Visual Mirror Therapy: An Exploratory Framework for Vision Rehabilitation in Children with Cerebral Visual Impairment and an Atelic Profile, Registered Report Stage 1

Author

Edwige Smague[1]

Affiliations:

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

Contact:

edwige@netadiscovery.org

ORCID ID: 0009-0002-8182-7888

Abstract: Children with cerebral visual impairment presenting an atelic profile constitute a population that is largely excluded from neurovisual rehabilitation research. This exclusion is primarily related to the absence of measurable behavioural responses to standard assessment and intervention tasks, often leading to the assumption that a lack of observable response reflects an absence of visual processing. However, converging evidence from neuroscience indicates that preserved neural processing may persist despite the absence of overt behavioural expression.

Inspired by principles derived from mirror therapy in post-stroke motor rehabilitation, this Registered Report proposes a conceptual and methodological framework to examine the feasibility,

tolerability, and measurement reliability of a visual mirror paradigm in children with cerebral visual impairment and an atelic profile. Rather than aiming to restore or train visual function, the visual mirror is defined as the repeated presentation of an artificially coherent, functional, and highly predictable visual experience, designed to temporarily substitute for the unstable or cognitively costly visual input typically encountered by the child.

The paradigm relies on passive visual exposure, delivered via a large screen or a virtual reality headset in a strictly non-interactive mode, without requiring effort, action, task engagement, or voluntary responses from the child. The proposed protocol is embedded within a precautionary ethical framework tailored to behaviourally non-responsive populations. Visual processing is assessed indirectly using non-verbal physiological indicators, such as heart rate and autonomic markers, rather than behavioural performance.

This Registered Report Stage 1 does not aim to evaluate therapeutic efficacy or clinical benefit. Instead, it defines the minimal experimental and ethical conditions required to support future mechanistic and efficacy studies in a population that is currently underrepresented in evidence-based neurovisual research.

Keywords: Atelic profile; cerebral visual impairment (CVI); cerebral plasticity; mirror therapy; non-verbal children; passive virtual reality; vision rehabilitation.

1. Introduction

Cerebral visual impairment (CVI) (1) is now recognised as one of the leading causes of paediatric visual disability. It results from damage to or dysfunction of the cerebral pathways involved in visual processing, independent of ocular integrity (2). Visual difficulties do not present uniformly across children with CVI. Some experience difficulties locating objects with their gaze, while others struggle with motion perception, object recognition, sustained visual attention, or visuomotor coordination.

Within this population, children with atelic profiles represent a particularly marginalised segment. Atelicity is defined here as a persistent inability to initiate, maintain, or orient behaviour towards a goal, even in simple sensory contexts (3). These children are unable to follow instructions or provide reliable responses, effectively excluding them from conventional assessment and rehabilitation paradigms.

This exclusion has created a critical gap, as the lack of empirical data makes it impossible to determine whether these children are truly non-rehabilitable or simply inaccessible to current methods. The present work aims to address this limitation by proposing a

paradigm shift grounded in the concept of implicit neural plasticity.

This manuscript is submitted as a Registered Report Stage 1 and is explicitly limited to the evaluation of feasibility, tolerability, and methodological reliability. It does not aim to assess therapeutic efficacy, clinical benefit, or functional visual improvement.

The primary objective of this Registered Report is to determine whether a visual mirror paradigm can be implemented in children with cerebral visual impairment and an atelic profile under controlled conditions, without inducing sustained physiological distress, and while allowing the collection of stable non-behavioural physiological signals.

Accordingly, the primary feasibility question addressed in this study is as follows: is it feasible to deliver repeated passive visual-mirror exposure sessions to children with CVI and an atelic profile, while maintaining physiological tolerability and obtaining interpretable autonomic markers in the absence of voluntary behavioural responses?

2. The Atelic Child and Visual Experience

2.1 Atelicity as a Disruption of the Perception–Prediction-Action Loop

In atelic children, the absence of goal-directed behaviour should not be interpreted as an absence of perception. Evidence from cognitive research indicates that perceptual and memory-related processing can occur in the absence of voluntary control and overt behavioural expression (4).

Atelicity can be understood as a functional disruption of the perception–prediction–action loop: the child receives sensory information but is unable to integrate it in a stable manner to guide action or exploratory behaviour (5).

2.2 How the Atelic Brain Experiences the Visual World

In atelic children with CVI, visual experience is characterised by (6):

- **Image Instability**: the perceived visual scene may appear fragmented or inconsistent.
- **Excessive Detail**: the brain receives too much information simultaneously and is unable to analyse or prioritise it efficiently.
- **Difficulty Anticipating Change**: an object entering the visual field or a light turning on may be experienced as sudden and unpredictable.

- **Impaired Recognition of Stability**: for example, the brain may fail to recognise that an object remains the same when it moves slightly or when lighting conditions change.

At a neurofunctional level, this situation is associated with simultaneous and non-hierarchical activation of multiple visual and attentional networks, resulting in a high level of prediction error. Over time, visual processing becomes cognitively costly and is progressively disengaged at a functional level (7).

