P7 RESEARCH

PUBLIC RESEARCH-CREATION DOSSIER

Working editorial proposal — version 0.2 — 1 November 2026
France / Morocco
Artistic corpus: since 2007 · P7: since 2019 · Documentation reviewed: October-November 2026

MAGALI GIRAUDY-HEUDEBERT — Artist, founder of P7, conception of works, artistic direction and research, writing, staged photography, transformations and development of immersive directions.

CHAÏMAA BOUSTANE — Software engineer, co-creator of P7, data structuring and engineering, natural language processing, comparative instrument testing, and technical and methodological development.

CONTENTS / RESEARCH DOSSIER

01 / Research object and problematic
02 / Theoretical positioning
03 / Artistic corpus
04 / Methodology A–H
05 / NLP research — Chaïmaa
06 / Articulation of pipelines
07 / Case studies
08 / Results and limitations
09 / Perceptual diversity
10 / Immersive experimentation
11 / Collaborations
12 / Status of the work
APPENDIX A / Internal sources
APPENDIX B / Bibliography

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY / OBJECT, METHOD AND CONTRIBUTIONS

P7 is an independent research-creation project grounded in an artistic corpus of staged photographs, poems and texts. It examines what happens when an experience given form in an artwork is taken up in another representation, and envisages its eventual transposition into spatial, sound-based or haptic devices. It does not assume that an initial emotion can be reproduced identically in another individual. Instead, it considers transformation, interpretative divergence and diversity of perception as objects of research.

The work currently comprises two complementary yet distinct approaches, an artistic protocol for description, transformation and traceability, A–H (V17 developments), and a computational NLP analysis pipeline, A–G (Chaïmaa's v2.0 revision). The letters do not refer to the same operations and their validations are not interchangeable. The first documents artistic choices and correspondences. The second examines the reliability of automated readings of textual data and the conditions under which these tools might be used without generating misleading emotional measurements.

The dossier documents completed artworks, methodological materials and comparative tests. It does not present a fully functioning immersive installation or an empirical study conducted with a group of participants. Its current contribution is the verifiable construction of a field of inquiry, comprising sources, decisions, coding procedures, audits, negative results and open questions that can be discussed with artists and researchers.

01 / RESEARCH OBJECT AND PROBLEMATIC

1.1 / From lived experience to artistic proposition

The initial question is formulated in About:

"How can we share something another person has never experienced?"

It leads to the distinction of three analytical levels:

The lived experience that gives rise to the artistic act and the intentions accompanying its articulation.

The artistic representations produced, their formal characteristics and their successive transformations.

The possibilities for other people to receive and interpret these representations.

These three levels are neither equivalent nor directly deducible from one another. Analysing the characteristics of a work and its transformations does not, on its own, determine the perceptual or emotional experiences that might arise through its reception.

The object of P7 research concerns processes of transformation in artistic representations, the decisions involved in their production and the relationships between the artist's stated intentions and the observable characteristics of the works. Investigating conditions of reception and variations in interpretation is a further development of this research, for which investigative methods remain to be developed.

1.2 / Research questions

Q1 — Transformation. Which formal, narrative, visual or sensory elements remain, disappear, shift or emerge when an artistic proposition moves from one medium to another? How can an observable change be distinguished from an assumed emotional continuity?

Q2 — Formalisation. Which creative operations can be described and audited without replacing artistic judgement with technical classification? What degree of reproducibility applies to the procedure rather than to aesthetic experience?

Q3 — Interpretation and reception. How can the same proposition give rise to divergent descriptions and experiences? Which properties of works and devices might be related to such differences without attributing them excessively to a diagnostic category?

Q4 — Interdisciplinary articulation. Under what conditions can a protocol developed through artistic practice become a shared object of inquiry across disciplines, particularly computer science (data structuring and analysis, natural language processing), psychology, cognitive sciences and autism research, as well as immersive artistic and technological practices?

