Stroboscopic Light Stimulation Safety Within and Beyond Laboratory Settings: Observational Evidence and Practical Guidance

David J. Schwartzman[1*], Trevor Hewitt[1], Timo T. Schmidt[2,3], Josemir W. Sander[4,5], Danny Nacker[1], James Thurbon[6], Vince Polito[6], Xaver Funk[7], Fiona Macpherson[8], Tom Galea[9], Gavin Lawson[10], Jimi Simpson[11], Romy Beauté[1], Anil K. Seth[1,12]

1. Sussex Centre for Consciousness Science and School of Engineering and Informatics, University of Sussex, UK
2. Freie Universität Berlin, Neurocomputation and Neuroimaging Unit, Berlin, Germany
3. CIRCE - Collaboration for Interdisciplinary Research on Conscious Experience e.V., Teupitz, Germany
4. UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology, London WC1N 3BG
5. Department of Neurology, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610041, China
6. Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia
7. Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Leiden University, Leiden, the Netherlands
8. Centre for the Study of Perceptual Experience, University of Glasgow, UK
9. Lumenate Growth Ltd, Bristol, UK
10. Audyssey, Llansantffraid, Powys, United Kingdom
11. Roxiva Innovations Ltd, Sheffield, UK
12. Program for Brain, Mind, and Consciousness, Canadian Institute for Advanced Research, Toronto, Canada

*Corresponding author. d.schwartzman@sussex.ac.uk

Abstract

Stroboscopic light stimulation (SLS) on closed eyes reliably evokes vivid geometric visual phenomena, and in some contexts, altered-state experiences, leading to its increasing use across research, public installations, recreational use, and exploratory clinical contexts. The main clinical risk for SLS is a photosensitive epileptic response. In contrast, non-epileptic sensitivities (e.g., migraine/photophobia, anxiety, autism/ADHD, psychosis) typically induce discomfort or distress rather than convulsive events. Here, we integrate a multi-laboratory safety survey of 1,070 participants, operational data from two commercial SLS providers, and a focused review of SLS and sensory-intolerance evidence. This synthesis was used to refine safety screening and to characterise adverse events. Across laboratory studies, 20 minor side effects (e.g., early withdrawal due to discomfort; ~18.7 per 1,000) were reported, with no severe incidents requiring medical attention. From two commercial datasets (~4.2 million closed-eye SLS sessions), 14 major adverse events requiring medical attention were documented (~3.3 per million); minor reactions were not systematically captured. Synthesising these strands, we developed the evidence-based Sussex Strobe Safety Screening Questionnaire (4SQ), which uses non-specialist language to identify known sensitivities to SLS, alongside practical recommendations for risk mitigation across research, clinical, commercial, and public contexts. Together, these findings suggest that the absolute risk under SLS is low but non-zero. Screening tools can help exclude pre-existing conditions, while graded exposure (e.g., a short 'taster' session, after which participants may opt out) and trained staff can mitigate the risk of first-episode events. Nonetheless, such events should be anticipated and minimised through clear screening pathways and managed through rehearsed on-site response plans.

Keywords: Photosensitive epilepsy; epileptic seizure; safety; risk mitigation; sensory sensitivity.

1 Introduction

Stroboscopic light stimulation (SLS), usually delivered to closed eyes at frequencies between ~5–50 Hz, evokes stroboscopically induced visual hallucinations (SIVHs) comprising dynamic geometric patterns and colours. Occasionally, more complex visual hallucinations (faces, people, or scenes) and altered-state experiences are reported [1–3]. Comparable phenomena occur with open-eye stimulation using diffusion goggles [4]. As SLS use expands beyond specialist research laboratories, clear and proportionate safety frameworks are required.

Contemporary SLS research has so far addressed multiple, partly overlapping aims, including investigation of the neural correlates of SIVHs using fMRI and EEG, particularly in relation to neural entrainment and thalamocortical dynamics [1,5–13]. These studies often combine electrophysiological and phenomenological measures to relate neural dynamics to subjective visual experience. SLS has also been used to examine altered states of consciousness (ASCs; [2,11,14,15]) and to model simple visual hallucinations [7,16,17].

Interest has grown in the potential therapeutic applications of SLS, particularly at gamma (~40 Hz) and alpha (9–11 Hz) frequencies, for conditions such as Alzheimer's disease and depression [18–21]. However, the evidence for therapeutic benefit remains preliminary and inconclusive [18,22].

Against this backdrop, we aim to synthesise cross-laboratory practice and operational data from two commercial SLS providers, alongside a focused review of evidence regarding SLS and sensory intolerance[1]. Our aims are to characterise risk and develop a broadly applicable, evidence-based screening tool spanning research, clinical, commercial, and public contexts. As use broadens, understanding who is at risk—and why—becomes increasingly important. We therefore begin by outlining key medical risks and discomfort-related sensitivities associated with SLS.

---

[1] Several of the present authors previously collaborated with Collective Act Ltd (CAL) on a large-scale public engagement project, Dreamachine, which used SLS and music to evoke SIVHs in a large number of participants. DJS, AKS, JWS, and TH contributed scientific input, and FM contributed philosophical input; see [3] and https://dreamachine.world. Insights from this collaboration informed elements of the general SLS safety principles discussed here. However, the Dreamachine programme was conducted under a separate legal and operational framework, and associated data are not reported in the present paper. Accordingly, all analyses and conclusions in this manuscript are based exclusively on laboratory and commercial datasets for which reporting permissions were in place.

1.1 Medical risks and sensitivities associated with SLS

Primary risk factor: photosensitive seizure (PSE)

The main medical risk associated with SLS is photosensitive convulsive seizures (PSE). While the lifetime risk of any epilepsy is relatively common (~1 in 26 in developed countries), PSE is comparatively uncommon, representing only a small proportion of epilepsy diagnoses [23]. General-population estimates indicate an annual incidence of ~1 per 100,000 and a lifetime prevalence of ~1 in 10,000 [24]. Importantly, most people with epilepsy are not at risk from SLS exposure. Photophobia, defined by a sensitivity or intolerance to bright light, is relatively common in people with epilepsy, but true PSE is rare. Given the rarity of this risk factor, SLS can be delivered with minimal risk when appropriate precautions are taken for PSE, along with the following secondary risk factors. In practice, the principal concern is undetected PSE causing first-episode reactions in individuals who screen negative, as most known PSE cases, typically emerging in adolescence, are aware and self-exclude. This issue is examined in greater depth in the Discussion.

Several factors, however, may increase the risk of a participant having PSE or suffering from a seizure more generally. The most notable of these factors are family history, age, sleep deprivation, pregnancy, recent alcohol or recreational drug use, and medications that lower seizure threshold. PSE is mainly seen in younger age groups—up to six times more common in children and adolescents (7–19 years) than in adults [23]. Epilepsy, including the photosensitive variant, is heterogeneous but often occurs in multiple members of the same family [25].

Sleep deprivation is a well-established risk factor that increases seizure likelihood in people with epilepsy [26,27]. Mechanistically, observational and experimental work indicates that reduced sleep increases cortical excitability and the frequency of epileptiform discharges, particularly in idiopathic generalised epilepsies [26–29]. Diary-based and prospective studies show that acute sleep loss can raise seizure risk by up to threefold [30,31]. Similarly, several prescribed medications, such as smoking cessation drugs (e.g., bupropion), antipsychotics, opioid analgesics, and stimulants, are associated with increased seizure susceptibility (a summary list is provided in the Supplementary Material).

Pregnancy involves physiological, hormonal, and psychological changes influencing seizure threshold across trimesters [32]. Altered drug metabolism, disrupted sleep, stress, and fatigue, may further increase susceptibility to seizure provocation during pregnancy. Given this potential vulnerability, SLS exposure during pregnancy is not recommended.