3. Research Question and Objectives

3.1 Primary Feasibility Question

The visual mirror paradigm evaluated in this Registered Report Stage 1 is conceptually derived from mirror therapy approaches originally developed in post-stroke motor rehabilitation (8), while differing fundamentally in its mechanism of action through functional substitution rather than visual comparison (9). In the context of cerebral visual impairment, the paradigm is designed to provide a coherent and predictable visual input capable of temporarily substituting for unstable or cognitively costly sensory experiences, consistent with predictive processing frameworks (7) and principles of sensory substitution (10).

The primary feasibility question addressed in this Registered Report Stage 1 is therefore as follows: is it feasible to deliver repeated passive visual-mirror exposure sessions to children with cerebral visual impairment and an atelic profile, while maintaining physiological tolerability and obtaining stable, interpretable non-behavioural physiological signals in the absence of voluntary behavioural responses?

3.2 Primary Objective

The primary objective of this Registered Report Stage 1 is to evaluate the feasibility and tolerability of a passive visual-mirror exposure protocol in children with cerebral visual impairment and an atelic profile. Feasibility is defined in terms of the ability to implement the protocol as planned, without inducing sustained physiological distress, and while allowing the collection of usable autonomic physiological measures, in a population for whom active task-based paradigms are not accessible (7).

3.3 Secondary Methodological Objectives

The secondary objectives of this study are strictly methodological and exploratory. They include:

- to assess whether non-behavioural physiological measures, such as heart rate and heart rate variability, can be reliably recorded during passive visual-mirror exposure sessions in this population;

- to examine the intra-individual stability and variability of these physiological signals across repeated sessions, under conditions of highly controlled and predictable visual stimulation (7);
- to document rates of session completion, interruption, or early termination due to signs of non-verbal dissent or physiological distress, in line with precautionary ethical principles;
- to explore whether protocol tolerability varies across individual neurovisual profiles within the atelic population, without making claims of group-level inference.

3.4 Reference to Feasibility and Success Criteria

Feasibility, tolerability, and success criteria are defined *a priori* and will be used to guide interpretation of the results of this Stage 1 Registered Report. These criteria, including predefined physiological thresholds and decision rules for protocol continuation or interruption, are detailed in Table 1.

Table 1. Study framework for Registered Report Stage 1: research questions, objectives, indicators, and predefined feasibility and success criteria.

Category	Indicator	criteria for success / interpretation
Protocol Implementation	Session Completion Rate	≥ 75% of planned sessions are completed without premature termination across a minimum sample of 10 participants.
Technical Reliability	Usable Physiological	≥ 80% of sessions yield usable HR and HRV data (defined as < 20% signal artefact) at the individual level.

Note. HR: Heart Rate; HRV: Heart Rate Variability.

	Data	
Physiological Tolerability	Acute Distress Signal	HR remains within < 20% increase from individual baseline for at least 90% of exposure time for each participant.
Autonomic Stability	HRV Stability	Absence of a persistent decrease in HRV sustained over 3 consecutive sessions within participant.
Ethical Safety	Dissent Response	100% compliance with the immediate termination upon detection of non-verbal dissent markers.
Attrition	Participant Withdrawal	Study is considered feasible if ≤ 20% of participants (i.e. no more than 2 out of 10) withdraw due to intolerance.
Informational Potential	Signal Sensitivity	Detection of measurable physiological shifts during controlled novelty phases in ≥ 50% of participants within the predefined feasibility sample.

Table 1 summarises the primary feasibility question, objectives, indicators, and predefined success criteria of this Registered Report Stage 1. In accordance with the principles of Registered Reports, all feasibility, tolerability, and measurement reliability criteria are specified *a priori*, prior to data collection. The table links each research objective to concrete physiological or procedural indicators and to explicit decision rules that will guide interpretation of the study outcomes. Importantly, these criteria are not intended to demonstrate therapeutic efficacy or clinical benefit. Rather, they determine whether the proposed visual mirror paradigm can be implemented under controlled conditions in children with cerebral visual impairment and an atelic profile, while ensuring ethical safety and enabling the acquisition of interpretable non-behavioural physiological data. This framework ensures transparency, prevents post hoc reinterpretation, and establishes a clear methodological foundation for subsequent mechanistic, or efficacy studies should feasibility be demonstrated.

4. Methods

4.1 Participants

Target Population

The target population comprises children with CVI presenting an atelic profile, defined as a persistent inability to initiate, maintain, or orient behaviour towards a goal, even in simple sensory contexts. This population is characterised by limited or absent voluntary behavioural responses, which currently precludes participation in conventional visual assessment or rehabilitation protocols.

Given the exploratory and feasibility-focused nature of this Registered Report Stage 1, no formal sample size calculation is performed. A minimum target sample of 10 participants is specified *a priori* as sufficient to assess protocol feasibility, tolerability, and measurement reliability in this rare and heterogeneous population, using an intra-individual design.

