Visual Mirror Exposure for Children with Cerebral Visual Impairment and an Atelic Profile: A Clinical Feasibility Study Protocol.

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 (CVI) presenting an atelic profile constitute a population that is largely excluded from neurovisual research, primarily due to the absence of reliable behavioural responses to standard assessment or intervention paradigms. This exclusion often leads to the assumption that a lack of observable response reflects an absence of visual processing, despite converging evidence from neuroscience indicating that neural processing may persist in the absence of overt behavioural expression.

This protocol describes a clinical feasibility study designed to evaluate the feasibility, tolerability, and measurement reliability of a passive visual mirror exposure paradigm in children with CVI

and an atelic profile. The visual mirror is defined as the repeated presentation of a highly predictable, coherent visual experience, intended to reduce perceptual instability and cognitive load associated with typical visual environments, without aiming to restore or train visual function.

The paradigm relies on passive visual exposure delivered via a large screen, or, where appropriate and tolerated, a virtual reality headset configured in a strictly non-interactive mode, without requiring effort, task engagement, or voluntary responses from the child. The study is embedded within a precautionary ethical framework specifically adapted to behaviourally non-responsive paediatric populations, defined here as children presenting absent voluntary behavioural responses to sensory or task-based instructions.

Feasibility and tolerability are assessed using predefined safety criteria and non-verbal physiological indicators, including heart rate and autonomic markers, rather than behavioural performance.

This feasibility study is designed to characterise the ethical acceptability, implementability, and physiological tolerability of the protocol in this vulnerable population, and to inform future research considerations without implying any obligation or commitment to subsequent studies.

Keywords: Atelic profile; cerebral visual impairment (CVI); cerebral plasticity; visual mirror exposure; 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 associated with CVI are heterogeneous and may include impairments in gaze orienting, motion perception, object recognition, sustained visual attention, or visuomotor coordination.

Within this population, children presenting an atelic profile constitute a particularly marginalised group. Atelicity is defined here as a persistent inability to initiate, maintain, or orient behaviour towards a goal, even in simple sensory contexts (3). Children with atelic profiles are typically unable to follow instructions or produce reliable behavioural responses, which effectively excludes them from conventional visual assessment and rehabilitation paradigms that rely on task engagement or observable performance.

This exclusion has created a significant methodological and ethical gap. The absence of empirical data in this subgroup makes it

difficult to determine whether these children are genuinely non-responsive to visual stimuli or whether they are simply inaccessible to existing assessment methods. In this context, behavioural non-responsiveness cannot be assumed to reflect an absence of visual processing, as converging evidence from neuroscience indicates that perceptual and neural processing may persist in the absence of overt behavioural expression.

The present study addresses this gap by proposing a feasibility-focused methodological approach designed to evaluate physiological responses to controlled visual stimuli in the absence of voluntary behaviour. Rather than aiming to assess therapeutic efficacy, clinical benefit, or functional visual improvement, the protocol is explicitly limited to evaluating whether a passive visual mirror exposure paradigm can be implemented safely and tolerably in children with CVI and an atelic profile, while allowing the acquisition of stable, non-behavioural physiological signals.

The primary objective of this feasibility study is to determine whether repeated sessions of passive visual mirror exposure can be delivered under controlled conditions without inducing sustained physiological distress, and while enabling the collection of interpretable autonomic markers. 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 in behaviourally non-responsive paediatric populations?

2. The Atelic Child and Visual Experience

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

In children presenting an atelic profile, the absence of goal-directed behaviour should not be interpreted as an absence of perception. Evidence from cognitive and neuroscientific research indicates that perceptual and memory-related processing can occur in the absence of voluntary control or overt behavioural expression (4). Accordingly, limited behavioural responsiveness does not preclude the presence of underlying sensory processing.

Atelicity can be described as a functional difficulty in initiating, maintaining, or organising behaviour in response to sensory information. In this context, the child may receive sensory input but be unable to use it reliably to guide action, exploration, or sustained engagement with the environment (5). This description does not imply a deficit in sensory reception itself, but rather a

disruption in the translation of sensory information into observable, goal-directed behaviour.