Secondary risk factors: sensory sensitivities and photophobia

Setting PSE aside, several conditions may increase an individual's sensitivity to SLS, including anxiety, migraine, autism spectrum disorder (ASD), attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), and psychosis. These sensitivities rarely involve serious medical events but can exacerbate discomfort or distress under high-intensity sensory stimulation.

Below, we summarise these sensitivities along with their prevalence.

Anxiety. In the UK, medical consultations for anxiety have recently increased markedly [33], with prevalence estimates ranging from 3.8% to 25% of the population [34]. Individuals with heightened anxiety may be more susceptible to discomfort under specific lighting conditions, and SLS can be anxiety-inducing [35,36].

Migraine. Current estimates put the global prevalence of migraine at ~14–15%; in terms of burden, migraine accounts for ~4.9% of global years lived with disability [37]. Photophobia is common, and bright or flickering light is frequently reported as a trigger. However, it has been argued that much of this 'provocation' reflects photophobia during the premonitory phase rather than an independent external trigger [38]. Regardless of mechanism, high-contrast SLS can exacerbate discomfort in people with migraine.

ASD. Prevalence estimates vary considerably depending on age, diagnostic criteria, and methods. The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence estimates the global prevalence of ASD in children to be around 1-2%, and ~1.1% of UK adults [39]. ASD is often associated with sensory hypersensitivity, heightened arousal, and elevated physiological stress responses, though these traits are heterogeneous and not universal [40,41]. For some individuals, high-intensity visual stimuli, such as bright light or SLS, may induce stress responses, particularly in those with elevated sensory reactivity [41].

ADHD. ADHD affects ~3–4% of UK adults (NICE, 2021), with photophobia reported in ~69% compared with ~28% of controls [42]. While ADHD per se is not a contraindication for SLS exposure, self-reported photophobia suggests a higher likelihood of discomfort under SLS.

Psychosis. Psychotic disorders, including schizophrenia, are relatively uncommon (global prevalence of schizophrenia ~0.28% [43]; broader psychotic disorders ~0.3%-0.7% [44]). Due to SLS evoking vivid visual phenomena, interactions with active positive symptoms may increase distress or confusion, warranting additional caution.

1.2 Public incidents shaping perceived risk and regulation

Several widely publicised incidents have shaped risk perception and regulation of SLS exposure, primarily by unintentionally triggering photosensitive epileptic seizures. The infamous 1997 "Pokémon incident" in Japan involved rapidly alternating red–blue flashes at ~12 Hz broadcast to an audience largely comprising of children. Seizures occurred in hundreds of viewers, many without prior epilepsy diagnosis [45]. In response, Japan introduced broadcasting regulations in 1999, limiting flash frequency to <3 Hz, restricting high-intensity flashes, and prohibiting saturated-red flicker [45]. Similar concerns have arisen elsewhere: a Dutch cohort study found seizures were over three times more likely at night-time electronic dance music events with intense stroboscopic lighting than at daylight events [46]. In the UK, Ofcom guidance, operationalised via the Harding Flash and Pattern Analyser ('Harding test'), which algorithmically screens broadcast images for luminance, colour, and spatial pattern flicker likely to provoke photosensitive seizures, is used to restrict flashing imagery. Despite these safeguards, the London 2012 Olympic logo promotional video had to be withdrawn due to seizure concerns [47].

1.3 Current screening practice

Across contexts, screening protocols vary widely in scope, design, and their evidence base. Laboratory studies typically use bespoke self-report questionnaires to exclude known PSE and other neurological or psychiatric vulnerabilities. In contrast, public installations often rely on simplified health declarations or verbal briefings with varying degrees of formality. Both approaches have limitations, as many focus narrowly on epilepsy, overlooking other clinically relevant sensitivities. Protocols are also context-specific and often insufficiently documented for replication or cross-study comparison.

To address these gaps, we developed the Sussex Strobe Safety Screening Questionnaire (4SQ), a concise, evidence-based tool for identifying sensitivities relevant to SLS. The 4SQ is grounded in three evidence strands: (i) a cross-laboratory SLS safety survey, (ii) operational data from two commercial providers, and (iii) a focused review of photic-stimulation and sensory-intolerance research. Together, these strands quantify absolute and operational risk under SLS, identify where risk concentrates, and translate the evidence into practical, proportionate screening guidance. For each safety consideration, we assess currently available data and specify screening and operating procedures that prioritise phenotypic risk markers over diagnostic labels. Key markers include photophobia, migraine or visual aura, seizure history, sensory intolerance, light-triggered discomfort. These markers are implemented within the 4SQ as a simple pre-screening pathway for research, clinical feasibility studies, commercial use, and public installations. Our aim is a

standardised, platform-agnostic safety architecture that enables broad inclusion while acknowledging that the absolute risk remains low but non-zero.

2 Methods

2.1 Cross-laboratory and commercial data acquisition on SLS safety and practice

A structured Qualtrics portal was created to capture SLS safety practices and outcomes across four research laboratories and two commercial providers. The portal captured: (i) submitter identifiers; (ii) reporting scope (whole group/platform vs. individual studies, programmes, or product sessions); (iii) date range and total number of experiments conducted; (iv) technical parameters of the SLS used (e.g., device type, stimulation mode, eye state, frequency range, brightness, duty cycle, music synchrony); (v) participant/user counts; (vi) counts of major incidents (e.g., epileptic seizures, panic attacks, events with medical implications) and minor side effects (e.g., discomfort leading to early withdrawal without medical consequences); (vii) number of epileptic seizures; (viii) participant/user demographics (where available); (ix) supporting documents (safety protocols, participant information, incident reports). All laboratory and supplier datasets, and their identities, were anonymised and remain so throughout this report.

Research laboratories
Four research laboratories contributed data, based in the UK, Germany, the Netherlands, and Australia, conducting SLS studies between 2020 and 2025 in healthy and clinical participants. Lab A provided data from one study (N = 20); Lab B contributed twelve studies (N = 461), including two involving participants with Major Depressive Disorder (MDD; N = 105); Lab C contributed six studies (N = 480); and Lab D provided five studies (N = 109). Where available, laboratories provided summary information on screening procedures and adverse-event logging.

SLS characteristics. Across laboratories, SLS was delivered using commercial and custom hardware. Devices included commercial stroboscopes (Lucia N^{0}03, Light Attendance GmbH, Innsbruck, Austria; Roxiva RX1, roXiva Ltd); custom-built stroboscopes (Lumenate Growth Ltd, Bristol, UK; University of Sussex); a projector (Epson EB-G7400U); and standard computer monitors at maximum brightness.

Commercial SLS providers
Data were also obtained from two commercial SLS providers. Commercial Provider A is a mobile app delivering closed-eye SLS experiences using the smartphone flashlight. Frequency, brightness, and duty cycle are modulated in synchrony with

audio content, with many sessions designed to complement music and enhance user-reported impact. The sessions comprise dynamic SLS sequences with frequencies of 3–13.5 Hz and duty cycles of ~0.0–0.7. The platform has been in operation since 2021 and, to date, has delivered ~3.8 million closed-eye SLS sessions to a large international user base.

Commercial Provider B is a manufacturer of a dedicated SLS device designed to support wellbeing and induce vivid SIVHs that can be used in group settings or for individual sessions. The device delivers controlled SLS via high-intensity LEDs, with configurable frequency, brightness, and duty cycle parameters. Users can create their own SLS sessions within a frequency envelope of 0.01–200 Hz and a duty cycle of 1–99% or select from a range of pre-set sessions. Some SLS sessions are tuned to align with music, with rhythmic modulation of light parameters designed to enhance the subjective experience. According to the company's operational figures, >400,000 closed-eye SLS sessions have been conducted over the past five years. This conservative total excludes additional usage from consumer (non-professional) units and likely underestimates total exposures. Commercial providers developed their own safety screening criteria (see Table 1 for a summary).