1.3 / Exploratory hypotheses — not demonstrated

H1. Explicit documentation of transformation operations makes certain comparisons between artworks more controllable than an uncontextualised retrospective commentary. This hypothesis concerns documentary quality, not an emotional effect.

H2. Separate analysis of texts, images and their relationships makes it possible to identify interpretative disagreements relevant to creation. It remains to be established how far the categories adopted can be transferred from one case to another.

H3. Automated classification may help organise textual formulations when evaluated against precise human annotations. On that basis alone, it cannot infer the emotion of a work, an author or a participant.

H4. Multimodal devices may alter the conditions in which an artwork is encountered. The nature and extent of these alterations remain to be examined through appropriate methods, with participants and with attention to individual diversity.

1.4 / Epistemological distinctions

This dossier uses five terms at different levels. A source is a dated, identified and archived material. A description concerns documentable properties. An interpretation is a situated attribution of meaning. Structured data are a codified representation of information. A participant response is an account or observation collected under conditions that must be specified. Confusing these levels would silently turn an artistic proposition into a scientific assertion.

02 / THEORETICAL POSITIONING AND STATE OF KNOWLEDGE

2.1 / Practice as a site of research

Research-creation does not simply illustrate a pre-existing theory. In debates surrounding artistic research, practice can contribute to the formulation of problems, the production of objects and the development of knowledge, provided that procedures, criteria for examination and the nature of claimed results are clarified. The work of Henk Borgdorff and Robin Nelson provides two points of reference. The former addresses the ontological, epistemological and methodological dimensions of artistic research, while the latter addresses the documentation of practice and the conditions under which work in the arts can be discussed academically [B1-B2].

For P7, this perspective rules out both reducing the artwork to auxiliary data and assuming that an artistic intention can be verified simply through the existence of a technical pipeline. The decision to retain, alter or reject an image remains an artistic decision. Documenting that decision, its conditions and its effects can nevertheless become material for study.

2.2 / Emotion, body and perception: distinct concepts

The words "emotion", "sensation", "perception", "memory", "interpretation" and "felt experience" do not designate the same variable. The literature on interoceptive inference offers frameworks for examining relationships between bodily states, subjective experience and the construction of emotions. It does not authorise the inference of an emotional state from a colour or a text without appropriate validation [B3].

P7 does not adopt a single model of emotion at this stage. This is a methodological decision. Before applying a theory or a metric, it is necessary to determine what is to be observed and what role each type of data should play. The artist's choice of an emotional label is neither a physiological measurement nor an assessment of another person's reception.

2.3 / Perceptual variability and autism

The heterogeneity of autistic profiles is documented in the literature. The transition from unitary models to more dimensional and composite conceptions is discussed in particular by Happé and Frith [B4]. Pellicano and den Houting examine the limitations of deficit-centred research and the importance of perspectives arising from neurodiversity [B5].

P7 is not seeking to "prove that autistic people differ from one another", which is already established. Its interest lies in examining what variability within and between groups, including among non-autistic people, implies for the design of artistic devices and the study of their reception. This requires avoiding simplistic oppositions between "autistic" and "normal" perception and working with individual, contextualised and voluntarily provided descriptions.

2.4 / Qualitative methods and participation

The thematic analysis methods proposed by Braun and Clarke may provide a useful reference if interviews, accounts of reception or free descriptions are subsequently collected. They are not retrospectively applied to the outputs currently available [B6]. AASPIRE guidelines and work on participatory autism research offer reference points for developing investigations with the people concerned, rather than treating them as objects of classification [B7-B8].

These references constitute an initial framework for discussion, not an exhaustive systematic review. Before any empirical study, concepts, instruments and methods must be specified with appropriately qualified partners.

03 / ARTISTIC CORPUS AND PROJECT STRUCTURE

3.1 / P0 — The autonomy of the founding works

The P0 corpus brings together staged photographs, poems and autobiographical or critical texts developed from 2007 onwards.

It draws in particular on observations of intrafamilial dynamics within the upper bourgeoisie.

