation. Scientific Reports. 2024;14(1):7359.
29. 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.
30. 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.
31. 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.
32. Marin-Campos R, Dalmau J, Compte A, Linares D. StimuliApp: Psychophysical tests on mobile devices. Behavior Research Methods. 2021;53(3):1301–7.

33. 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).
34. 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).
35. Polich J. Updating P300: An integrative theory of P3a and P3b. Clinical Neurophysiology. 2007;118(10):2128–48.
36. Näätänen R, Paavilainen P, Rinne T, Alho K. The mismatch negativity (MMN) in basic research of central auditory processing: a review. Clin Neurophysiol. 2007;118(12):2544–90.
37. Lau-Zhu A, Lau MPH, McLoughlin G. Mobile EEG in research on neurodevelopmental disorders: Opportunities and challenges. Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience. 2019;36:100635.
38. Delorme A, Makeig S. EEGLAB: an open source toolbox for analysis of single-trial EEG dynamics including independent component analysis. J Neurosci Methods. 2004;134(1):9–21.
39. 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.
40. Shimizu N. [Neurology of eye movements]. Rinsho Shinkeigaku. 2000;40(12):1220–3.
41. Ramat S, Leigh RJ, Zee DS, Optican LM. Ocular oscillations generated by coupling of brainstem excitatory and inhibitory saccadic burst neurons. Exp Brain Res. 2005;160(1):89–106.
42. Bonnen K, Burge J, Yates J, Pillow J, Cormack LK. Continuous psychophysics: Target-tracking to measure visual sensitivity. J Vis. 2015;15(3).
43. Yeomans JS, Li L, Scott BW, Frankland PW. Tactile, acoustic and vestibular systems sum to elicit the startle reflex. Neurosci Biobehav Rev. 2002;26(1):1–11.
44. Mosleh S, Coder JB, Scully CG, Forsyth K, Al Kalaa MO. Monitoring Respiratory Motion With Wi-Fi CSI: Characterizing Performance and the BreatheSmart Algorithm. IEEE Access. 2022;10:131932–51.
45. Zimmer U, Roberts KC, Harshbarger TB, Woldorff MG. Multisensory conflict modulates the spread of visual attention across a multisensory object. NeuroImage. 2010;52(2):606–16.