2.2 Visual Experience in Atelic Children with Cerebral Visual Impairment

In atelic children with cerebral visual impairment, visual experience is often reported by clinicians and caregivers as unstable and difficult to interpret (6). Commonly described features include:

- **Image Instability**: where the visual scene may appear fragmented or inconsistent;
- **Excessive Perceptual Detail**: resulting in difficulty prioritising or organising visual information;
- **Difficulty Anticipating Visual Change**: such that new objects or changes in lighting may be experienced as abrupt or unpredictable;
- **Impaired Recognition of Visual Stability**: for example, difficulty recognising that an object remains the same despite minor changes in position or context.

At a functional level, these characteristics are associated with increased perceptual uncertainty and elevated cognitive load during visual processing. Over time, visual engagement may become effortful or aversive, leading to reduced spontaneous

visual exploration or apparent disengagement from visual stimuli (7).

This section provides a conceptual and descriptive framework to support the design choices of the proposed protocol. It does not constitute a testable theoretical model and does not imply specific mechanisms of impairment. Rather, it serves to justify the use of simplified, predictable, and non-interactive visual stimuli in a feasibility-focused study involving behaviourally non-responsive paediatric populations.

3. Research Question and Objectives

3.1 Primary Feasibility Question

The visual mirror exposure paradigm evaluated in this study is conceptually informed by principles derived from mirror-based approaches originally developed in post-stroke motor rehabilitation (8), while differing fundamentally in its intended function and mechanism. Rather than relying on visual comparison or illusion, the present paradigm is designed to provide a coherent, stable, and highly predictable visual stimulus that may temporarily substitute for unstable or cognitively costly visual environments in children with cerebral visual impairment, consistent with sensory

substitution principles (9) and descriptive models of predictive processing (7).

In the context of cerebral visual impairment and atelic profiles, the paradigm is explicitly designed for behaviourally non-responsive paediatric populations and does not require task engagement, instruction following, or voluntary behavioural responses.

The primary feasibility question addressed in this study is therefore as follows: Is it feasible to deliver repeated sessions of passive visual mirror exposure to children with cerebral visual impairment and an atelic profile while maintaining physiological tolerability and obtaining stable, interpretable non-behavioural physiological signals in behaviourally non-responsive paediatric populations?

3.2 Primary Objective

The primary objective of this clinical feasibility study is to evaluate the feasibility and physiological 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 enabling the acquisition 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 are intended to characterise protocol performance and measurement properties rather than to assess therapeutic efficacy or clinical benefit. Specifically, the objectives are:

- to assess whether non-behavioural physiological measures, including 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 indicators of non-verbal dissent or physiological distress, in accordance 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, Tolerability and Safety Criteria

To ensure the highest standard of participant safety, feasibility and tolerability criteria are defined a priori. These predefined thresholds and decision rules, detailed in Table 1, constitute a mandatory safety and governance framework for protocol management.

Their primary purpose is to characterise the reliability, tolerability, and ethical acceptability of the protocol in children with atelic profiles, and to ensure that study conduct remains grounded in continuous monitoring of participant well-being and protocol stability. These criteria are not intended to demonstrate therapeutic efficacy but to guide ethical conduct and interpretation within a feasibility-focused study.

Table 1. Feasibility, tolerability, and safety indicators with predefined decision thresholds.

Category	Indicator	Feasibility Thresholds and 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	Feasibility is supported if participant withdrawal due to intolerance does not exceed 20% (i.e. no more than 2 out of 10 participants).
Informational Potential	Signal Sensitivity	Presence of measurable physiological modulation during controlled novelty phases in ≥ 50% of participants within the predefined feasibility sample.

Table 1 summarises the primary feasibility question, objectives, indicators, and predefined feasibility and tolerability criteria for this clinical feasibility study. All criteria are specified a priori, prior to data collection, to guide ethical conduct, safety monitoring, and interpretation of the study outcomes. The table links each research objective to concrete physiological or procedural indicators and to explicit decision rules governing protocol continuation or early termination. Importantly, these criteria are not intended to demonstrate therapeutic efficacy or clinical benefit. Rather, they are designed to determine whether the proposed visual mirror exposure protocol can be implemented safely and tolerably under controlled conditions in children with cerebral visual impairment and an atelic profile, while enabling the acquisition of interpretable non-behavioural physiological data. This structure supports transparency, ethical oversight, and methodological clarity within a feasibility-focused study, without implying any obligation or commitment to subsequent research.