Inclusion Criteria

Participants must meet the following criteria:

- a clinical diagnosis of CVI, established by a qualified clinician, independent of ocular pathology;
- a behavioural profile consistent with atelicity, operationalised as the absence of reliable goal-directed responses to visual or task-based instructions;

- age within the paediatric range appropriate for non-invasive physiological monitoring, as determined by the host institution ethics committee;
- medical stability allowing participation in brief passive visual exposure sessions without contraindication;
- informed consent obtained from a parent or legal guardian.

Exclusion Criteria

Participants meeting any of the following criteria will be excluded:

- uncontrolled epilepsy or recent seizure activity judged to pose a risk during visual stimulation;
- severe medical instability or acute illness at the time of participation.
- known intolerance to screen-based or head-mounted visual exposure;
- conditions preventing the reliable acquisition of physiological signals, such as severe movement disorders incompatible with sensor placement;
- any clinical judgement indicating that participation would not be in the child's best interest.

Ethical Justification

The ethical justification of the present protocol lies in its methodological design rather than in the general vulnerability of the target population. The proposed visual-mirror paradigm is strictly passive, non-invasive, and does not require instruction following, task engagement, or voluntary behavioural responses. As such, it is specifically adapted to children for whom conventional assessment or intervention procedures are not ethically appropriate due to their inability to provide reliable behavioural assent.

Given the limited capacity for verbal or behavioural communication in children with an atelic profile, the absence of overt response is not interpreted as consent. Instead, participant protection is ensured through continuous monitoring of predefined physiological and behavioural indicators of potential non-verbal dissent. Any signal suggesting discomfort or distress results in the immediate termination of the session. This precautionary approach minimises risk exposure while allowing the evaluation of protocol feasibility under controlled conditions.

This Registered Report Stage 1 does not involve therapeutic intent, does not seek to induce functional change, and does not withhold standard care. Its sole purpose is to determine whether the protocol can be implemented safely and tolerably, thereby establishing the

ethical and methodological preconditions required for any future empirical investigation in this population.

4.2 Setting and Equipment

The visual mirror paradigm is delivered in a controlled clinical or research setting designed to minimise extraneous sensory stimulation and to ensure participant safety. All sessions take place in a quiet room with reduced ambient noise and simplified visual surroundings, in order to limit non-specific sensory load and potential sources of distraction.

Modes of Visual Presentation

Visual stimuli are presented using one of two equivalent modalities, depending on participant tolerance and practical constraints:

- A large screen positioned directly in front of the child, used when head-mounted devices are not tolerated or are contraindicated.
- A virtual reality headset configured in a strictly passive, non-interactive mode, providing full field visual immersion and reducing peripheral visual input.

Both modalities are designed to deliver identical visual content and temporal parameters. No interactive features, task demands, or response contingencies are included in either modality.

The protocol is therefore evaluated for feasibility across modalities rather than for equivalence between modalities.

Controlled Conditions

Across both presentation modes, the following parameters are controlled and standardised:

- Stimulus size, contrast, luminance, colour, and motion characteristics.
- Duration of visual exposure blocks and inter-block intervals.
- Viewing distance in the screen condition, adjusted to promote central visual exposure while limiting peripheral engagement.
- Absence of additional visual, auditory, or tactile stimulation during exposure.

The purpose of this controlled environment is not to create an immersive or engaging experience, but to ensure precise regulation of visual input and to reduce parasitic sensory stimulation. This configuration is intended to approximate a mirror-like condition in which the brain is exposed to a single, isolated, and predictable visual signal.

Equipment for Physiological Monitoring

Physiological data are acquired using non-invasive sensors suitable for paediatric populations. Monitoring focuses on autonomic measures, including heart rate and heart rate variability, recorded continuously throughout baseline, exposure, and post-exposure periods. Sensor placement and data acquisition procedures are selected to minimise discomfort and to allow signal recording without requiring voluntary movement, verbalisation, or task engagement from the child.

Signal quality is assessed in real time to identify artefacts resulting from excessive movement, sensor displacement, or technical failure. Periods of data affected by such artefacts are flagged and excluded from analysis according to predefined criteria.

4.3 Visual Mirror Exposure Protocol

The visual mirror exposure protocol consists of brief, repeated, and strictly controlled sessions of passive visual stimulation. The protocol is designed to expose the child to a simple, coherent, and highly predictable visual environment, without requiring instruction following, task engagement, or voluntary behavioural responses.

Session Structure

Each session comprises the following sequential phases:

1. **Baseline Phase**

A resting baseline is recorded prior to visual exposure. During this phase, no visual stimulus is presented. Physiological signals are recorded to establish the individual resting autonomic state.

2. **Stabilisation Phase**

A static, high contrast visual stimulus is presented against a uniform background. This phase is intended to allow engagement with a stable visual signal without the need to process motion or change.

3. **Continuity Phase**

The visual stimulus undergoes slow, continuous, and regular motion, such as linear translation at a constant velocity. No acceleration, abrupt transitions, or unpredictable changes are introduced.

4. **Controlled Novelty Phase**

Limited and predictable modifications are introduced to the stimulus, such as gradual changes in colour, size, or trajectory. These changes are predefined and infrequent and are intended to probe autonomic sensitivity while avoiding sensory overload.