3 Results: laboratory-based studies

3.1 Laboratory-based SLS survey

Most studies (n = 21) used fixed-frequency SLS with reported frequencies spanning 1–80 Hz; all used a square-wave SLS signal. Stimulation protocols typically used frequencies within the alpha frequency range (8–12 Hz; Mauro et al., 2015), with one laboratory also testing 15 Hz stimulation. A subset (n = 3; total n = 95) used dynamic frequency shifts between 3 and 15 Hz.

Flash duration and inter-flash interval (duty cycle) varied, with most protocols adopting a 50% duty cycle (equal flash and inter-flash interval), with values ranging from 25% to 75%.

Brightness levels varied by device: mean luminous flux for stroboscope-based setups was ~5,373 lumens (SD = 326); the projector operated at 447.2 cd/m^2; monitor setups typically delivered ~300 cd/m^2. As luminous flux (lumens) and luminance (cd/m^2) quantify different properties, these values are not directly comparable and are reported as provided by each laboratory.

Session duration ranged from brief exposures (8 s) to extended stimulation (≤ 25 min), with some protocols including ramp-up periods and rest intervals.

3.2 Participants

Across studies, 1,070 unique participants took part (mean age = 25.04 years, SD = 2.68). Of these, 389 (36.4%) identified as male, 680 (63.6%) as female, and 1 (<0.1%) as non-binary. One hundred and five participants self-reported symptoms consistent with MDD, assessed using the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9).

3.3 SLS Safety Screening Across Laboratories

Screening and risk-management procedures varied across groups, reflecting differences in study populations, aims, and institutional requirements (Table 1). We collated safety protocols from the four laboratories (Labs A-D) and identified a shared minimum screening set, alongside areas of divergence.

All laboratories applied a minimum age criterion (18 or 21 years), reflecting higher PSE incidence in those aged 7–18 [23], as well as consent and safeguarding requirements for minors. Every protocol excluded a personal epilepsy history, particularly photosensitive subtypes, and most laboratories (A, B, D) also screened for first-degree family history. All laboratories assessed sensitivity to bright or flashing light (including migraine history or photophobia), and pregnancy was a common exclusion.

Despite convergence on core exclusions, laboratories differed across several domains:

Anxiety. All laboratories recognised potential discomfort in individuals with heightened anxiety, but screening approaches varied. Lab A used the State–Trait Anxiety Inventory, Trait version (STAI-T; Spielberger, 2012) with an exclusion cut-off score of >50. Lab B excluded self-reported severe anxiety within the past 3 years, while Lab C used a broad "severe psychiatric condition" criterion. Lab D did not screen specifically for anxiety.

Psychiatric disorders. Laboratories A and C applied broad exclusions ("any psychiatric disorder"; "any severe psychiatric condition"). Lab D excluded psychosis or first-degree family history of schizophrenia, while Lab B excluded severe anxiety or psychosis within 3 years.

Alcohol and recreational drug use. Laboratories A, C, and D assessed recent use and instructed participants not to attend under the influence to reduce the risk of adverse reactions and preserve data quality. Laboratory B did not formally assess recent substance use.

Psychotropic medication use. Laboratories A, C, and D excluded current psychoactive medications (e.g., antipsychotics, anxiolytics), to avoid agents that may lower seizure threshold or alter SLS responsiveness. Laboratory B did not specify medication status.

Sleep deprivation. Laboratories A, C, and D excluded recent sleep loss, whereas Lab B did not.

Current major medical issues. Laboratory A excluded active major medical conditions (e.g., cardiovascular, metabolic, neurological) that could increase vulnerability to intense stimulation [49], citing examples such as unstable hypertension, significant arrhythmias, and multiple sclerosis. Other laboratories did not apply this exclusion.

Traumatic brain injury (TBI). Laboratory A excluded any history of TBI, including concussion or post-concussive syndrome, given frequent post-TBI photophobia, headache, and sensory overload.

Unexplained loss of consciousness: Laboratory B uniquely screened for unexplained, repeated losses of consciousness to identify possible absence seizures.

Heart disease/implanted cardiac devices: Only Laboratory C explicitly excluded participants with heart disease or implanted cardiac pacemakers, including those without neuroimaging components, to maintain consistency in safety screening and minimise any potential cardiovascular risk.

Aphantasia: Laboratory C excluded aphantasia (inability to generate visual imagery voluntarily). This was a study-design choice to maintain comparable phenomenological reporting. Data on SLS-induced experiences in aphantasia remains limited [50].

Exclusion criterion	Lab A	Lab B	Lab C	Lab D	Commercial Provider A	Commercial Provider B
History of epilepsy or PSE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Family history of PSE	✓	✓	—	—	✓	✓
Photophobia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	—
Migraine	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Anxiety (severe)	✓ (STAI-T)	✓ (severe; ≤3y)	✓ (severe psych.)	✓ (strong fears/panic)	✓	✓
Severe mental illness (psychosis/bipolar etc.)	✓ (any psych. disorder)	✓ (psychosis; ≤3y)	✓ (severe psych.)	✓ (psychosis; FHx schizophrenia)	✓	✓
Pregnancy	✓	✓	—	✓	✓	✓
Unexplained loss of consciousness	○	✓	○	○	✓	✓
Neurological disease	✓	—	✓	✓	○	✓
Substance use	✓ (≥14u/wk; <24halcohol <1wk drugs)	—	✓ (>3u <24h; any drugs <24h)	✓ (psychotropics now/≤3mo)	✓	✓ (<24h alcohol)
Psychiatric meds	✓	—	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sleep deprivation	—	—	✓ poor sleep prev night	✓ (acute/chronic)	✓	✓
Eye disease/uncorrected vision	○ (uncorrected vision)	—	✓ (eye disease)	—	○	○
Ear/vestibular (e.g., Ménière's)	—	—	✓	—	○	○
Cardiac issues or pacemaker	—	—	✓	—	○	○
Head trauma	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓
Age bounds	21–60	≥18	≥18	≥18	≥18	≥18

Table 1. Comparison of screening criteria for SLS across four laboratories (Labs A–D), and two commercial providers (Provider A = app-based; Provider B = device-based). Each row lists a specific exclusion criterion, with columns indicating whether it is explicitly included in the Lab's screening protocol. Symbols are defined as follows: '✓' Criterion explicitly included in the screening procedure. '—' Criterion not included in the screening procedure. '○' Criterion included in a qualified or partial form. PSE = photosensitive convulsive seizures; '≤3y' = within last 3 years; FHx = family history; u/wk = units per week; psych. = psychiatric.

3.4 Additional risk management strategies

Beyond screening, we note additional risk management strategies, identify common strategies across laboratories, and highlight areas of divergence.

First-aid training and on-site readiness. Most laboratories ensured that staff conducting studies had current first-aid training, including the recognition and management of seizures. In Laboratory C, not all staff were first-aid trained; however, a designated first-aid warden was always on call and immediately available during data collection.

Taster SLS exposure. All sites implemented 'graded exposure', including a brief 'taster' session before the main experiment to confirm tolerability and identify potential adverse responses before the main experiment.

EEG pre-screening. In two studies, Lab D required first-time SLS participants to undergo a 10-minute EEG with SLS to assess photosensitivity. Although a clinically accepted method for identifying PSE, EEG screening has low sensitivity in asymptomatic, pre-screened adults [51]. Where thorough medical and migraine/photophobia history, clear risk information, supervised 'graded exposure', and trained staff are in place, routine SLS-EEG is unlikely to provide material benefit and may increase cost and participant burden.