4. Methods

4.1 Participants

The target population comprises children with cerebral visual impairment (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 as behaviourally non-responsive, which currently precludes participation in conventional visual assessment or rehabilitation protocols that rely on task engagement or observable performance.

Participants will be recruited prospectively following approval from the appropriate Human Research Ethics Committee, using the present protocol without modification.

Given the exploratory and feasibility-focused nature of this clinical feasibility study, no formal sample size calculation is performed. A minimum target sample of 10 participants is specified a priori as sufficient to evaluate 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 cerebral visual impairment, established by a qualified clinician and 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's ethics committee;
- medical stability permitting 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 an increased 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 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 for the present protocol lies in its methodological design rather than solely in the general vulnerability of the target population. The proposed visual mirror exposure paradigm is strictly passive and 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 limited capacity to provide reliable behavioural assent.

Given the reduced capacity for verbal or behavioural communication in behaviourally non-responsive children with an atelic profile, the absence of overt response is not interpreted as consent. Participant protection is ensured through continuous monitoring of predefined physiological and behavioural indicators of potential non-verbal dissent. These indicators and their associated thresholds are specified a priori and operationalised in Table 1. In particular, session termination is triggered by predefined autonomic criteria aligned with Table 1, including a sustained heart rate increase beyond the 20% threshold relative to the individual baseline, a persistent reduction in heart rate variability across consecutive sessions, and/or the emergence of behavioural markers indicative of distress or refusal.

Any detection of such indicators results in immediate termination of the session, in accordance with the predefined stopping rules. This precautionary approach prioritises participant safety and minimises risk exposure while allowing evaluation of protocol feasibility under controlled conditions.

This feasibility study does not involve therapeutic intent, does not seek to induce functional change, and does not withhold standard care. Its purpose is limited to determining whether the protocol can be implemented safely and tolerably in this population, based on explicit, predefined safety thresholds, without implying any obligation or commitment to subsequent research.

4.2 Setting and Equipment

The visual mirror exposure 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. The protocol is designed to be implementable across clinical and research settings without requiring site-specific adaptation.

Modes of Visual Presentation

Visual stimuli are presented using one of two non-interactive modalities, selected on the basis of participant tolerance, comfort, and clinical judgement:

- A large screen positioned directly in front of the child, which constitutes the default mode of visual presentation and is used whenever head-mounted devices are not tolerated or are deemed inappropriate.
- A virtual reality headset, configured in a strictly passive, non-interactive mode, providing full-field visual exposure and reducing peripheral visual input. Use of a head-mounted device is optional and contingent upon individual tolerance; it is discontinued immediately if signs of discomfort or non-verbal dissent are observed.

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 evaluated for feasibility across presentation modalities rather than for equivalence or comparative performance between modalities.

Controlled Conditions

Across both modes of visual presentation, 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 non-specific sensory stimulation. This configuration is intended to approximate a mirror-like condition in which the child is exposed to a single, isolated, and predictable visual stimulus under conditions of minimal sensory competition.

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 during baseline, exposure, and post-exposure periods. All physiological monitoring devices used in the study are certified for human use and comply with applicable regulatory standards (e.g. CE marking and/or TGA or FDA approval, depending on device availability and site requirements). Detailed device

specifications are provided in supplementary documentation or appendices where required by the reviewing ethics committee.

Sensor placement and data acquisition procedures are selected to minimise discomfort and to allow reliable 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.

Safety Monitoring and Personnel

Continuous monitoring during all sessions will be conducted by the researcher delivering the protocol, who is trained in the recognition of physiological and behavioural indicators of distress in paediatric neurodevelopmental populations, with immediate access to a clinician affiliated with the host institution for safety escalation. All personnel responsible for session monitoring have received specific training in the recognition of physiological and behavioural indicators of distress, including autonomic changes, non-verbal dissent markers, and signs of sensory overload in behaviourally non-responsive children.

Monitoring personnel are authorised to interrupt or terminate sessions immediately if predefined safety thresholds are met or if any indication of discomfort or distress is observed, in accordance with the predefined stopping rules outlined in Table 1 and Section 4.5.