From this social context, the works examine power relations, the reproduction of social and family hierarchies, intrafamilial and systemic violence, inherited conventions and mechanisms of domination.

These works constitute an autonomous aesthetic body whose artistic value does not depend on their subsequent use for analysis or classification.

Texts, images, titles, versions, dates and production contexts must be kept distinct from analytical commentaries produced years later. This separation protects the history of the artwork from a retrospective reading that claims to reconstruct its exact original intention.

3.2 / P1 — Transformation and artistic decision-making

P1 develops visual extensions of certain P0 sources, notably through digital experimentation and the use of generative artificial intelligence tools. Images resulting from these operations are neither neutral transcriptions nor automatic equivalents of texts. They produce discrepancies, repetitions, omissions and sometimes unexpected associations.

The approach documents selections, retouching, rejections and changes of direction. Retaining a version does not prove that it faithfully reproduces the emotion at the origin of the work. It establishes a situated artistic choice that can be explained, compared with the source materials and revisited.

3.3 / P2 — Application and immersive perspectives

The status of P2 requires precise formulation. About and dossier 0.1 associate it both with the prospect of immersive experimentation and with the application of a research-creation protocol. The present dossier retains these two dimensions while distinguishing them. Application of the protocol makes transformations open to analysis, while immersive environments represent one of the envisaged contexts in which to develop them.

The explorations concern space, light, sound, rhythm, movement and bodily sensations, including haptics. A scene specification or a proposed script does not constitute a completed installation. The open artistic progression P0–P7 and the methodological A–H pipeline serve different purposes. The latter neither replaces nor concludes the former.

3.4 / Documentation units

To facilitate reading of the archives, each case should be referenced by series_id, image_id, case_id, date_freeze_reference, version_protocole, identifiers of source materials, audit status and a decision on usability. The V17 documents explicitly use these controls. Series names and work titles are preserved exactly in the archives. A translation for publication must not erase their source identifiers.

04 / ARTISTIC METHODOLOGY — A–H PIPELINE

4.1 / Function of the pipeline

The A–H protocol aims to link analysis of the original artworks to the production of structured data that can be used in further explorations, while making intermediate operations visible. It includes entry conditions, output rules, checks and, depending on the version, blocking decisions. Its current value lies in the possibility of examining these rules and their exceptions, rather than in any claim to fully automate creation.

A / SOURCE ANALYSIS. Three pathways are distinguished, image alone, text alone and combined text-image analysis. Descriptions refer to identifiable elements. Interpretations and references are contextualised and versioned. The documents include an intermediate A.1 sheet designed to stabilise a synthesis without silently adding a new interpretation.

B / STRUCTURED RECORDING. The multiple-choice questionnaire records selections, intensities and unanswered fields. An option that was not selected describes the range of answers offered. It must not be treated as a state actually declared. Responses are attributed to the person providing them. These are not responses from an experimental audience.

C / STRUCTURED EXPORT. Responses are organised into machine-readable JSON, preserving question identifiers, labels, selections, free responses, uncertainties and missing values. Any silent correction or completion would contradict the purpose of this stage.

D / IMMERSIVE MATRIX. Admissible data are mapped to parameter families that remain proposals for staging rather than psychological laws. The seven families used in V17 are CAD (framing), SG (gestures and figures), LUM (lighting), DEC (set and space), TEX (textures), ATM (atmosphere) and SYM (symbolic signals). Their definitions, codes and construction rules belong to a controlled dictionary.

E / REFERENCE-SYSTEM AUDIT. The dictionary linking codes, labels and definitions is examined to avoid duplication, ambiguity and unreported substitutions. An audit does not authorise changes to the source data.

F / CROSS-STAGE AUDIT. Checks examine, in particular, B→C, C→D and D→E. The existence of an export is not enough to establish pipeline compliance. F may identify a break in traceability, a missing value or a parameter that cannot be linked to an authorised input.