3.5 Adverse responses to SLS

Across all surveyed laboratories, no severe adverse reactions were observed, specifically no seizures or syncope (transient loss of consciousness). Among 1,070 participants, 20 non-serious minor side effects were reported: 0/20 in Lab A (0.0 per 1,000), 7/461 in Lab B (15.2 per 1,000), 11/480 in Lab C (22.9 per 1,000), and 2/109 in Lab D (18.3 per 1,000). This corresponds to a pooled prevalence of ~18.7 per 1,000 (1.87%). Events clustered into five main themes: anxiety/distress (n = 5; e.g., misinterpreting bodily sensations, uncertainty about session duration), eye discomfort or photophobia (n = 5), dizziness or vertigo (n = 3), headache or migraine (n = 3; including one mild migraine with prior history), and non-specific unpleasantness or early withdrawal (n = 4). Where multiple symptoms were reported, the primary reason for withdrawal was coded. All events were resolved on-site without medical transfer. For context, this pooled prevalence (~1.87%) sits at the low end of MRI terminations in screened adults due to anxiety or claustrophobia (~1–3%; [52]).

4 Results: Commercial SLS Providers

4.1 Commercial providers screening procedures

Compared with laboratory protocols, commercial SLS screening procedures overlap on the core exclusions, notably a history of epilepsy or PSE and age ≥18, with caution around migraine, photophobia and significant psychiatric histories (Table 1).

However, clear divergences from laboratory-based screening were observed. Provider A screened for migraine or photophobia, cardiac issues, sleep deprivation cut-offs, and neurodiversity-related sensory intolerance. Provider A also provided users with a detailed list of medications associated with increased seizure risk. In contrast, Provider B included core exclusions (e.g., epilepsy, pregnancy, recent alcohol/drugs, sleep deprivation, head injury), but did not formally assess photophobia or migraine, syncope history, cardiac or pacemaker status, or neurodiversity-related sensory needs.

4.2 Commercial providers adverse responses to SLS

Provider A. Across approximately 3.8 million closed-eye SLS sessions delivered via a mobile platform, nine major adverse events were recorded through ad hoc feedback and incident reporting. Major events were defined as those requiring medical attention (e.g., a primary care doctor visit), and judged to have probable or higher causation related to SLS. This equates to roughly 2.4 incidents per million sessions, underscoring the rarity of such outcomes. Minor side effects (e.g., transient discomfort, unpleasantness, or session withdrawal) were not systematically recorded. Consequently, the data primarily reflect serious events requiring medical attention rather than the full spectrum of tolerability outcomes.

Provider B. Based on operational figures, >400,000 closed-eye SLS sessions have been conducted using this device over the past five years. This conservative estimate excludes consumer (non-professional) use and therefore likely underestimates total exposures. Adverse-event data were limited, as user feedback and incident reporting were largely ad hoc. Two recent cases were directly reported: one episode of transient memory loss over several days following repeated use, and one seizure at a public event. Historical accounts from earlier operations describe a prolonged trance-like unresponsive state (resolved on-site) and two further seizures assessed by emergency services, including one with short-lived cognitive disorientation. In total, five adverse events were identified. Although low (~12.5 per million sessions), this estimate should be interpreted cautiously due to the lack of systematic reporting.

5 Discussion

Across the laboratory and commercial datasets, adverse events associated with SLS were rare and generally non-serious. Laboratory studies (n = 1,070) reported 20 minor withdrawals due to discomfort, with no severe adverse events. Commercial provider data (~4.2 million sessions) reported 14 severe adverse events requiring medical attention (~3.3 per million). Together, these data indicate that the absolute risk of serious adverse outcomes under controlled, closed-eye SLS is low but non-zero, and that proportionate pre-screening effectively mitigates the majority of predictable risks.

To support proportionate risk management, we developed the Sussex Strobe Safety Screening Questionnaire (4SQ). The 4SQ is a brief, plain-language tool that identifies established SLS sensitivities and links screening outcomes to actionable risk-management guidance. To balance inclusion with risk reduction, the 4SQ prioritises phenotypic risk markers (photosensitivity, light-triggered discomfort, migraine/visual aura, seizure history, sensory intolerance) over diagnostic labels. It provides a simple, implementable screening pathway for research, clinical, commercial, and public contexts.

5.1 Development of the Sussex Strobe Safety Screening Questionnaire (*4SQ*)

To translate our findings into practical screening guidance, we synthesised three evidence strands: a multi-laboratory SLS safety survey, operational data from commercial providers, and a focused review of SLS and sensory-intolerance evidence. Drawing on this synthesis for each safety-relevant sensitivity, we (a) state the rationale linking the factor to elevated risk or intolerance to SLS, (b) specify non-specialist screening questions, and (c) define a default decision (exclude/include with caution and accommodations). Where evidence is limited or heterogeneous, conservative exclusion criteria are applied.

1) Age (minimum age & safeguarding)

***Rationale*:** photosensitive convulsive seizures (PSE) are up six times more common in those aged 7–19 than in adults [23], and participation by minors carries additional consent and safeguarding requirements. Although photosensitivity declines with age, large-scale epidemiological evidence shows that the likelihood of seizures becoming prolonged or non-self-limiting (i.e., status epilepticus) increases from around 60 years of age [53]. Accordingly, ≥60 years is recommended as a conservative upper-age threshold for unsupervised SLS, with medical clearance and enhanced safeguards advised above this age.
Screening: Confirm age is ≥18 or older at booking or consent.
***Default decision*: Exclude participants aged <18 years**.

2) Neurological history

PSE or seizure history (including first-degree family history)
Rationale: SLS can provoke epileptic seizures in susceptible individuals. The risk is higher in younger individuals and in those with a family history of photosensitivity. Any personal history of unprovoked seizure (not only epileptic) indicates a lowered seizure threshold and uncertainty about individual triggers. Seizures in non-photosensitive epilepsy may be precipitated by interacting factors including high arousal, anxiety, hyperventilation, sleep loss, recent illness, or medicines that may reduce seizure threshold. Given this diagnostic ambiguity, a conservative approach treats any prior seizure history as a contraindication.
Screening: Assess personal epilepsy or seizure history; first-degree family history and prior visually triggered events.
Default decision: **Exclude participants with any personal seizure history or first-degree family history of photosensitive epilepsy**.

Migraine (especially with photophobia or aura)
Rationale: Bright or flickering light is a common migraine trigger; visual aura reflects cortical hyper-excitability, and marked photophobia predicts increased discomfort and early withdrawal.
Screening: Assess history of migraine or frequent headaches and the presence of photophobia or visual aura.
Default decision: **Exclude participants with migraine accompanied by visual aura or marked photophobia; otherwise, include with caution and enhanced monitoring.**

Traumatic brain injury (TBI), concussion, or head injury (past 12 months)
Rationale: Post-concussive symptoms, including photophobia, headache, sensory overload, and dizziness can be exacerbated by high-intensity SLS; recent TBI also carries uncertain seizure risk.
Screening: Assess any head injury or TBI within the past 12 months and the presence of persistent post-concussive symptoms.
Default decision: **Exclude participants with head injury or TBI within the past 12 months.**

Unexplained loss of consciousness/episodes of altered awareness
Rationale: Unexplained episodes may indicate undiagnosed epilepsy (e.g., absence seizures) or other neurological instability. SLS could precipitate adverse events in such cases.
Screening: Assess any history of fainting, blackouts or brief unresponsiveness without a clear medical explanation.
Default decision: **Exclude participants with unexplained loss of consciousness; defer participation pending medical evaluation.**

3) Neurodevelopmental conditions & sensory sensitivity

Autism spectrum disorder (ASD)
Rationale: Higher rates of photophobia and sensory intolerance mean intense SLS may be overwhelming for some autistic individuals; the relevant risk marker is sensory sensitivity, and not the diagnosis itself.
Screening: Assess light sensitivity and sensory intolerance.
Default decision: **Do not blanket-exclude.** Include by default in environments designed to be tolerable for neurotypical and neurodivergent participants. **Exclude only if marked photophobia or sensory intolerance persists, or if the participant prefers not to proceed.**

Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)
Rationale: Photophobia and light discomfort are commonly reported in ADHD. Again, sensory sensitivity, rather than the diagnostic label, is the relevant risk marker.
Screening: Assess photophobia and sensory intolerance using brief, direct questions.
Default decision: **Do not blanket-exclude**. **Exclude only when marked photophobia or sensory intolerance is reported; otherwise, include with accommodations.**