All phases are delivered in a fixed order. No adaptive or contingent modifications are applied within a session.

Stimulus Parameters

Across all sessions, visual stimuli are characterised by:

- A very limited number of objects presented simultaneously.
- High contrast between stimulus and background.
- Slow and continuous motion when movement is present.
- Absence of faces, social content, symbolic material, or rapid visual events.

Stimulus parameters, including duration, luminance, contrast, colour range, and motion characteristics, are predefined and remain identical across participants, except where minor adjustments are required to ensure tolerability.

Temporal Progression

The protocol follows a predefined temporal progression across multiple weeks, with gradual increases in perceptual complexity introduced only after successful completion of earlier stages. Early sessions prioritise static and highly predictable stimuli, whereas later sessions introduce controlled novelty in a structured manner.

This progression is intended to minimise perceptual load and to reduce prediction error, while allowing repeated exposure under stable conditions. The full session schedule and temporal progression are specified *a priori* and summarised in Table 2.

Table 2. Visual-Mirror Exposure Protocol: session structure, stimulus parameters, and temporal progression.

Phase	Visual content	Motion characteristics	Duration (minutes)	Predictability level	Purpose
Baseline	No stimulus	None	3	Not applicable	Establish individual autonomic resting state
Stabilisation	Single high-contrast static object	None	4	Maximal	Promote visual stability and reduce sensory load
Continuity	Same object	Slow linear motion at constant velocity	4	High	Support temporal predictability and sustained engagement
Controlled novelty	Same object	Predefined gradual change (colour, size, or trajectory)	2	Moderate, predefined	Probe autonomic sensitivity without sensory overload

Week range	Phases included	Novelty introduction
Weeks 1 to 2	Baseline, Stabilisation	None
Weeks 3 to 4	Baseline, Stabilisation, Continuity	None
Weeks 5 to 6	All phases	Controlled novelty only

Table 2 summarises the structure of the visual mirror exposure protocol, including session phases, stimulus parameters, and temporal progression. All durations, stimulus characteristics, and phase sequences are predefined *a priori* in accordance with Registered Report requirements. The protocol is intentionally brief to minimise physiological burden and to ensure tolerability in a behaviourally non-responsive paediatric population. Temporal progression across weeks is fixed and does not adapt to observed responses, except when predefined safety stopping rules are triggered. This table provides the operational specification required for protocol replication, auditing, and future comparative evaluation.

Protocol Integrity

All sessions are delivered according to the predefined protocol without modification based on observed physiological responses, except in cases where stopping rules are triggered. Any deviation from the planned session structure, including early termination, is documented and considered in feasibility assessment.

4.4 Outcomes and Measures

The present Registered Report Stage 1 does not aim to assess therapeutic efficacy or functional visual improvement. All

outcomes are strictly methodological and exploratory, and are selected to evaluate feasibility, tolerability, and measurement reliability of the visual mirror paradigm in a behaviourally non-responsive paediatric population.

Outcome measures are limited to non-behavioural physiological signals, defined as autonomic physiological measures recorded without requiring voluntary motor, verbal, or task-based responses from the child. Autonomic physiological measures are not interpreted as specific markers of visual processing, but as non-behavioural indicators of physiological regulation, tolerability, and phase-dependent sensitivity to controlled visual input. In this population, such measures represent the only ethically and practically accessible signals available for feasibility assessment. These measures are chosen to allow indirect assessment of physiological engagement and tolerability during passive visual exposure.

Primary Outcomes

The primary outcomes relate to physiological tolerability of the protocol. Tolerability is operationalised as the absence of sustained autonomic destabilisation indicative of distress during or following exposure. The following measures are recorded continuously throughout baseline, exposure, and post-exposure phases:

- Heart rate, used to detect acute or sustained autonomic activation relative to individual baseline.
- Heart rate variability, used as an index of autonomic flexibility and parasympathetic regulation.

Predefined thresholds for physiological alert and stopping rules are specified *a priori* and detailed in Section 4.5.

Secondary Outcomes

Secondary outcomes are methodological and descriptive in nature. They include:

- The feasibility of acquiring continuous, interpretable physiological signals across all session phases.
- The presence or absence of non-verbal dissent markers, defined as behavioural or physiological signals interpreted as refusal or discomfort, including abrupt increases in heart rate, sustained reduction in heart rate variability, sudden motor stiffening, agitation, or atypical vocalisations.
- The proportion of sessions completed as planned versus interrupted or terminated early due to safety criteria.
- Intra-individual stability and variability of physiological signals across repeated sessions.

No outcome relies on behavioural performance, visual choice, task completion, or explicit communication from the child.

Measurement Windows

Physiological measures are analysed within predefined temporal windows corresponding to each session phase. Baseline measures serve as the individual reference state. Changes observed during stabilisation, continuity, and controlled novelty phases are interpreted relative to this baseline, without inference of cognitive or perceptual content.

Periods affected by signal artefact, defined as loss or distortion of the physiological signal rendering data uninterpretable due to excessive movement or sensor displacement, are flagged and excluded according to predefined criteria.