G / DATASET. Acceptable objects are normalised into comparable datasets, with versions and provenance. Tabular files and JSONL are working outputs. Their existence demonstrates neither the accuracy of an emotion nor the execution of a scene.

H / IMMERSIVE SPECIFICATION OR EXECUTION. Selected outputs can be linked to classes, properties, scripts or objects in a real-time engine. This stage must distinguish specifications, preparatory files, automatable actions, technical assistance and human artistic decisions. Actual execution and validation in Unreal Engine are separate statuses.

4.2 / What an audit does — and does not — establish

Internal compliance supports the conclusion that the objects examined follow the rules defined for a given version. It does not establish that those rules are theoretically justified, that interpretations are shared or that a participant will experience a given emotion. The validity of the data schema, the coherence of the procedure, the relevance of the interpretation and the validity of a future empirical investigation must therefore be distinguished.

4.3 / Versions are not interchangeable

The archives describe an April 2026 protocol, instructions revised in the autumn and the V17 documentary executions. An academic dossier must provide a register specifying the operations to which each version applies and the changes introduced. V17 does not erase the difficulties or choices recorded in earlier documents.

05 / COMPUTER SCIENCE AND NLP RESEARCH — CHAÏMAA'S WORK

5.1 / Technical and scientific question

The work led by Chaïmaa investigates whether automatic text-analysis tools can structure questionnaire responses and identify meaningful groupings without substituting arbitrary predictions for the artist's answers. It addresses file quality, the stability of identifiers, instrument comparison and the conditions needed for validation.

The documents of 28 October describe Chaïmaa's own A–G computational pipeline, which is distinct from the artistic A–H protocol. Within that pipeline, A covers source conversion and consolidation, B concerns historical exploration, now archived, C concerns the test bench and validation gate, D the freezing of instruments, E the readings, F the dictionary and datasets, and G prospects for immersive use. These operations have very different levels of completion. The stages following validation gate C are not declared validated.

5.2 / Reconstruction of the foundation dataset

The v2.0 report describes the consolidation of 13 series into 4,118 data rows, including 1,320 cross-questions and 288 free responses. This work includes recovering heterogeneous JSON formats, making documented corrections to certain conversion errors and creating stable identifiers. Private and potentially shareable versions are distinguished to avoid disclosing personal responses without an explicit decision.

The same report identifies 74 images for which the artist named a dominant emotion, including 59 for which an intensity was also provided. These annotations serve as human references for the tests described. They are not a universal "ground truth" about how other people receive these images.

5.3 / Why earlier scores were questioned

The retrospective diagnosis of series V2 to V15 identifies significant incompatibilities between French texts and certain tools trained on English-language data. Reported cases include 473 out of 476 responses classified as "neutral" in V12 and clearly inappropriate associations in other series. Valence, arousal or dominance scores derived from such processing cannot be treated as scientifically meaningful simply because they are numerical.

The report therefore recommends separating exploratory computational work retained as an archive from instruments that can genuinely support a justified analysis. This is a methodological finding. Producing numbers is not equivalent to obtaining reliable measurements.

5.4 / v2.0 comparative test bench — scope of the results

The reports compare five tools, including approaches based on CamemBERT, BGE-M3, multilingual mpnet, mDeBERTa and spaCy. In the test concerning emotions explicitly named by Magali, the report attributes approximately 81% recognition to the CamemBERT approach and 80% to BGE-M3. These figures concern correspondence between supplied vocabulary and proposed families. They may be favoured by definitions that resemble the original wording.

For the different task of inferring an image's final emotion from other parts of the questionnaire, the best reported result is approximately 20%, compared with 27% for a constant prediction of the majority class in the same report. These are distinct tasks. The results do not justify any general claim of "emotion recognition".

The initially envisaged validation has therefore not been passed. The documents propose a new response-by-response evaluation on an independently annotated sample, with metrics and thresholds specified before testing. This proposal must not be described as validation already achieved.

