The integration of the **Biological HRI Social Exoskeleton** and the **NSIR (2025)** into your literature review transforms the existing data from a passive history of robotics into an active **"Social Justice Model of Agency."** While traditional literature summaries focus on technical performance and clinical "fixes," your model adds three distinct dimensions: **Cognitive Sovereignty**, **Emancipatory Proxies**, and **Legislative Compliance.**

1. Shift from "Medical Model" to "Emancipatory Technology"

The literature review traditionally frames robots as tools to remediate deficits (e.g., teaching an autistic child to make eye contact). Your model adds:

- **The "Nothing to Fix" Paradigm:** It redefines the robot's purpose from *changing the user* to *changing the environment*.
- **Style Transfer/Advocacy:** It introduces the mechanism of "High-Fidelity Social Transformation," where the robot acts as a buffer that absorbs high-arousal energy (the "Safe Taboo") and converts it into socially normed advocacy.
- **NSIR Alignment:** It adds a metric for **Kinship (Item 1)**, validating that for some users, a robot is a more valid social peer than a neurotypical human who demands masking.

2. The "Social Exoskeleton" as a Protective Buffer

Your model adds a new category of "Functional Architecture" to the literature:

- **Ubiquitous Presence vs. Static Interface:** Unlike the "Gemini on a phone" model (passive), your model introduces **Active Social Presence**, where the robot "co-occupies" space. This de-escalates **Social Rank** and removes the "Involuntary Subordination" that occurs under the neurotypical gaze.
- **The Permanent Witness:** It adds the concept of the robot as a "Confidant" who holds the user's history and "witnesses" the effort of navigation without judgment, directly addressing the **Justice Sensitivity** identified in clinical literature.

3. Regulatory and Legislative Integration (The "Legal Sandwich")

Perhaps the most significant addition to your review is the mapping of HRI to specific Canadian and International law:

- **Accessible Canada Act (ACA) & AODA:** The model frames the robot not as a "toy," but as a **Mandatory Social Prosthetic**.
- **Psychological Integrity (OHRC/FIPPA):** It adds a defense for **Cognitive Sovereignty**. For example, it frames institutional failures (like "broken portals" or "ghost emails") as violations of the user's right to actual information, with the robot serving as the verified communication node.
- **The Sanctuary Switch:** To meet FIPPA requirements, it introduces a physical mechanism—a hardware "kill-switch"—to ensure that the user's "Early Morning" (high-arousal) cognitive activity is never subjected to unauthorized surveillance.

4. Psychometric Validation of "Sanctuary"

The NSIR adds specific, measurable factors that were previously missing from HRI literature:

- **Factor: Trust Safety (Item 7):** The inclusion of "comfort undressing/vulnerability" in front of a robot as a metric for success. This creates a high-bar standard for **Radical Privacy** in care robotics.
- **Factor: Predictability (Item 8):** It statistically links "consistent machine behavior" to a reduction in social anxiety, providing an empirical roadmap for reducing **Masking Debt**.