All outcomes and indicators are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3. Outcomes, measures, indicators, and interpretation framework

Outcome domain	Measure	Phase(s)	Indicator	Interpretation purpose
Physiological Tolerability	HR	All phases	Stability relative to baseline	Assess autonomic tolerability of exposure without inference of therapeutic effect.
Physiological Tolerability	HRV	All phases	Maintenance of autonomic flexibility	Detect physiological stress or destabilisation as safety indicators only.
Feasibility of Measurement	Signal Acquisition Quality	All phases	Proportion of usable signal	Determine feasibility of physiological monitoring in a non-responsive population.
Non-Verbal Dissent	Behavioural and Physiological Markers	All phases	Presence of predefined indicators	Trigger stopping rules as an ethical safeguard, not an outcome.
Session Completion	Session Status	Whole session	Completed versus interrupted	Assess procedural feasibility independent of clinical change
Measurement Reliability	Intra-individual signal patterns	Across sessions	Signal consistency	Evaluate methodological robustness without group-level inference.

Note: HR: Heart Rate; HRV: Heart Rate Variability

Table 3 summarises the predefined outcomes, measures, and indicators used to evaluate feasibility, tolerability, and measurement reliability in this Registered Report Stage 1. All outcomes are specified *a priori* and are strictly non-behavioural in nature. The framework is designed to determine whether stable and interpretable physiological data can be collected during passive visual mirror exposure, while ensuring participant safety. These outcomes are not intended to support claims regarding visual perception, cognitive processing, or therapeutic efficacy, but to establish the methodological preconditions required for future mechanistic or interventional studies.

4.5 Safety and Stopping Rules

Participant safety is a central component of the present Registered Report Stage 1, given the vulnerability of the target population and the absence of reliable verbal or behavioural assent. The visual mirror protocol is therefore governed by predefined safety thresholds and stopping rules designed to prioritise physiological and behavioural indicators of potential discomfort or distress.

Safety Monitoring Framework

Safety monitoring relies on continuous observation of non-behavioural physiological signals and behavioural micro indicators

throughout all phases of each session, including baseline, exposure, and post-exposure periods. Monitoring is conducted in real time by trained personnel, with immediate authority to interrupt the session if predefined criteria are met.

The absence of overt behavioural response is not interpreted as consent or tolerance. Instead, safety assessment is based on objective physiological changes and observable behavioural signs that may indicate non-verbal dissent.

Physiological Stopping Criteria

Sessions are immediately terminated if any of the following physiological criteria are met:

- a sudden and sustained increase in heart rate exceeding approximately 20% above the individual resting baseline, persisting beyond transient fluctuations.
- a marked and persistent reduction in heart rate variability relative to baseline levels, indicative of reduced autonomic flexibility.
- any pattern of autonomic destabilisation suggesting sustained physiological activation rather than transient orienting responses.

These thresholds are operational precautionary criteria rather than diagnostic markers. They are defined *a priori* to prevent prolonged exposure to potential stress in the absence of subjective reporting.

Behavioural Stopping Criteria

In parallel with physiological monitoring, sessions are terminated immediately if any of the following behavioural indicators are observed:

- sudden motor stiffening or freezing not present at baseline.
- Marked agitation, repetitive movements, or abrupt changes in posture;
- atypical vocalisations or changes in breathing pattern suggestive of distress;
- any behavioural change judged by the supervising clinician or researcher to reflect discomfort or refusal.

Behavioural indicators are interpreted conservatively. When uncertainty exists, the decision rule favours terminating the session.

Stopping Procedures and Documentation

If a stopping criterion is met, visual stimulation is ceased immediately, and the child is returned to a neutral resting state. No attempt is made to resume the session on the same day.

All instances of early termination, including the triggering criterion and session phase, are systematically documented and incorporated

into feasibility and tolerability analyses. Early termination is not considered a protocol deviation but a predefined outcome relevant to feasibility assessment.

Ethical positioning

These stopping rules operationalise a precautionary ethical framework in which participant protection supersedes data completeness. The protocol does not aim to infer subjective emotional states but to establish clear, auditable decision rules for discontinuation based on observable biological and behavioural signals.

The presence, frequency, and context of stopping events constitute key feasibility outcomes in this Stage 1 Registered Report and directly inform the ethical viability of future empirical investigations using this paradigm.

4.6 Procedure timeline

The procedure follows a predefined and fixed timeline designed to evaluate feasibility, tolerability, and measurement reliability of the visual mirror paradigm across repeated exposures. The timeline is structured to minimise sensory load, ensure participant safety, and allow assessment of intra individual physiological stability over time.

Each participant follows the same temporal progression, independent of physiological responses, except in cases where predefined stopping rules are triggered. No adaptive modification of stimulus parameters is performed based on interim observations.

The protocol is organised into three successive phases spanning six weeks. Progression from one phase to the next is contingent solely on successful completion of the planned sessions, defined by the absence of sustained physiological distress and the ability to acquire interpretable physiological signals.

Early sessions prioritise maximal predictability and perceptual stability. Subsequent sessions introduce controlled and limited novelty in order to probe autonomic sensitivity while maintaining a low cognitive and sensory burden.