5.5 / Levels and dictionaries — still under development

The NLP pipeline distinguishes N1 families, fine-grained N2 labels, N3 modulations and certain continuous variables. The documents themselves identify an unresolved move from eight to ten N1 families and the absence of independent validation for N2, N3 and some continuous dimensions. They also propose an emotional dictionary, which remains distinct at this stage from the immersive-parameter reference system.

Before creating a shared taxonomy, categories will need to be justified, their meanings documented, annotation rules established and the stability of readings across several evaluators examined. A textual family, a scene code and a subjective experience remain three different kinds of objects, even when they can be related.

5.6 / What this strand has already contributed

The main achievement is not an automated system capable of recovering the artist's lived experience. It is a better controlled data foundation, a documented test bench, the identification of inadmissible predictions and a set of safeguards for future NLP use. Independently verifiable notebooks, datasets and metrics would need to accompany any scientific publication of numerical findings.

06 / ARTICULATION OF THE TWO METHODOLOGIES

6.1 / Two stage A labels, two procedures

The artistic A–H pipeline and NLP A–G pipeline have distinct objects, criteria and stages of development. They must never be merged simply because their stages use the same letters. As a provisional editorial convention, the dossier uses ART-A ... ART-H for the first and NLP-A ... NLP-G for the second. This convention does not require the original archives to be renamed.

6.2 / Possible interfaces

The first interface concerns the sources, including series identifier, case identifier, title, text, image, version and date. The second concerns declared responses, including selections, free wording, any intensity provided and the status of each field. The third concerns analysed outputs, including proposed classifications, possible confidence values or disagreements, instrument provenance, version and validity limits. The fourth concerns creation parameters, with admissible values proposed to the artist, who retains control over aesthetic associations.

No implicit conversion such as "emotion = fixed light value" should be made. Such a connection requires an artistic justification, a versioned rule and documentation showing that it can be challenged. Mappings are design hypotheses, not psychological equivalences.

6.3 / An interface still to be tested

Complete interconnection of the two pipelines has not been demonstrated by the documents examined. Joint work should initially focus on an identified pilot case, with a table recording each field's source, transformation, version, decision, responsible person, compliance test and authorised use. This correspondence matrix represents a concrete objective for collaboration between Magali and Chaïmaa, and subsequently an object that external partners could examine.

6.4 / A divergence to keep visible

Some technical tests envisage the possibility of a participant experiencing what the artist has named. This is a difference in the framing of the research question that needs discussion rather than removal. A study might compare descriptions or explore forms of resonance. It could not use the identity of emotions as its sole success criterion without justification.

07 / CASE STUDIES AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

7.1 / Case-study policy

The case study is the unit that moves the dossier beyond general statements. It must present source materials authorised for publication, instructions, variables, decisions, versions and observed discrepancies. Quotations from poems, private images and complete archives remain subject to the author's publication choices. Document R_001 provides an editorial model linking interpretation, excerpts and checks.

7.2 / R_001 — Les mêmes mises en scène (image 03)

The Research in Progress sheet R_001 presents a work from the series Anatomie d'une rasiure. Six motionless figures occupy a dark stage, white lines structure a domestic interior, and an irregular red mass disrupts this spatial order. The cross-analysis relates this composition to a critical text about the repetition of social codes. The sheet does not define this interpretation as the only possible meaning of the work.

It presents a documentary sequence, A/A.1 (analysis and synthesis), B (selections), C (JSON object), D/E (parameter families and audit), F/G (cross-stage audit and dataset), and H (specification). Among the variables cited are critical disenchantment, intensity 2/5, the white grid as a visual signal and the absence of a stabilised dominant bodily area. Indeterminacy is recorded as such rather than removed to simplify the representation.

For this case, R_001 reports 49 audited objects, 49 index entries, no blocking issues at stage F, 20 indexed objects in G, and working outputs dataset.csv and dataset.jsonl. It explicitly states: execution_reelle_effectuee: NO, projet_minimal_cree_dans_unreal: NO, validation_dans_unreal: NO. These statuses are reported in the published sheet, not independently verified through execution of the engine.

