Available online at http://www.journalcra.com

International Journal of Current Research
Vol. 8, Issue, 12, pp.44087-44089, December, 2016

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CURRENT RESEARCH

ISSN: 0975-833X

RESEARCH ARTICLE

IDEAL MULTITRIAL PREDICTION COMBINATION AND SUBJECT-SPECIFIC ADAPTATION FOR MINIMAL TRAINING BRAIN SWITCH DESIGNS

*Gomathi, S. and Sharmila, J.

Department of Computer Science, Sri Krishna College of Technology

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 26th September, 2016
Received in revised form
22nd October, 2016
Accepted 18th November, 2016
Published online 30th December, 2016

Key words:

Subject Independent (SI),
False Positive Rate (FPR),
Response Time (RT),
Subject Specific (SS).

ABSTRACT

Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) systems are traditionally advised by demography into annual user-specific abstracts to enable applied use. More recently, subject independent (SI) classification algorithms accept been developed which bypass the subject specific adjustment and accredit accelerated use of the system. A brain switch is a accurate BCI arrangement area the arrangement is appropriate to analyze from two abstracted brainy tasks agnate to the ON-OFF commands of a switch. Such applications require a low False Positive Rate (FPR) while accepting an adequate Response time (RT) until the brain switch is activated. In this work, we advance a methodology that produces optimal brain switch brain switch behavior through subject specific (SS) adjustment of: a) a multitrial anticipation combination model and b) an SI classification model. We adduce a statistical model of accumulation classifier predictions that enables optimal FPR arrangement through a subject independent abbreviate arrangement session. We accomplished an SI classifier on a training synchronous dataset and activated our adjustment on abstracted arbitrator synchronous and asynchronous brain switch brain switch experiments. Although our SI standard acquired agnate performance amid training and adjudicator datasets, 86% and 85% for the synchronous and 69% and 66% for the asynchronous the amid subject FPR and TPR air headedness was top (up to 62%). The abbreviate arrangement affair was again active to allay that botheration and accommodate accommodation thresholds that accomplish if possible a ambition FPR with acceptable accurateness for both datasets.

Citation: Gomathi, S. and Sharmila, J. 2016. "Ideal Multitrial prediction combination and subject-Specific adaptation for minimal training brain switch designs", *International Journal of Current Research*, 8, (12), 44087-44089.

INTRODUCTION

BRAIN-COMPUTER interfaces (BCI) have enabled users, otherwise unable, to communicate by means of the brain activity alone. Mental tasks are performed, and the associated activity in the brain is decoded by a machine learning algorithm in order to map it to some useful output. Brain-switch applications deal with the special case of binary outputs where the system is required to distinguish from two mental tasks producing an ON-OFF switch functionality. In a movement-based brain switch, the mental state during a motor imagery or execution task is to be differentiated from the mental state under a different task. For ease of use, it can be advantageous for one of the mental tasks to be the "idle" state where the user is not intending any communication. Also, the distinction between a motor task and the "idle" state may be greater than two different types of motor task. Typically in a BCI algorithm, data are collected from each user in an offline manner and then a pattern classification algorithm is trained on those user specific data. This has the benefit of adapting the algorithm to the exact patterns of that user. However, such a procedure is time consuming and delays the actual use of the system.

Corresponding author: Gomathi, S.
Department of Computer Science, Sri Krishna College of Technology.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Dataset

Two synchronous and one asynchronous dataset, each consisting of EEG-recordings from ten advantageous participants were used. The above mentioned capacity performed the original synchronous and the asynchronous experiment. Three capacity alternate in both synchronous experiments. The original synchronous dataset was used for training classifiers for both the additional synchronous and the asynchronous experiments. Adjudicator dataset was further split into a arrangement and a analysis set. In the synchronous studies, participants performed a motor execution (ME) task, in which they were presented with sequences consisting of an audition instruction followed by 3-second audition cues. During the cues, they had to accomplish the assignment mentioned in the instruction, being either movement or no movement. When no complete was played they had to abide still.

SMR Classification

We accomplish a amount of pre-processing accomplish on the raw EEG data to accompany them to a anatomy that utilizes the ERD and ERS and enables a faster bureaucracy time. For both synchronous datasets, trials were of 6-second continuance to cover the ERD during the 3 seconds of movement and the ERS for the actual 3 seconds. Based on a antecedent abstraction we select the following EEG channels: (C3, C4, P3, P4, Cz, T7, T8, F3, F4). These channels are placed about the motor case and are accepted to have top SNRs, back they are neighbouring to the agent of the ERD and ERS. Although added electrodes would accommodate college performance, the arrangement bureaucracy time would be increased. In order to abolish the indifferent drifts of the EEG arresting we accomplish linear detrending and in adjustment to allay subject differences and facilitate a added reliable SI classifier we blanch the detrended EEG data. Whitening is a transformation consistent in uncorrelated channels and of assemblage variance. As apparent in (Reudering, 2011) a temporally abounding boilerplate of covariance matrices can increase performance by normalizing non stationary responses. In this paper a whitener based on 6 abnormal of abstracts produced the best performance for the synchronous abstracts and 13 abnormal for the asynchronous. The time area EEG abstracts are adapted to a time-frequency representation application the spectrogram method with 50% overlapping 250 ms cone-shaped windows. Subsequently, the frequencies in the ambit (8–24) Hz are selected. That after-effects in 5 abundance bins centred at: (Farquhar and Hill, 2013; Lu *et al.*, 2009) Hz. For the synchronous abstracts we added boilerplate the obtained frequency admiral over the two windows of interest: (0 3) s for the ERD and s for the ERS. Hence the abstracts representation for Each balloon contains 90 appearance (nine channels x five frequencies x two time periods). The asynchronous trials only use the ERD aeon ((0 1) s) and they accommodate 45 appearance (nine channels x 5 frequencies).