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. It is specifically adapted to behaviourally non-responsive paediatric populations.

Session Structure

Each session comprises the following sequential phases, delivered in a fixed and predefined order:

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 exposure to a stable visual signal without the need to process motion, change or novelty.

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 modifications are predefined, infrequent and temporally constrained, and are intended to probe autonomic sensitivity while minimising the risk of sensory overload.

All phases are delivered in a fixed sequence. 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. Gradual increases in perceptual complexity are introduced only after successful completion of earlier phases, as defined by the absence of predefined physiological or behavioural stopping criteria.

Early sessions prioritise static and highly predictable visual stimuli. Subsequent sessions introduce slow motion and, later, controlled and limited novelty in a structured and non-adaptive manner. This progression is intended to minimise perceptual load

and prediction error while allowing repeated exposure under stable and controlled conditions.

The full session schedule, phase composition, 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 to ensure protocol stability and participant safety. 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 and ethical oversight.

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 feasibility study 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. 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 Structure

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 predefined stopping rules as an ethical safeguard, not as an outcome measure.
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 clinical feasibility study. All outcomes are specified *a priori* and are strictly non-behavioural in nature. The structure 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 ensured through predefined physiological and behavioural stopping rules, operationalised in Table 1 and applied uniformly across all sessions. The visual mirror exposure protocol is governed by these predefined safety thresholds and stopping rules, which are designed to prioritise physiological and behavioural indicators of potential discomfort or distress in a behaviourally non-responsive paediatric population.

Safety Monitoring Procedures

Safety monitoring is conducted continuously during all session phases by trained personnel, with immediate authority to interrupt the session if predefined stopping criteria are met. Monitoring is performed in real time throughout baseline, exposure, and post-exposure periods.

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.

Figure 1 provides an illustrative example of how real-time physiological safety monitoring is implemented during a single visual mirror exposure session, including the definition of an individual baseline and the application of predefined safety thresholds. This figure is provided for conceptual clarification only and does not represent empirical data.

Figure 1. Illustrative example of real-time physiological safety monitoring during a single visual mirror exposure session (mock-up).



This illustrative mock-up shows how physiological safety is monitored during a passive visual mirror exposure session. The solid grey horizontal line represents the individual resting heart rate baseline. The dashed red line indicates the predefined safety threshold corresponding to a +20% increase relative to baseline. The shaded area represents the predefined physiological safety zone. The solid line represents heart rate variation over time across session phases, including a controlled novelty phase. In this example, physiological modulation remains within predefined safety limits, and no stopping criteria are triggered. This figure is provided for explanatory purposes only and does not represent empirical data.

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 systematically favours immediate session termination.

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 governance approach in which participant protection supersedes data completeness. These stopping procedures are not intended to infer subjective emotional states, but to provide clear, auditable

documentation of discontinuation decisions based on observable biological and behavioural signals.

The presence, frequency, and context of stopping events constitute key feasibility outcomes in this feasibility study 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 when predefined stopping rules are triggered. No adaptive modification of stimulus parameters is performed based on interim observations. No interim analyses or protocol adaptations will be performed during the study.

The protocol is organised into three successive phases spanning six weeks. Progression from one phase to the next follows a

predefined fixed schedule and is not adapted based on observed responses, except in cases where predefined stopping rules result in session termination. Successful completion is defined retrospectively for feasibility evaluation and does not alter the planned timeline.

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 predefined, feasibility-focused study framework.

5. Data Analysis Plan

This section outlines the predefined descriptive analysis structure used to evaluate feasibility, tolerability, and measurement reliability of the visual mirror paradigm. 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 in this feasibility study. 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 predefined 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: Heart Rate; HRV: Heart Rate Variability

Table 5 summarises the predefined data analysis plan for this feasibility study, 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 study, 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 interpretive structure for interpreting outcomes strictly in terms of feasibility rather than therapeutic efficacy.

5.1 General Analytical Structure

This feasibility study 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.

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 Structure Specific to Feasibility Assessment

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 at the individual level.