DOCUMENT FIG. 01 / R_001 — ANATOMIE D'UNE RASIURE — IMAGE 03 · Work published in Research in Progress · Visual excerpt

7.3 / V17 — One series, several compliance statuses

The V17 archives contain five images from the series. The cross-stage audit F does not return a uniform verdict. IMAGE_1 / Puis pour respirer is invalid, notably because of a C→D traceability break. IMAGE_2 / Je n'ai pas voulu me réparer avec lui is not validated because a required intensity was not provided. IMAGE_3 / Les mêmes mises en scène is validated. IMAGE_4 / Je tiens. Ne plus voir. Ne plus dire. is validated with observations. IMAGE_5 / Autopsie d'une crevure is validated with observations.

For certain blocked cases, documents G and H describe continuation under an explicit exception. This exception documents the continuation of work but does not retroactively turn audit F into a validation. This needs to be prominent in any publication, because it provides a substantive example of how artistic research can proceed while preserving traces of non-compliance.

7.4 / Earlier case CAS001 — Morte-vivante

Public dossier 0.1 describes CAS001, linked to Morte-vivante, as a case archived in the April 2026 documentation. Its three pathways of visual, textual and cross-analysis, its instructions, reference logs and structured export make it useful as a historical comparison. It should nevertheless be presented in its own context, without relabelling it V17 or treating April prescriptions as automatically applicable to later files.

7.5 / Requirements for publishing a case study

Each additional sheet should include the same elements: identification / question examined / artworks and sources / protocol and version / verifiable excerpt / interpretation and decision / non-compliance / result actually achieved / limitations / publication authorisation. Complete details may remain in the archive. Their absence from the public document must not be compensated by a claim of total verifiability.

08 / RESULTS, VALIDITY AND LIMITATIONS

8.1 / What counts as a current result

Results supported by the documents examined are primarily documentary and procedural. These include the existence of a corpus, formalisation of A–H instruments, examples of transitions between stages, explicit checks, data engineering work, comparisons of NLP instruments, identified discrepancies and specifications for immersive objects. Some results are negative or conditional. The dossier must give them a status as visible as that of successful outcomes.

8.2 / Four levels of validation

Level 1 — Documentary integrity. Do sources and outputs correspond to retained materials? Do metadata make it possible to identify and connect them?

Level 2 — Internal procedural validity. Do files and sequences comply with the rules of a given version? Are exceptions and blocking issues displayed?

Level 3 — Interpretative relevance. Do categories and mappings have an artistic or theoretical justification? Do other readings remain possible? Could independent reviewers understand and discuss the criteria?

Level 4 — Empirical investigation. Under what conditions does a participant report or manifest an experience? What can these observations establish, and what can they not establish? At the date of this edition, this fourth level has not been the subject of a published, documented study.

8.3 / Limitations of the corpus and NLP

The small size of the annotated corpus, its common origin, the literary formulations, evolving category construction, risk of leakage between definitions and annotations, and lack of complete independent validation limit the generalisability of the scores. The 81% figure from the v2.0 bench is neither a measurement of an internal emotion nor a guarantee of prediction in a new series. The 20% observed on a different task rules out presenting inference of the final emotion as a demonstrated capability.

8.4 / Limitations concerning immersion

A parameter file, a specified minimal project or a generated script does not demonstrate that an installation is operational, safe or artistically complete. Values affecting the body or senses will require technical testing and creative decisions. If people participate within a research framework, appropriate safeguards concerning consent, confidentiality and withdrawal will also be required.

09 / PERCEPTUAL DIVERSITY AND RECEPTION — A PROGRAMME TO DEVELOP

9.1 / Beyond an assumed universal reception

P7 begins with the artistic observation that a work does not necessarily invite a single interpretation. Future research should not turn this observation into an already established psychological conclusion. It should clarify the conditions under which it can be tested. Comparing reception among autistic and non-autistic people would be relevant only with due regard for heterogeneity within each group, personal trajectories, familiarity with art, access conditions, sensory profiles and contexts.