4) Psychiatric history

Anxiety disorders / high anxiety
Rationale: SLS can elevate arousal and alter perception, potentially precipitating panic or distress. However, evidence remains limited, warranting a conservative approach.
Screening: Use the STAI-T where feasible (suggested cut-off score > 50) or assess self-reported severe anxiety or panic history.
Default decision: **Exclude participants with STAI-T >50 or severe anxiety disorder, otherwise, include with caution using enhanced briefing, easy opt-out, and close monitoring.**

Psychosis (current or recent)
Rationale: SLS-evoked visual phenomena may interact with positive psychotic symptoms, increasing distress or confusion. However, evidence is limited, justifying a conservative approach.
Screening: Assess current psychotic symptoms and any recent psychotic episodes.
Default decision: **Exclude participants with current psychotic symptoms; consider inclusion only in stable remission with explicit clinical clearance.**

5) Other medical conditions

Pregnancy
Rationale: Direct evidence on SLS exposure during pregnancy is lacking; physiological, hormonal, and psychological changes, alongside altered drug metabolism, disrupted sleep, stress, and fatigue, may lower seizure threshold, warranting a precautionary exclusion.
Screening: Assess current pregnancy status.
Default decision: **Exclude participants who are currently pregnant**.

Heart disease / implanted cardiac devices / unstable medical conditions
Rationale: SLS can elicit autonomic arousal; pre-existing cardiac instability or serious systemic illness may increase vulnerability to adverse physiological responses.
Screening: Assess history of arrhythmias, unstable angina, heart failure, implanted devices; uncontrolled hypertension; or active neurological or systemic disease.
Default decision: **Exclude participants with unstable cardiac disease, implanted cardiac devices, or uncontrolled serious medical conditions**.

6) Substances & sleep
Alcohol or recreational drug use (recent)
Rationale: Recent intoxication might alter neural responsiveness (depending on substance), judgment, self-report, timely withdrawal, and tolerability.
Screening: Assess whether alcohol or recreational drugs were used recently and whether any current or residual effects are present (e.g., "high", hangover, withdrawal, unusual fatigue, poor sleep).
Default decision: **Exclude or reschedule participants reporting or exhibiting current or residual effects.**
Operational note. Sites should pre-specify conservative wash-out periods by substance class (e.g., alcohol, cannabis, stimulants, MDMA, psychedelics).

Sleep deprivation (recent)
Rationale: Acute sleep loss increases seizure risk and reduces capacity to monitor and respond to distress.
Screening: Assess hours slept in the past 24 hours and recent acute restriction (e.g., <4 hours).
Default decision: **Exclude or reschedule following acute sleep deprivation; proceed once sleep has normalised**.

7) Medications
Psychotropic or psychoactive medications
Rationale: Some medications alter neural responsiveness and may lower seizure threshold, increasing uncertainty in individual risk estimation.
Screening: Assess current use of antipsychotics, bupropion (for smoking cessation), opioid analgesics, benzodiazepines, stimulants, or other psychoactive agents (see

Supplementary Material for a full list of medications that may lower the seizure threshold).
Default decision: **Exclude participants using medications known to lower seizure threshold, unless a protocol explicitly permits specific classes with clinical oversight.**

Drawing on this synthesis, we developed the Sussex Strobe Safety Screening Questionnaire (4SQ; Figure 2). The 4SQ is a brief, plain-language instrument designed to operationalise these safety-relevant sensitivities into a consistent pre-participation screening process for SLS. It spans neurological, psychiatric, sensory, medical, and lifestyle factors known to influence tolerability or risk during SLS exposure, without relying on diagnostic labels where phenotypic markers are more informative.

A 'YES' response to any item prompts further assessment and a predefined, context-specific eligibility decision (exclusion, inclusion with caution, or inclusion with accommodations), rather than automatic exclusion.

The Sussex Strobe Safety Screening Questionnaire (4SQ)

This questionnaire is designed to help determine whether stroboscopic light is suitable for you. Please answer questions to the best of your knowledge. Your responses are confidential and will only be used for screening purposes.

For each item, please tick YES or NO. If you are unsure, please tick YES.

Question	YES	NO
1. Age		
1.1 Are you aged 18 or over?		
2. Neurological History		
2.1 Have you ever been diagnosed with epilepsy, including photosensitive epilepsy?		
2.2 Have you ever experienced a seizure or convulsion (with or without a formal diagnosis)?		
2.3 Do you have a first-degree relative (parent, sibling, or child) with epilepsy?		
2.4 Have you ever had an unexplained blackout or sudden loss of awareness or brief loss of consciousness?		
2.5 Have you had a head injury, concussion, or traumatic brain injury in the past 12 months?		
3. Psychiatric and Mental Health		
3.1 Have you ever been diagnosed with a severe mental health condition (e.g., psychosis, bipolar disorder, schizophrenia)?		
3.2 In the past 3 years, have you experienced severe anxiety (e.g., frequent panic attacks, pervasive worry, or avoidance) that interfered with daily life?		
3.3 Excluding antidepressants, are you currently taking any medications that affect the brain or nervous system (e.g., antipsychotics, bupropion for smoking cessation, benzodiazepines, stimulants, opioid pain medications)?		
3.4 Do you have a first-degree relative (parent, sibling, or child) diagnosed with schizophrenia or a psychotic disorder?		
4. Medical Conditions		
4.1 Have you been diagnosed with a heart condition (e.g., arrhythmia, angina, heart failure), have a cardiac pacemaker or implanted device, or another serious unstable medical condition?		
4.2 Are you currently pregnant, or do you think you may be pregnant?		
5. Sensory Sensitivities		
5.1 Do you have migraine or frequent severe headaches, and do bright or flickering lights trigger them (e.g., with visual aura or marked light sensitivity)?		
5.2 Do you regularly experience strong discomfort, panic, or distress in response to bright or flashing lights?		
6. Lifestyle and Substance Use		
6.1 Do you feel any current or residual effects from alcohol or recreational drugs which you have recently consumed (e.g., "high", hangover, withdrawal, unusual fatigue, poor sleep)?		
6.2 Have you had significantly reduced sleep (less than 4 hours) in the past 24 hours?		

Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: ____/____/_____

Figure 2. The 4SQ is a brief, plain-language pre-participation safety questionnaire for stroboscopic light stimulation (SLS) used to identify established SLS sensitivities. It comprises five sections covering (1) neurological history (personal history of epilepsy or any unprovoked seizure, including non-photosensitive epilepsy; first-degree family history of photosensitive epilepsy; prior visually triggered events; unexplained loss of awareness; neurological diagnoses; recent head injury), (2) psychiatric and mental health history (current or past diagnoses, recent difficulties, current psychotropic medication, and first-

degree family history of psychosis), (3) cardiovascular conditions (cardiac disease and implanted cardiac devices), (4) sensory sensitivities (migraine or photophobia, and strong discomfort, panic, or adverse reactions to bright or flashing lights), and (5) lifestyle and physiological factors (alcohol or recreational drug use within the past 24 h, significant sleep restriction, and pregnancy). Responses are recorded as binary (Yes/No). Any YES response prompts further assessment; for neurological history items, the default decision is exclusion, reflecting uncertainty in individual seizure susceptibility. For non-neurological items, eligibility decisions are context-specific (exclude, include with caution, or include with accommodations). The 4SQ is not a diagnostic instrument and is intended to support proportionate, precautionary risk management across research, clinical, commercial, and public settings.

5.2 Practical risk mitigation for SLS

Mitigating the risks associated with SLS delivery requires trained staff, proportionate screening, and appropriately controlled exposure parameters. We recommend that staff receive regular first-aid training, including seizure first aid, syncope management, panic response, and post-event documentation, with annual refreshers and scenario-based drills. In our cross-laboratory synthesis, we found that a small set of procedural safeguards provided an effective balance between safety and accessibility: proportionate screening, brief supervised 'graded exposure' with explicit opt-out, plain-English stop-signals, and continuous monitoring.