The predefined target sample size of 10 participants represents an a priori feasibility objective rather than a rigid requirement. In the event that recruitment is limited due to population rarity or ethical constraints, feasibility interpretation will be conducted transparently based on the achieved sample, with explicit reporting of recruitment limitations and without post hoc modification of feasibility criteria.

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 a priori, prior to any data collection, to minimise analytical flexibility and to prevent post hoc reinterpretation. Any deviation from the planned analytical procedures, including unexpected data quality constraints or session level interruptions triggered by predefined stopping rules, will be documented transparently and reported alongside the feasibility and tolerability results. No post hoc changes to decision thresholds or outcome definitions will be introduced after data collection begins.

This analytical structure establishes the methodological conditions required to justify the consideration of future mechanistic or efficacy studies, contingent upon feasibility, tolerability, and measurement reliability being demonstrated.

6. Ethics, Oversight, and Regulatory Considerations

This manuscript describes a clinical feasibility study 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.

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 predefined non-verbal dissent will result in immediate termination of the session, in accordance with the stopping rules specified in Section 4.5.

No therapeutic intent is associated with this 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 consideration of 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. As a feasibility study involving a vulnerable paediatric population, the protocol may be discontinued if predefined feasibility, safety, or tolerability criteria are not met. Such an outcome would be considered ethically appropriate and informative for future research planning.

7. Discussion

The present manuscript describes a clinical feasibility study protocol designed to evaluate a visual mirror paradigm in children with cerebral visual impairment (CVI) presenting an atelic profile. As no empirical data have been collected, this discussion does not interpret outcomes or effects, but instead examines the methodological validity, scope, and limits of the proposed protocol. The primary methodological value of this protocol lies in

its explicit adaptation to a population for whom conventional visual assessment or rehabilitation approaches are neither ethically nor practically applicable. By relying exclusively on passive visual exposure and non-behavioural autonomic physiological measures, the protocol avoids any requirement for voluntary responses, task engagement, or instruction following. This design directly addresses a major methodological gap in the study of children with severe CVI and atelic profiles, while remaining compatible with stringent ethical constraints.

A central strength of the proposed approach is its exclusive focus on feasibility, tolerability, and measurement reliability, rather than on clinical efficacy or functional visual processing. The use of predefined session phases and within-session, within-individual contrasts allows evaluation of whether physiological signals exhibit structured and interpretable organisation in response to controlled visual input, without reliance on absolute autonomic values. This structure is specifically intended to determine whether the proposed paradigm is sufficiently stable, interpretable, and ethically manageable to justify future empirical implementation.

The protocol also incorporates conservative safety monitoring and stopping rules designed to protect participants who may be unable to express discomfort through overt behavioural or verbal means.

By clearly distinguishing between analytic inclusion criteria and ethical termination criteria, the design prioritises participant protection while preserving methodological transparency. These safeguards are essential when working with highly vulnerable paediatric populations and constitute a core component of the feasibility assessment.

Several limitations inherent to the proposed design must be acknowledged. The absence of behavioural outcomes, group-level comparisons, or functional performance measures necessarily restricts the interpretive scope of the data that may be generated by future implementation. In addition, autonomic physiological signals are not interpreted as specific markers of visual processing, but rather as indirect indicators of physiological regulation, tolerability, and signal stability. These constraints are intentional and reflect the ethical and practical boundaries associated with research involving children with severe cerebral visual impairment and atelic profiles, rather than methodological shortcomings.

The predefined feasibility, tolerability, and measurement reliability criteria are intended to guide both the ethical conduct and interpretation of the study. Should these criteria not be met, early discontinuation of the protocol would constitute an ethically appropriate and informative outcome. Conversely, if the criteria

are satisfied, the findings may inform future methodological or clinical research considerations, without implying any obligation or commitment to subsequent studies.

This discussion therefore addresses the validity and limits of the proposed methodological approach itself, rather than interpreting outcomes that have not yet been observed. The manuscript should be read as a methodological protocol evaluated prior to data collection, establishing clear ethical, procedural, and analytical boundaries for any future empirical investigation.

Declarations

Ethics Statement: This manuscript presents a conceptual and methodological protocol 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 protocol 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. Bach-y-Rita P, S WK. Sensory substitution and the human-machine interface. Trends Cogn Sci. 2003;7(12):541–6.