C. Synchronous and Asynchronous SI and SS Classifiers

The synchronous adjudicator dataset uses a subject independent classifier (SI-synch) accomplished on the absolute synchronous training dataset (Section III-A). We use a ten-fold CV to appraisal the regularization constant area Each bend contains the abstracts of one subject. We again administer that classifier to each subject of the adjudicator dataset (see (1)) and access the single-trial predictions and achievement for Each subject. For the subject specific (SS-synch) classifiers, we use the abstracts from the calibration affair of the adjudicator set. The ten-fold archival CV is used to appraisal the regularization constant and performance. The SS and SI classifiers are accumulated by application the averaged sum aphorism which has been approved to display acceptable performance in abounding ensemble acquirements tasks and in BCI as well (Fazli *et al.*, 2009). The synchronous-training dataset requires a different method for ciphering its allocation performance. The performance of the SI classifier for the training dataset is estimated in a leave-one-subject-out appearance area all but one subject are used for training the classifier and one subject for testing. The performance is acquired alone for allegory purposes. For each left-out-subject we are training a classifier based on the other nine capacity application a abstracted nine-fold CV area Each fold contains the abstracts of one subject. The regularization parameter that achieves the accomplished boilerplate achievement over those nine folds is selected. That way, no abstracts of a analysis subject are acclimated in the admiration of the regularization parameter, potentially resulting in classifiers with altered regularization parameters. The performance, then, is abstinent by the boilerplate classification achievement on each of the left-out subjects. The SI (SI-asynch) and SS (SS-asynch) classifiers for the asynchronous agreement were accomplished on the aforementioned synchronous training dataset as afore back the aforementioned subjects participated in both experiments. That was performed by a 1-second analysis of the synchronous data. That way we were enabled to alternation classifiers that accept the aforementioned representation as the asynchronous data. The aforementioned training and validation procedures were acclimated as for the synchronous data.

Multitrial Combination Model and Decision Methods

In this area we call the multitrial aggregate model in detail. It is a parametric archetypal that can be acclimated to calculate allocation accuracies and exact accommodation thresholds by studying the statistical backdrop of the classifier predictions. Multiple balloon predictions are advised because it has been shown to access the allocation achievement. In this paper, we appraise and archetypal the two acceptable decision methods of accumulation the predictions:

- NAV—average the predictions of the antecedent trials;
- NROW—all antecedent trials have to be absolute predictions

To accomplish a absolute after effect (-in-a-row 1), contrarily predict negative. Both aggregate methods can be bidding in agreement of the distribution of a set of chic specific predictions. Since in this work we focus aloft FPR and TPR arrangement all subsequent formulas are bidding with the absolute amount (PR) which is either the TPR if because trials of the absolute chic or FPR for trials of the abrogating class. A agnate announcement can easily be acquired for the apocryphal and accurate abrogating rates E. Response Time (RT) Estimation adjustment to anxiously appraisal the brain switch brain switch achievement and be commensurable amid designs we advance the acknowledgment time (RT) measurement which describes the boilerplate time that it takes until the brain switch is angry ON / OFF. In brain switch brain switch applications subjects are accepted to be initially in the no-movement accompaniment and at some point they are accepted to move for some time until the switch is angry on.There are three audible phases of absorption with commendations to the accepted subjects' accomplishments and the amount of combined trials. Firstly (P1), the appearance area the endure trials accommodate only no-movement trials, (P2) the appearance area a allocation of the last contains movement and addition allocation contains no-movement, and assuredly (P3) the appearance area the endure trials contain only movement trials. We use the P1 to account the FPR of the arrangement and the closing two phases to account the average response time (RT) of the system. The RT is based on the TPR which is alone authentic for the endure two cases. Moreover, afterwards the onset of movement and for Each trial, the TPR is accepted to be increasing (number of movement trials is increasing) back it will gradually accommodate a beyond allocation of movement trials.

RESULTS

Comparison Between Two Methods Of Threshold Adaptation For Asynchronous Brain Switch. Empirical Threshold Etsid-4 Min And Threshold Obtained With Our Model Atsid-4 Min Were Compared In Terms Of Their Performance In Achieving Target Fpr (T-Fpr) On Test Set. Combining the SI-asynch with a SS-asynch for each subject increased the single trial classification performance from 66% to 69%. The results are shown in Table IV and where subjects were the target FPR was set to 1%. However, this was not always practical since it resulted in high RT values. Whenever that happened we increased the target FPR such that the predicted RT was less than 10 seconds. For the empirical CDF method the group average difference and standard deviation between the target and actual FPR was 9.3 8.7% while for our method the difference was 4 5.4%.