In contexts where direct supervision is not possible, such as app-based or home-use SLS, additional safeguards are required. These include a simple and immediately accessible means to terminate stimulation (e.g., a clear "stop" control), automatic termination of SLS if sudden movement is detected where feasible, and user-adjustable brightness to enhance comfort and minimise minor side effects. Clear plain-language guidance should be provided on safe usage (e.g., avoiding use near water, in the bath, or at height), and robust incident-reporting mechanisms should be in place so that users can easily report adverse reactions. Following any report of a major incident, users should be guided towards appropriate medical attention, ideally under the oversight of medical professionals or designated safety officers.

Clinically, photosensitivity is typically assessed using intermittent photic stimulation (IPS) during EEG, normally spanning ~1–65 Hz to elicit abnormal electrophysiological responses. Seizure-provoking responses have been reported to cluster most consistently between ~15 and 25 Hz (Fisher et al., 2005). Although we do not consider clinical IPS assessment necessary for general SLS use, to mitigate risk we recommend that routine SLS protocols should generally not exceed 15 Hz, with conservative sequences capped at 15 Hz, and only minimal dwell time above this threshold where higher frequencies are used. This approach avoids the

frequency range most consistently associated with elevated seizure risk, while preserving the perceptual vividness of SLS experiences.

Prolonged direct exposure to high-intensity light sources can cause retinal damage. Exposure limit values (ELVs) defined in the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and adopted by the European Directive 2006/25/EC, specify maximum permissible ocular exposures. For visible light, these limits correspond to very short allowable durations at high luminance (e.g., ~2.4 s at ~7,000 lux for continuous exposure with eyes open). In practice, the blink/eyelid reflex (~0.1 s; Pearce, 2008) provides rapid protection, so under controlled SLS conditions, particularly closed-eye protocols, harmful exposure is unlikely. We recommend verifying peak luminance at the participant position using a calibrated light meter and documenting compliance with European Directive 2006/25/EC. For commercial providers, photobiological safety should also comply with the IEC 62471 standard ("Photobiological safety of lamps and lamp systems"), which classifies devices by risk group. Only devices rated as Risk Group 1 ("low risk") or below should be used for SLS applications, confirming that under reasonable conditions of use, no photobiological hazard to the eye or skin is expected.

5.3 First-episode risk without screening: benchmarks and context

Even with a robust screening tool, a residual risk of first-episode reactions persists among individuals who screen negative, making it important to contextualise baseline risk in unscreened or minimally screened populations. As the present study focuses on screened SLS use, direct estimates of baseline risk must be inferred from adjacent high-exposure contexts.

To approximate baseline first-episode risk to SLS, we draw on two relevant comparators: (i) safety-critical occupational screening contexts (e.g., aircrew), in which intermittent photic stimulation (IPS) is routinely administered, and (ii) mass public exposures to stroboscopic lighting at electronic dance music events. As a proxy for base-rate first-episode seizure-related reactions, we compared the reported adverse event rate across three large cohorts in which systematic screening was not undertaken: UK aircrew candidates (N = 13,658; adverse events: 322 per 100,000; [54]), electronic dance-music event attendees (N = 400,343; adverse events: 9 per 100,000, likely under-ascertained; Salet et al., 2019), and Danish air-force recruits (N = 5,893; adverse events: 1,103 per 100,000; [55]). Here, we define a first-episode adverse event as either an IPS-evoked photoparoxysmal response (PPR) or a clinically observed seizure. Across cohorts, reported rates span from 9 to 1,103 per 100,000, reflecting substantial heterogeneity in outcome definition (EEG-based PPR vs clinical seizure) and exposure context (occupational screening vs public events).

Given this heterogeneity, we report both an exposure-weighted pooled estimate and a deliberately conservative unweighted mean. The pooled estimate across all exposures is ~34.5 per 100,000 (145/419,894; 95 % CI ~ 28.9–40.1), which likely underestimates first-episode seizure risk in public settings and overestimates risk during IPS screening, as not all PPRs translate to clinical seizures during SLS. The unweighted mean (~478 per 100,000) is intentionally conservative and should be interpreted as a worst-reasonable planning benchmark rather than a population prevalence estimate.

These figures therefore represent upper-bound estimates drawn from unscreened contexts. With adequate screening, the likelihood of a first-episode photosensitive reaction is expected to be substantially lower than these benchmarks. In addition to screening for seizure history, migraine/photophobia, and relevant medications, explicitly asking about prior symptom-free exposure to SLS (e.g., nightclub lights, EEG IPS, SLS sessions) further reduces residual risk. However, it is important to interpret such exposure cautiously. For example, in the UK public and occupational uses of strobe lighting (e.g., nightclubs, theatres, live events) are typically constrained by safety guidance to low flash rates, commonly ≤4 Hz, alongside short duty cycles, indirect placement, and warning signage. Symptom-free exposure under these conditions indicates tolerance to low-frequency, risk-mitigated SLS only, and does not establish safety at higher, more provocative frequencies or with longer continuous exposure.

When combined with clear participant information, an explicit opt-out option, brief and closely monitored 'graded exposure', and trained staff, this layered approach substantially reduces the risk of enrolling an undiagnosed photosensitive individual. Consistent with this interpretation, no seizures were observed across the surveyed laboratories, and operational data from commercial partners indicate that seizure events under closed-eye SLS are extremely rare.

6 Conclusion

We present a practical, evidence-based framework for delivering stroboscopic light stimulation (SLS) in a manner that is safe, scalable, and replicable. Screening is centred on phenotypic risk markers, including photophobia, migraine with aura, seizure history, and sensory intolerance, rather than diagnostic labels alone. The Sussex Strobe Safety Screening Questionnaire (4SQ) provides a concise, plain-language, non-specialist tool for identifying sensitivities relevant to SLS prior to exposure. External benchmarks indicate the absolute risk associated with SLS is low but non-zero, and operational risk can be further reduced through conservative stimulation parameters (including sub-15 Hz protocols), brief and monitored graded exposure, and trained on-site response. Taken together, this framework is platform-agnostic and applicable across research, clinical feasibility studies, commercial

delivery, and public installations, supporting a standardised, evidence-informed safety architecture that enables responsible and scalable inclusion.

Funding

D.J.S. is supported by a Medical Research Council Grant UKRI083. A.K.S. is supported by the European Research Council (ERC) Advanced Investigator Grant 101019254, under the European Union's Horizon 2020 programme. T.H. is supported by the Margaret Boden PhD scholarship from the University of Sussex. R.B. is funded by the Be.AI Leverhulme PhD scholarship, from the Leverhulme Trust. J.W.S. is based at the NIHR University College London Hospitals Biomedical Research Centre, which receives funding from the UK Department of Health. He receives research support from the Dr Marvin Weil Epilepsy Research Fund, the Academy of Medical Sciences, and the National Institute for Health Research.

Acknowledgements

DJS, AKS, FM, TH and JWS are grateful to Collective Act Ltd for the opportunity to collaborate on the Dreamachine project, which informed aspects of our approach to stroboscopic-light safety described here. The authors are also grateful to Devraj Joshi (Whatever Together) and Cecelia Schwartzman for helpful discussions.

Data Availability

Aggregated incident-rate data and anonymised survey summaries are available on request from the corresponding author.

Competing interests

All authors declare that they have no competing interests.