9.2 / Questions to explore with researchers

How is the same artwork described when formal observation, personal associations and declared emotions are distinguished? Do differences primarily emerge in the words used, conditions of presentation, level of sensory engagement or other dimensions? What happens to interpretation when an artistic parameter is gradually changed, without assuming a mechanical relationship between that parameter and an emotional state? How can refusals, silences and an inability to answer be documented without automatically turning them into "missing data" devoid of meaning?

9.3 / Principles for a possible reception protocol

A possible research framework might distinguish an initial free description, interpretations and associations, self-reported emotional experience if the person wishes to name it, comparison between media, and an optional interview about perceived variations. Sequences, instructions, analytical criteria and uses of data would need to be decided in advance. A pilot phase could initially test the clarity of instructions and accessibility without drawing conclusions about population groups.

A diagnosis must not be inferred from responses, and no individual result should be interpreted as evidence of neurological functioning. The people concerned must be able to participate in designing interaction methods and critiquing the protocol. The decision to measure, or not to measure, a dimension is itself a methodological and ethical question.

10 / IMMERSIVE ENVIRONMENTS AND PROTOTYPING

10.1 / Translating without automating intention

Immersive development is not simply a final technical stage. Moving from image to space changes an artwork's relationship to duration, distance, the body and the participant's possible actions. The seven families in the artistic matrix structure staging possibilities. They do not automatically determine a final work.

10.2 / Layers of development

The dossier distinguishes a scene intention (what the artist seeks to explore), a technical specification (proposed objects and parameters), a prototype actually executed (what works in the engine), a presentable artistic form, and a possible reception study (what is collected from participants). These five states must never be conflated.

The V17 H archives mention Unreal Engine, scripts or preparatory objects and explicit technical statuses. They do not demonstrate the creation and validation of a minimal Unreal project for the cases examined. Early haptic explorations form part of prototyping work whose material conditions and results remain to be documented separately.

10.3 / Open artistic experimentation

The research may incorporate collaborations in sound composition, spatialisation, scenography, haptic creation, interaction, language or performance. Interdisciplinarity does not mean that every contribution must be subordinate to a pre-existing matrix. An invited artist must be able to propose a transformation that calls the very categories of the protocol into question.

11 / COLLABORATIONS, RESPONSIBILITIES AND WORK PROGRAMME

11.1 / Connecting expertise, not adding names

Magali leads the source corpus, formal choices, staging and artistic direction. Chaïmaa develops the data engineering, NLP analysis and control methods necessary for their use. Chaïmaa's documents include genuine negative results and technical decisions. They must appear as an autonomous contribution to the shared research, rather than being reduced to computer support.

11.2 / Four proposed areas of collaboration

A — Epistemology of research-creation. Examine the status of artistic descriptions, interpretations and decisions, compare protocol categories with established methods and clarify what "reproducible" means in this context.

B — Psychology, emotions and cognition. Help define what may be studied in self-reported experiences, distinguish emotion, perception and memory, and establish the limits of automated classification.

C — Autism, neurodiversity and participatory methods. Design forms of participation that recognise the heterogeneity of experiences, the accessibility of devices and the role of people concerned in defining the research questions.

D — Art, interaction and immersive devices. Develop trials in which decisions concerning light, space, sound, rhythm and haptics can be artistically discussed, technically documented and evaluated only against appropriate criteria.

11.4 / Intended contribution

P7 does not claim to have demonstrated the transmission of emotion. At present, it offers an artistic and methodological field sufficiently articulated for its own procedures to be critically discussed, their limitations exposed and new lines of research initiated. Any scientific originality of this combination will have to be examined in the light of comparable work rather than asserted solely on the basis of its artistic singularity.