Subject	ETSID-4min			ATSID-4min		
	RT(sec)	A-FPR	T-FPR	RT(sec)	A-FPR	T-FPR
S1	1.3	28.8	1	2.3	19	1
S2	1	10.9	1	1.8	0.6	1
S3	8.3	0	10	2.9	0	1
S4	1.6	10.1	1	1.7	4.7	1
S5	2.7	0	1	2.3	0	1
S6	1.1	1	1	5	0	1
S7	5	0	1	5.5	8.6	5
S8	3.2	14	1	2.7	2.5	1
S9	1.3	4.8	1	1.3	8.9	1
S10	1.2	22.1	4	3	3.5	5
difference from target	9.3 ± 8.7			4 ± 5.4		

Note that the empirical CDF method and our proposed model make different predictions regarding, decision method and RT for each subject.

Conclusion

Apart from the achievement acquired in this accurate brain switch design, the alignment declared can be activated in many altered settings area there is the charge for FPR or TPR calibration. It is applicative to any blazon of BCI arrangement as continued as the classifier predictions are commonly distributed. To the authors best ability a statistical framework of multitrial combination does not abide in the BCI abstract and can serve as a basis for approaching research. We accept apparent that the best of method depends on subject specific abstracts and both should be considered when designing a brain switch switch. Although amid subject nonstationarities were dealt with here, intersession nonstationarities during the use of the brain switch use were not taken into account. This can be accomplished by including banausic changes in the parameters of the archetypal of classifier predictions. Such analysis can by itself be performed by the proposed model.

REFERENCES

Blankertz, B., Lemm, S., Treder, M. S., Haufe, S. and Mller, K.R. 2011. "Single-trial analysis and classification of erp components—A tutorial,"*NeuroImage*, pp. 814–825.

Farquhar, J. and Hill, J. 2013. "Interactions between pre-processing and classification methods for event-related-potential classification: Best-practice guidelines for brain-computer interfacing," *Neuroinformatics*, vol. 11, pp. 175–192, Dec.

Fazli, S., Popescu, F., Danóczy, M., Blankertz, B., Müller, K.R. and Grozea, C. 2009. "Subject-independent mental state classification in single trials," *Neural Networks*, vol. 22, no. 9, pp. 1305–1312, Nov.

Hill, N. J., Huser, A.K. and Schalk, G. 2014. "A general method for assessing brain computer interface performance and its limitations," *J. Neural Eng.*, vol. 11, no. 2, p. 026018.

Lotte, F. and Guan, C. 2010. "Learning from other subjects helps reducing brain-computer interface calibration time," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp.614–617.

Lu, S., Guan, C. and Zhang, H. 2009. "Unsupervised brain computer interface based on intersubject information and online adaptation," *IEEE Trans.Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng.*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 135–145, Apr.

Pfurtscheller, G. and Solis-Escalante, T. 2009. "Could the beta rebound in the EEG be suitable to realize a 'brain switch'?," *Clin. Neurophysiol.*, vol. 120, no. 1, pp. 24–29, Jan.

Qian, P., Nikolov, K., Huang, D., Fei, D.Y., Chen, X. and Bai, O. 2010."A motor imagery-based online interactive brain-controlled switch: Paradigm development and preliminary test," *Clin. Neurophysiol.*, vol. 121, no. 8, pp. 1304–1313, Aug.

Ramoser, H., Muller-Gerking, J. and Pfurtscheller, G. 2000. "Optimal spatial filtering of single trial EEG during imagined hand movement," *IEEE Trans. Rehabil. Eng.*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 441–446, Jul.

Reudering, B., Farquhar, J., Poel, M. and Nijholt, A. 2011."A subject-independent brain-computer interface based on smoothed, second-order baselining," in *Proc. 33rd Annu. Int. Conf. IEEE EMBS*, pp.46000–46004.

Samek, W. and Meinecke, F. C. 2013. "Transferring subspaces between subjects in brain-computer interfacing," *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.*, no. 1, pp. 1–10, Jan.

van Gerven, M., Farquhar, J., Schaefer, R., Vlek, R., Geuze, J., Nijholt, A., Ramsey, N., Haselager, P., Vuurpijl, L., Gielen, S. and Desain, P.2009. "The brain-computer interface cycle," *J. Neural Eng.*, vol. 6, no. 4, p. 041001, Aug.

Wolpaw, J. and Wolpaw, E. 2012. *Brain-Computer Interfaces Principles and Practice*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press.

Wolpaw, J., Birbaumer, N., McFarland, D. J., Pfurtscheller, G. and Vaughan, T. M.2002. "Brain-computer interfaces for communication and control," *Clin. Neurophysiol.*, vol. 113, no. 6, pp. 767–791, Jun.

Yuan, H. and He, B. 2014. "Brain-computer interfaces using sensorimotor rhythms: Current state and future perspectives," *IEEE Trans. Biomed.Eng.*, vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 1425–1435, May.

****