7 References

1. Amaya IA, Behrens N, Schwartzman DJ, Hewitt T, Schmidt TT. Effect of frequency and rhythmicity on flicker light-induced hallucinatory phenomena. Spitschan M, ed. *PLOS ONE*. 2023;18(4):e0284271. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0284271

2. Beauté R, Schwartzman DJ, Dumas G, et al. Mapping of Subjective Accounts into Interpreted Clusters (MOSAIC): Topic Modelling and LLM applied to Stroboscopic Phenomenology. *arXiv*. Preprint posted online February 25, 2025. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2502.18318

3. Hewitt T, Amaya I, Beauté R, Seth AK, Schmidt TT, Schwartzman DJ. Stroboscopically induced visual hallucinations: historical, phenomenological, and neurobiological perspectives. *Neurosci Conscious*. 2025;2025(1):niaf020. doi:10.1093/nc/niaf020

4. Shenyan O, Lisi M, Greenwood JA, Skipper JI, Dekker TM. Visual hallucinations induced by Ganzflicker and Ganzfeld differ in frequency, complexity, and content. *Sci Rep*. 2024;14:null. doi:10.1038/s41598-024-52372-1

5. Amaya IA, Schmidt ME, Bartossek MT, et al. Flicker light stimulation induces thalamocortical hyperconnectivity with LGN and higher-order thalamic nuclei. *Imaging Neurosci*. 2023;1:1-20. doi:10.1162/imag_a_00033

6. Becker C, Gramann K, Müller H, Elliott M. Electrophysiological correlates of flicker-induced color hallucinations. *Conscious Cogn*. 2009;18:266-276. doi:10.1016/j.concog.2008.05.001

7. Ffytche D. The hodology of hallucinations. *Cortex*. 2008;44(8):1067-1083. doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2008.04.005

8. Heller NH, Patel N, Faustin VM, Tse PU, Störmer VS. Neural correlates of stroboscopic stimulation to test a model of psychedelic hallucination. *PsyArXiv*. Preprint posted online December 4, 2023. doi:10.31234/osf.io/dex5v

9. Mauro F, Raffone A, VanRullen R. A Bidirectional Link between Brain Oscillations and Geometric Patterns. *J Neurosci*. 2015;35(20):7921-7926. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0390-15.2015

10. Pütz P, Braeunig M, Wackermann J. EEG correlates of multimodal ganzfeld induced hallucinatory imagery. *Int J Psychophysiol*. 2006;61(2):167-178. doi:10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2005.09.002

11. Schwartzman DJ, Schartner M, Ador BB, Simonelli F, Chang AYC, Seth AK. Increased spontaneous EEG signal diversity during stroboscopically-induced

altered states of consciousness. Preprint posted online January 4, 2019. doi:10.1101/511766

12. Sumich A, Anderson JD, Howard CJ, et al. Reduction in lower-alpha power during Ganzfeld flicker stimulation is associated with the production of imagery and trait positive schizotypy. *Neuropsychologia*. 2018;121:79-87. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2018.11.004

13. Wackermann J, Pütz P, Allefeld C. Ganzfeld-induced hallucinatory experience, its phenomenology and cerebral electrophysiology. *Cortex*. 2008;44:1364-1378. doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2007.05.003

14. Bartossek MT, Kemmerer J, Schmidt TT. Altered states phenomena induced by visual flicker light stimulation. Eisenbarth H, ed. *PLOS ONE*. 2021;16(7):e0253779. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0253779

15. Montgomery C, Amaya IA, Schmidt TT. Flicker light stimulation enhances the emotional response to music: a comparison study to the effects of psychedelics. *Front Psychol*. 2024;15:1325499. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1325499

16. Pearson J, Chiou R, Rogers S, Wicken M, Heitmann S, Ermentrout B. Sensory dynamics of visual hallucinations in the normal population. *eLife*. 2016;5:e17072. doi:10.7554/eLife.17072

17. Rule M, Stoffregen M, Ermentrout B. A Model for the Origin and Properties of Flicker-Induced Geometric Phosphenes. Sporns O, ed. *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2011;7(9):e1002158. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002158

18. Agger MP, Danielsen ER, Carstensen MS, et al. Safety, Feasibility, and Potential Clinical Efficacy of 40 Hz Invisible Spectral Flicker versus Placebo in Patients with Mild-to-Moderate Alzheimer's Disease: A Randomised, Placebo-Controlled, Double-Blinded, Pilot Study. *J Alzheimers Dis*. 2023;92(2):653-665. doi:10.3233/JAD-221238

19. Huang F, Huang Q, Zheng L, et al. Effect of 40 Hz light flicker on behaviors of adult C57BL/6J mice. *Brain Res*. 2023;1814:148441. doi:10.1016/j.brainres.2023.148441

20. Kim S, Kim S, Khalid A, et al. Rhythmical Photic Stimulation at Alpha Frequencies Produces Antidepressant-Like Effects in a Mouse Model of Depression. Svenningsson P, ed. *PLOS ONE*. 2016;11(1):e0145374. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0145374

21. Martorell AJ, Paulson AL, Suk HJ, et al. Multi-sensory Gamma Stimulation Ameliorates Alzheimer's-Associated Pathology and Improves Cognition. *Cell*. 2019;177(2):256-271.e22. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2019.02.014

22. Yang YL, Lai TW. Chronic Visual Stimulation with LED Light Flickering at 24, 40, or 80 Hz Failed to Reduce Amyloid β Load in the 5XFAD Alzheimer's Disease Mouse Model. *eneuro*. 2023;10(8):ENEURO.0189-23.2023. doi:10.1523/ENEURO.0189-23.2023

23. Quirk JA, Fish DR, Smith SJM, Sander JWAS, Shorvon SD, Allen PJ. Incidence of photosensitive epilepsy: a prospective national study. *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol*. 1995;95(4):260-267. doi:10.1016/0013-4694(95)00118-I

24. De Bittencourt PRM. Photosensitivity: The Magnitude of the Problem. *Epilepsia*. 2004;45(s1):30-34. doi:10.1111/j.0013-9580.2004.451010.x

25. Perucca P, Bahlo M, Berkovic SF. The Genetics of Epilepsy. *Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet*. 2020;21(1):205-230. doi:10.1146/annurev-genom-120219-074937

26. Badawy RAB, Curatolo JM, Newton M, Berkovic SF, Macdonell RAL. Sleep deprivation increases cortical excitability in epilepsy: Syndrome-specific effects. *Neurology*. 2006;67(6):1018-1022. doi:10.1212/01.wnl.0000237392.64230.f7

27. Moore JL, Carvalho DZ, St Louis EK, Bazil C. Sleep and Epilepsy: a Focused Review of Pathophysiology, Clinical Syndromes, Co-morbidities, and Therapy. *Neurotherapeutics*. 2021;18(1):170-180. doi:10.1007/s13311-021-01021-w

28. Giorgi FS, Maestri M, Guida M, et al. Controversial Issues on EEG after Sleep Deprivation for the Diagnosis of Epilepsy. *Epilepsy Res Treat*. 2013;2013:1-5. doi:10.1155/2013/614685

29. Giorgi FS, Guida M, Caciagli L, et al. What is the role for EEG after sleep deprivation in the diagnosis of epilepsy? Issues, controversies, and future directions. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2014;47:533-548. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2014.10.005

30. Dell'Aquila JT, Soti V. Sleep deprivation: a risk for epileptic seizures. *Sleep Sci*. 2022;15(02):245-249. doi:10.5935/1984-0063.20220046

31. Haut SR, Hall CB, Masur J, Lipton RB. Seizure occurrence: Precipitants and prediction. *Neurology*. 2007;69(20):1905-1910. doi:10.1212/01.wnl.0000278112.48285.84

32. Li Y, Meador KJ. Epilepsy and Pregnancy. *Continuum*. 2022;28(1):34-54. doi:10.1212/CON.0000000000001056

33. Slee A, Nazareth I, Freemantle N, Horsfall L. Trends in generalised anxiety disorders and symptoms in primary care: UK population-based cohort study. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2021;218(3):158-164. doi:10.1192/bjp.2020.159

34. Remes O, Brayne C, Van Der Linde R, Lafortune L. A systematic review of reviews on the prevalence of anxiety disorders in adult populations. *Brain Behav*. 2016;6(7):e00497. doi:10.1002/brb3.497

