



HAL
open science

Impact of MI-BCI feedback for post-stroke and neurotypical people

Léa Pillette, Bertrand Glize, Bernard N’Kaoua, Pierre-Alain Joseph, Camille Jeunet, Fabien Lotte

► To cite this version:

Léa Pillette, Bertrand Glize, Bernard N’Kaoua, Pierre-Alain Joseph, Camille Jeunet, et al.. Impact of MI-BCI feedback for post-stroke and neurotypical people. Journée Jeunes Chercheurs en Interfaces Cerveau-Ordinateur et Neurofeedback (JJC-ICON’2019), Mar 2019, Lille, France. hal-02095124

HAL Id: hal-02095124

<https://inria.hal.science/hal-02095124v1>

Submitted on 10 Apr 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L’archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d’enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Impact of MI-BCI feedback for post-stroke and neurotypical people

Léa Pillette^{1,2}, Bertrand Glize^{3,4}, Bernard N’Kaoua³,

Pierre-Alain Joseph^{3,4}, Camille Jeunet⁵, Fabien Lotte^{1,2}

¹Inria, France

²LaBRI (Univ. Bordeaux, CNRS, Bordeaux-INP), France

³Handicap, Activity, Cognition, Health, Univ. Bordeaux, Bordeaux, France

⁴Service MPR Pôle de Neurosciences Cliniques CHU, Univ. Bordeaux, France

⁵CLLE (Univ. Toulouse, CNRS), France

The efficiency of BCI in general and of BCI based post-stroke motor rehabilitation therapy, in particular, depends on the feedback that is provided [2,4]. Feedback arriving to the brain are either extrinsic (information originating from an external source, e.g., a screen or a person) or intrinsic (somatosensory sensations felt by the person during the training). Both types of feedback have proven efficient for healthy participants to control a BCI [3,7] and to promote functional recovery post-stroke [1,5].

Literature indicates that the type of feedback might have an impact on BCI efficiency in terms of performances. For example, an intrinsic somatosensory feedback might be more effective than an extrinsic visual feedback for post-stroke rehabilitation and for neurotypical persons in a multitasking context [3,6]. However, there are no information in the literature regarding the influence that feedback might have over long-term learning. There is also a gap in the literature regarding the potential impact of the profile of the participants, e.g., kinesthetic abilities, on the type of feedback to provide.

In this work our aim is to explore the impact of modality of feedback, as well as users’ neurophysiological and psychological characteristics on user experience, BCI performances and neurophysiological markers. To do so, we analyzed the literature and implemented accordingly a MI-BCI with realistic visual and tactile feedback. We also designed protocols for which we plan to include forty neurotypical and post-stroke patients. Each of them will take part in 10 MI-BCI training sessions during about an 1 hour each. Training sessions will differ depending on the type of feedback which is provided, i.e., either a realistic visual feedback alone or the same visual feedback and a tactile feedback in addition.

References

1. Biasucci, A., Leeb, R., Iturrate, I., Perdakis, S., Al-Khodairy, A., Corbet, T., ... & Viceic, D. (2018). Brain-actuated functional electrical stimulation elicits lasting arm motor recovery after stroke. *Nature communications*, 9(1), 2421.
2. Grosse-Wentrup, M., Mattia, D., & Oweiss, K. (2011). Using brain-computer interfaces to induce neural plasticity and restore function. *Journal of neural engineering*, 8(2), 025004.
3. Jeunet, C., Vi, C., Spelmezan, D., N'Kaoua, B., Lotte, F., & Subramanian, S. (2015, September). Continuous tactile feedback for motor-imagery based brain-computer interaction in a multitasking context. In *Human-Computer Interaction* (pp. 488-505). Springer, Cham.
4. Lotte, F., Larrue, F., & Mühl, C. (2013). Flaws in current human training protocols for spontaneous brain-computer interfaces: lessons learned from instructional design. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, 7, 568.
5. Mottaz, A., Corbet, T., Doganci, N., Magnin, C., Nicolo, P., Schnider, A., & Guggisberg, A. G. (2018). Modulating functional connectivity after stroke with neurofeedback: Effect on motor deficits in a controlled cross-over study. *NeuroImage: Clinical*, 20, 336-346.
6. Ono, T., Shindo, K., Kawashima, K., Ota, N., Ito, M., Ota, T., ... & Ushiba, J. (2014). Brain-computer interface with somatosensory feedback improves functional recovery from severe hemiplegia due to chronic stroke. *Frontiers in neuroengineering*, 7, 19.
7. Ramos-Murguialday, A., Schürholz, M., Caggiano, V., Wildgruber, M., Caria, A., Hammer, E. M., ... & Birbaumer, N. (2012). Proprioceptive feedback and brain computer interface (BCI) based neuroprostheses. *PLoS one*, 7(10), e47048.