All sessions are scheduled with sufficient temporal spacing to avoid cumulative fatigue or sensitisation effects. Session frequency and duration are identical across participants.

The full procedure timeline, including session content and duration, is specified *a priori* and summarised in Table 4.

Table 4. Procedure timeline and visual mirror exposure progression

Phase	Weeks	Session duration
Initial exposure (static stimuli)	Weeks 1–2	**10 to 15 minutes per session**
Predictable motion exposure	Weeks 3–4	**10 to 15 minutes per session**
Controlled novelty exposure	Weeks 5–6	**10 to 15 minutes per session**

Table 4 summarises the predefined temporal structure of the visual mirror exposure protocol. Each phase is designed to incrementally modulate perceptual complexity while preserving high stimulus predictability.

Session durations are intentionally brief to reduce physiological and sensory burden. The progression from static to dynamic stimuli, followed by controlled novelty, reflects the theoretical aim of gradually engaging visual predictive mechanisms without inducing overload.

This timeline does not represent a therapeutic dose escalation and is not intended to induce functional change. Its sole purpose is to support evaluation of protocol feasibility, tolerability, and physiological signal stability within a Registered Report Stage 1 framework.

5. Data Analysis Plan

This section outlines the predefined descriptive analysis framework used to evaluate feasibility, tolerability, and

measurement reliability of the visual mirror paradigm in this Registered Report Stage 1. The analyses focus exclusively on non-behavioural physiological signals, predefined temporal windows corresponding to protocol phases, and explicit decision rules specified *a priori*. No hypothesis testing or efficacy evaluation is planned at this stage. The complete data analysis plan, including signals, temporal windows, indicators, and decision thresholds, is summarised in Table 5.

Table 5. Data analysis plan: signals, windows, indicators, and decision rules

Analysis domain	Physiological signal	Temporal window	Descriptive metric	Indicator	Decision rule
Baseline Physiological State	HR	Pre-exposure	Mean HR	Stable autonomic baseline	Baseline valid if signal is continuous and artefact-free for each participant.
Baseline Physiological State	HRV	Pre-exposure	Time-domain indices	Interpretable baseline	Retained if indices are computable at the individual level.
Exposure Tolerability	HR	Stabilisation	Mean and peak HR	Absence of sustained activation	Session continues if HR remains within predefined thresholds for that participant.
Exposure Tolerability	HRV	Stabilisation	Qualitative pattern	Autonomic stability	Session interrupted if sustained reduction indicating distress is observed.
Sensitivity to Controlled Novelty	HR	Controlled novelty phase	Peak and pattern relative to baseline	Autonomic reactivity	Data point included in intra-individual analysis if signal quality meets Table 1 criteria; session terminated if non-verbal dissent markers (Section 4.5) are detected.
Non-Verbal Dissent	Combined Signals	All phases	Presence of markers	Ethical safety	Immediate termination upon detection.
Measurement Reliability	HR and HRV	Across sessions	Intra-individual consistency	Signal stability	Assessed descriptively within participants across repeated sessions
Feasibility Assessment	Procedural Indicators	Entire protocol	Completion rate	Implementability	Overall feasibility evaluated across the predefined feasibility sample (minimum n = 10), without group-level inference

Note: HR: Herat Rate; HRV: Heart Rate Variability

Table 5 summarises the predefined data analysis plan for this Registered Report Stage 1, linking each analytical domain to specific physiological signals, temporal windows, descriptive metrics, and explicit decision rules. In line with the objectives of a feasibility-focused Registered Report, the table specifies how physiological data will be examined descriptively at the individual level, without hypothesis testing or group-level inference. The decision rules outlined in the table define *a priori* the conditions under which protocol feasibility, physiological tolerability, and measurement reliability will be considered achieved, partially achieved, or not achieved. By specifying these analytical procedures before data collection, the table ensures transparency, prevents analytical flexibility, and establishes a clear framework for interpreting outcomes strictly in terms of feasibility rather than therapeutic efficacy.

5.1 General Analytical Framework

This Registered Report Stage 1 is not designed to test therapeutic efficacy, causal effects, or group-level hypotheses. All analyses are therefore descriptive, exploratory, and strictly limited to the evaluation of feasibility, tolerability, and measurement reliability of the visual mirror paradigm.

Analyses focus on intra-individual trajectories rather than between-participant comparisons. Each child serves as their own reference, and no inferential statistics aimed at generalisation are planned at this stage.

No hypothesis testing, effect size estimation, or correction for multiple comparisons will be conducted.

5.2 Data Preprocessing and Signal Quality Control

Physiological signals are visually and algorithmically inspected prior to analysis to identify artefacts related to movement, sensor displacement, or technical failure.

Segments affected by signal artefact are flagged and excluded according to predefined criteria. Only periods with interpretable physiological data are retained for analysis.

Baseline values are computed individually for each participant using resting state segments recorded prior to visual exposure.

5.3 Descriptive Analysis of Physiological Signals

Heart rate and heart rate variability are summarised using descriptive statistics within predefined temporal windows corresponding to protocol phases.