35. Digre KB, Brennan KC. Shedding Light on Photophobia. *J Neuroophthalmol*. 2012;32(1):68-81. doi:10.1097/WNO.0b013e3182474548

36. Patterson Gentile C, Aguirre GK. A neural correlate of visual discomfort from flicker. *J Vis*. 2020;20(7):11. doi:10.1167/jov.20.7.11

37. Steiner T, Scher A, Stewart W, Kolodner K, Liberman J, Lipton R. The Prevalence and Disability Burden of Adult Migraine in England and their Relationships to Age, Gender and Ethnicity. *Cephalalgia*. 2003;23(7):519-527. doi:10.1046/j.1468-2982.2003.00568.x

38. Schulte LH, Jürgens TP, May A. Photo-, osmo- and phonophobia in the premonitory phase of migraine: mistaking symptoms for triggers? *J Headache Pain*. 2015;16(1):14. doi:10.1186/s10194-015-0495-7

39. Prevalence | Background information | Autism in adults | CKS | NICE. Accessed October 10, 2025. https://cks.nice.org.uk/topics/autism-in-adults/background-information/prevalence/

40. Corbett BA, Schupp CW, Levine S, Mendoza S. Comparing cortisol, stress, and sensory sensitivity in children with autism. *Autism Res*. 2009;2(1):39-49. doi:10.1002/aur.64

41. Corbett BA, Muscatello RA, Blain SD. Impact of Sensory Sensitivity on Physiological Stress Response and Novel Peer Interaction in Children with and without Autism Spectrum Disorder. *Front Neurosci*. 2016;10. doi:10.3389/fnins.2016.00278

42. Kooij JJS, Bijlenga D. High Prevalence of Self-Reported Photophobia in Adult ADHD. *Front Neurol*. 2014;5. doi:10.3389/fneur.2014.00256

43. Charlson FJ, Ferrari AJ, Santomauro DF, et al. Global Epidemiology and Burden of Schizophrenia: Findings From the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Schizophr Bull*. 2018;44(6):1195-1203. doi:10.1093/schbul/sby058

44. Saha S, Chant D, Welham J, McGrath J. A Systematic Review of the Prevalence of Schizophrenia. Hyman SE, ed. *PLoS Med*. 2005;2(5):e141. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0020141

45. Ishiguro Y, Takada H, Watanabe K, Okumura A, Aso K, Ishikawa T. A Follow-up Survey on Seizures Induced by Animated Cartoon TV Program "Pocket Monster." *Epilepsia*. 2004;45(4):377-383. doi:10.1111/j.0013-9580.2004.18903.x

46. Salet N, Visser M, Stam C, Smulders YM. Stroboscopic light effects during electronic dance music festivals and photosensitive epilepsy: a cohort study and case report. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(6):e023442. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-023442

47. Glendinning L. Please look away ... it's the 2012 logo. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/media/2007/jun/06/marketingandpr.olympics2012 . June 6, 2007. Accessed October 13, 2025.

48. Spielberger CD. State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Adults. Published online July 9, 2012. doi:10.1037/t06496-000

49. Cortese A, Conte A, Ferrazzano G, et al. Photophobia in multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler Relat Disord*. 2018;26:55-57. doi:10.1016/j.msard.2018.09.005

50. Reeder RR. Ganzflicker Reveals the Complex Relationship Between Visual Mental Imagery and Pseudo-Hallucinatory Experiences: A Replication and Expansion. *Collabra Psychol*. 2022;8(1):36318. doi:10.1525/collabra.36318

51. de Pémille CV, Rekik S, Amiel H, et al. Contribution of intermittent photic stimulation to routine EEG. *Neurophysiol Clin Clin Neurophysiol*. 2021;51(6):549-553. doi:10.1016/j.neucli.2021.10.003

52. Munn Z, Moola S, Lisy K, Riitano D, Murphy F. Claustrophobia in magnetic resonance imaging: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Radiography*. 2015;21(2):e59-e63. doi:10.1016/j.radi.2014.12.004

53. Ong CT, Sheu SM, Tsai CF, Wong YS, Chen SCC. Age-Dependent Sex Difference of the Incidence and Mortality of Status Epilepticus: A Twelve Year Nationwide Population-Based Cohort Study in Taiwan. Biagini G, ed. *PLOS ONE*. 2015;10(3):e0122350. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0122350

54. Gregory RP, Oates T, Merry RTG. Electroencephalogram epileptiform abnormalities in candidates for aircrew training. *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol*. 1993;86(1):75-77. doi:10.1016/0013-4694(93)90069-8

55. Trojaborg W. EEG Abnormalities in 5,893 Jet Pilot Applicants Registered in a 20-Year Period. *Clin Electroencephalogr*. 1992;23(2):72-78. doi:10.1177/155005949202300206

8 Supplemental Material

8.1 List of medications that may lower seizure threshold

Reviewing evidence on medications known to reduce seizure threshold, we arrive at the following list:

Antimicrobials

- **β-lactams**: penicillins, **c**ephalosporins, carbapenems (dose-related risk; carbapenems higher relative risk; also rapid, marked reduction of valproate levels with carbapenems).

- **Isoniazid** (mechanism via pyridoxal-5-phosphate/GABA; pyridoxine reverses toxicity).

- **Fluoroquinolones** (e.g., ciprofloxacin, ofloxacin, levofloxacin; rare but reported; GABAA antagonism).

Antimalarials

- **Mefloquine, chloroquine** (seizures reported in people with and without epilepsy).

Analgesics

- **Opioids** (class effect is context- and dose-dependent; tramadol, buprenorphine and pethidine/meperidine most consistently implicated; others possible under certain conditions).

- **NSAIDs**: aspirin, diclofenac, indometacin (dose-dependent; uncommon clinically). Mefenamic acid can be pro-convulsant at toxic doses. Ibuprofen and paracetamol are *not* implicated.

Methylxanthines (respiratory)

- **Theophylline, aminophylline** (adenosine A1 antagonism; can cause difficult-to-treat seizures in toxicity).

Antipsychotics

- **Clozapine** (strongest signal; clinical seizures ~3–6%).
- Chlorpromazine and other phenothiazines (other antipsychotics have lower but present risk).

- Haloperidol, benperidol, droperidol, melperone, azaperone (butyrophenones)
- Other monoaminergic agents: Venlafaxine and mirtazapine (rare, usually dose-related pro-convulsant effects, most often reported in overdose or at higher therapeutic doses).

Antiepileptics (paradoxically)

- Benzodiazepine withdrawal (withdrawal lowers threshold).
- Withdrawal of topiramate, lamotrigine, gabapentin and pregabalin (can lower seizure threshold and precipitate seizures).
- Carbamazepine (can exacerbate some generalised/myoclonic epilepsies).

Immunosuppressant / Antineoplastic

- **Cyclosporine** (high epileptogenic potential in review).
- **Chlorambucil** (intermediate potential).

Radiology contrast

- **Iodinated contrast media** (low epileptogenic potential; rare events; risk affected by CNS comorbidity).

Smoking cessation

- **Bupropion** (clear, dose-dependent risk at therapeutic use for smoking cessation).

Other

- **Interferon-α** (minimal/inconclusive pro-convulsant potential).
- **Atomoxetine** and stimulant medications for ADHD (e.g. methylphenidate, amphetamine formulations) have a generally low seizure risk once treatment is established, but caution is advised during initiation or recent dose changes; unfamiliarity with a recently prescribed stimulant should prompt conservative screening and, where appropriate, clinical review.

Additional References:

Hitchings, A. W. (2016). Drugs that lower the seizure threshold. Adverse drug reaction bulletin, 298(1), 1151-1154.

Ruffmann, C., Bogliun, G., & Beghi, E. (2006). Epileptogenic drugs: a systematic review. Expert review of neurotherapeutics, 6(4), 575-589.