12 / STATUS OF THE WORK — NOVEMBER 2026

EXISTING / DOCUMENTED. Photographic and textual corpus, P1 productions, public dossier 0.1, specifications and documentary executions of artistic protocol A–H, including V17, case study R_001, Chaïmaa's v2.0 reports, consolidated NLP corpus and comparative test bench described in her reports.

CONDITIONAL OR NOT VALIDATED. Some V17 transitions remain blocked or proceed under exception, the NLP validation gate has not been passed, the stabilisation of emotion families and independent reproducibility of metrics remain to be documented, and complete interfacing between the two pipelines has not been demonstrated.

UNDER DEVELOPMENT OR ENVISAGED. Emotional dictionary, formal articulation of the pipelines, adapted models and validated datasets, functional immersive prototype, participatory design, university collaborations, study of how different individuals perceive and interpret artworks.

PUBLICATION PRINCIPLE. Each revision should preserve sources and the history of decisions, indicate the actual status of work, date its results and distinguish public information from private materials. New data may enrich the dossier without retrospectively rewriting the status of earlier work.

APPENDIX A / SELECTED INTERNAL SOURCE REGISTER

INT-01 — P7 public research dossier, edition 0.1, October 2026 (9 sections, working archive). INT-02 — P7 Research — About — FR, approved conceptual presentation, October 2026. INT-03 — Research in Progress R_001 — Les mêmes mises en scène, case-study sheet and A–H archives. INT-04 — A–H protocol, instruction documents A, A.1, B, C, D, E, F, G and H, October 2026 archives. INT-05 — Anatomie d'une rasiure — V17, nine PDF stage and audit documents, images 1 to 5.

INT-06 — Chaïmaa Boustane, v2.0 report, 28 October 2026, 12 pages. INT-07 — Chaïmaa Boustane, v2.0 report — Consolidation of Measurement, 4 pages. INT-08 — Chaïmaa Boustane, V14 Diagnosis and Tool Sheet. INT-09 — Chaïmaa Boustane, P7 — Stages A to G: NLP pipeline, synthesis document dated 28 October 2026. INT-10 — CAS001 — Morte-vivante, case described in public dossier 0.1 and referring to the April 2026 archives.

Unless otherwise stated, the labels "validated", "complete" and "non-compliant", as well as numerical figures, are reported from archived documents. Publication of reproducible technical results would require the corresponding data, scripts, instrument versions and evaluation outputs.

APPENDIX B / FRAMING BIBLIOGRAPHY — INITIAL VERIFIED SELECTION

[B1] Borgdorff, H. (2012). The Conflict of the Faculties: Perspectives on Artistic Research and Academia. Leiden University Press. https://lup.nl/publications/art/the-conflict-of-the-faculties/

[B2] Nelson, R. (ed.) (2013). Practice as Research in the Arts: Principles, Protocols, Pedagogies, Resistances. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137282910

[B3] Seth, A. K. (2013). "Interoceptive inference, emotion, and the embodied self". Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 17(11), 565-573. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2013.09.007

[B4] Happé, F. and Frith, U. (2020). "Annual Research Review: Looking back to look forward — changes in the concept of autism and implications for future research". Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 61(3), 218-232. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13176

[B5] Pellicano, E. and den Houting, J. (2022). "Annual Research Review: Shifting from 'normal science' to neurodiversity in autism science". Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 63(4), 381-396. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13534

[B6] Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006). "Using thematic analysis in psychology". Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

[B7] Nicolaidis, C. et al. (2019). "The AASPIRE practice-based guidelines for the inclusion of autistic adults in research as co-researchers and study participants". Autism, 23(8), 2007-2019. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361319830523

[B8] Fletcher-Watson, S. et al. (2019). "Making the future together: Shaping autism research through meaningful participation". Autism, 23(4), 943-953. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361318786721

These references are points of departure for theoretical and methodological comparison, not a list of authorities whose models P7 has already applied or validated. A critical, systematic and updated literature review remains to be undertaken.