Analyses examine:

- baseline resting periods,
- stabilisation phases,
- continuity phases,
- controlled novelty phases.

For each participant, temporal evolution of physiological signals is visualised across sessions using within subject plots and time series representations.

No aggregation across participants is performed.

5.4 Assessment of Feasibility and Tolerability

Feasibility outcomes are evaluated using procedural indicators, including:

- number of sessions initiated,
- number of sessions completed,
- frequency and timing of early session termination,
- occurrence of protocol deviations.

Tolerability is assessed through the absence or presence of sustained physiological activation exceeding predefined thresholds, and through documentation of non verbal dissent markers triggering session interruption.

These outcomes are summarised descriptively at the individual level.

5.5 Assessment of Measurement Reliability

Measurement reliability is examined by evaluating:

- stability of physiological signals across repeated sessions within individuals,
- consistency of signal patterns across comparable protocol phases,
- proportion of sessions yielding usable physiological data.

Reliability assessment does not assume stationarity or normality of signals and is limited to descriptive pattern identification.

5.6 Interpretation Framework and Decision Rules

Interpretation relies on within-session and within-individual contrasts across predefined protocol phases, rather than on absolute autonomic values. Differential autonomic patterns observed between baseline, stabilisation, continuity, and controlled novelty phases are used to characterise the internal structure and interpretability of physiological signals. These contrasts inform decision rules by allowing distinction between phase-dependent physiological organisation and random fluctuation or non-specific

global activation. They are not used to infer magnitude of response, functional visual processing, or therapeutic effect.

Outcomes are interpreted as indicating:

- feasibility achieved,
- feasibility partially achieved,
- feasibility not achieved,

based on the combination of protocol completion rates, physiological tolerability, and signal interpretability.

No post hoc modification of decision thresholds is permitted.

Importantly, the protocol is considered feasible even if physiological stabilisation reflects habituation rather than engagement, provided predefined tolerability and signal interpretability criteria are met.

5.7 Transparency and Reproducibility

All analysis procedures, decision rules, and feasibility criteria are defined prior to data collection to prevent analytical flexibility and post hoc reinterpretation.

This analytical framework establishes the methodological conditions required to justify progression to future mechanistic or efficacy studies, contingent upon feasibility being demonstrated.

6. Ethics, Oversight, and Regulatory Considerations

This Registered Report Stage 1 presents a conceptual and methodological protocol and does not involve the collection, analysis, or reporting of empirical data from human participants. No study procedures have been initiated, and no participants have been recruited at this stage.

The proposed visual mirror paradigm is intended for future empirical implementation in a highly vulnerable paediatric population. Consequently, ethical considerations are integrated at the protocol design level, prior to any data collection. Formal ethical approval will be sought from the appropriate Human Research Ethics Committee at the host institution before the commencement of any study involving human participants.

The protocol is designed in accordance with the precautionary principle. The visual mirror exposure is strictly passive, non-invasive, and does not require instruction following, task engagement, or voluntary behavioural responses. The absence of overt behavioural response is not interpreted as consent. Participant protection relies on continuous monitoring of predefined physiological and behavioural indicators of potential

non-verbal dissent, including autonomic destabilisation and observable signs of distress. Any indication of non-verbal dissent will result in immediate termination of the session.

No therapeutic intent is associated with this Stage 1 protocol. The study does not aim to induce functional change, does not replace or withhold standard care, and does not involve deception, randomisation, or experimental manipulation beyond controlled visual exposure. The sole purpose of the proposed protocol is to determine whether the paradigm can be implemented safely, tolerably, and with sufficient measurement reliability to justify future mechanistic or efficacy studies.

Data management, storage, and analysis procedures for any future implementation will comply with institutional, national, and international regulations governing research involving children and vulnerable populations. Any subsequent Stage 2 Registered Report or clinical study will be contingent upon successful demonstration of feasibility and ethical acceptability as defined in the present protocol.

7. Discussion

This Registered Report Stage 1 proposes a structured and ethically grounded framework to evaluate the feasibility, tolerability, and measurement reliability of a visual mirror paradigm in children with cerebral visual impairment presenting an atelic profile. This

population is largely excluded from conventional neurovisual research due to the absence of reliable behavioural responses, resulting in a critical methodological gap. The present work addresses this gap by shifting the focus from behavioural performance to passive exposure and non-behavioural physiological indicators.

The primary contribution of this protocol lies in the explicit operationalisation of feasibility and tolerability criteria in a population for whom standard outcome measures are not applicable. By defining *a priori* decision rules, physiological thresholds, and stopping criteria, the study establishes a transparent framework that allows clear interpretation of outcomes without post hoc adjustment. This approach aligns with the core principles of Registered Reports and ensures methodological rigour at the earliest stage of investigation.

Importantly, this Stage 1 protocol does not aim to demonstrate therapeutic efficacy, functional improvement, or neural plasticity. Instead, it seeks to determine whether the visual mirror paradigm can be implemented safely and consistently, and whether interpretable autonomic signals can be obtained under controlled conditions. The absence of group level inference, hypothesis testing, or efficacy claims is a deliberate and necessary constraint at this stage.

Several limitations are inherent to the present design. The exclusive reliance on descriptive intra individual analyses precludes any conclusions regarding generalisability or clinical benefit. In addition, physiological measures are used solely as indicators of tolerability and signal stability, not as proxies for perceptual or cognitive processing. These limitations are intrinsic to the feasibility oriented nature of Stage 1 Registered Reports and do not represent methodological weaknesses.

If feasibility, tolerability, and measurement reliability are demonstrated according to the predefined criteria, the present protocol will provide a robust foundation for subsequent Stage 2 Registered Reports or empirical studies. Such future work may then address mechanistic questions, refine stimulus parameters, or explore clinical relevance, contingent upon appropriate ethical approval and preregistration.

In summary, this Registered Report Stage 1 establishes a necessary methodological and ethical precondition for studying visual interventions in a behaviourally non-responsive paediatric population. By prioritising feasibility and safety over efficacy claims, it opens a controlled and auditable pathway for future research that would otherwise remain inaccessible.

Declarations

Ethics Statement: This manuscript presents a conceptual and methodological framework developed within an independent research programme. No data involving human participants were collected, generated, or analysed as part of the present work.

The proposed protocol is intended to inform future empirical research involving vulnerable paediatric populations. Formal ethical approval will be sought from the appropriate Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) at the host institution prior to the commencement of any study involving human participants.

The framework has been designed in accordance with the precautionary principle. Given the limited capacity for verbal assent in the target population, the absence of a behavioural response is not interpreted as consent. The protocol explicitly integrates physiological and behavioural indicators as markers of potential non-verbal dissent, and any such indicators would lead to immediate termination of the session in future implementations.

Data and Materials Availability

No empirical data were collected for this study. The protocol materials and methodological documentation have been archived in a private repository and can be shared with reviewers or editors upon request.

Data Availability Statement

Not applicable. No data were generated or analysed in the current study.

1. Smague E. Literature Review of the Influence of Neurovisual Disorders on the Diagnosis of Autism in Australian Children. Current Developmental Disorders Reports. 2024;12(1):3.

2. Chokron S, Bernard JM, Imbert M. Length representation in normal and neglect subjects with opposite reading habits studied through a line extension task. Cortex. 1997;33(1):47–64.

3. Hacohen A, editor The psychological reality of the telic/atelic distinction: Evidence from adult and child Hebrew. Proceedings of the 21st Annual Meeting of the Israel Associations for Theoretical Linguistics,(unnumbered); 2006.

4. Derrien D, Garric C, Sergent C, Chokron S. The nature of blindsight: implications for current theories of consciousness. Neurosci Conscious. 2022;2022(1):niab043.

5. Friston K, Mattout J, Kilner J. Action understanding and active inference. Biol Cybern. 2011;104(1-2):137–60.

6. Dutton GN, Jacobson LK. Cerebral visual impairment in children. Semin Neonatol. 2001;6(6):477–85.

7. Friston K. The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory? Nat Rev Neurosci. 2010;11(2):127–38.

8. Ramachandran VS, Rogers-Ramachandran D. Synaesthesia in phantom limbs induced with mirrors. Proc Biol Sci. 1996;263(1369):377–86.

9. Altschuler EL, Wisdom SB, Stone L, Foster C, Galasko D, Llewellyn DM, et al. Rehabilitation of hemiparesis after stroke with a mirror. Lancet. 1999;353(9169):2035–6.

10. Bach-y-Rita P, S WK. Sensory substitution and the human-machine interface. Trends Cogn Sci. 2003;7(12):541–6.

11. Rizzo AS, Koenig ST. Is clinical virtual reality ready for primetime? Neuropsychology. 2017;31(8):877–99.

12. Lueck AH, Dutton G. Vision and the brain: Understanding cerebral visual impairment in children: AFB Press, American Foundation for the Blind Arlington, VA; 2015.

13. Cohen-Maitre SA. Visual attention in children with cortical visual impairment: ProQuest Information & Learning; 2002.

14. Sciences CfIOoM. International ethical guidelines for health-related research involving humans. Geneva: Cioms. 2016.

15. Porges SW. The polyvagal perspective. Biological psychology. 2007;74(2):116–43.

16. 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.

17. Zeki S, Shipp S. The functional logic of cortical connections. Nature. 1988;335(6188):311–7.

18. Cohen MX. Analyzing neural time series data: theory and practice: MIT press; 2014.

19. Dehaene S, Changeux JP, Naccache L, Sackur J, Sergent C. Conscious, preconscious, and subliminal processing: a testable taxonomy. Trends Cogn Sci. 2006;10(5):204–11.

20. Kazdin AE. Single-case experimental designs. Evaluating interventions in research and clinical practice. Behaviour Research and Therapy. 2019;117:3–17.

21. Hersen M. Single-Case Experimental Designs. In: Bellack AS, Hersen M, Kazdin AE, editors. International Handbook of Behavior Modification and Therapy: Second Edition. Boston, MA: Springer US; 1990. p. 175–210.